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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation

The primitive Christian hope of the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God was based on the memory of the teachings of Jesus. The fact that that hope remained unfulfilled did not vitiate the Christian faith. But, the hope was transformed in such a way that the Christian faith was able to survive the surrender of the original expectation.

The study of this transformation has traditionally dealt with three issues in the history of the primitive church; the struggle for unity, the conflict with Gnosticism, and the accommodation to Greek metaphysics. A fourth factor recognized by Albert Schweitzer was the


2. The non-occurrence of the Parousia promised in Matthew 10:23 is the first postponement and, in the opinion of Schweitzer, altered the plans of Jesus, Quest, p. 358.
abandonment of the early hope of the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God. 1

The role of Paul in the decline of eschatology is uncertain. The "Tübingen School" of New Testament criticism, begun by F. C. Baur around 1831, maintained that Paul "developed his doctrine in complete opposition to the primitive Christian community." 2 Thus the eschatological thought of Paul was de-emphasized by Baur. R. H. Charles, in the Jowett Lectures of 1899 in London, 3 held that Paul's eschatological emphasis, initially found in I and II Thessalonians, declined as his thought unfolded, until in the Imprisonment Letters he had reached a Gnostic Hellenism with little emphasis on the Parousia. On the other hand, Albert Schweitzer holds that Paul's thought is uniformly dominated by the Jewish eschatological framework. 4

The Tübingen position has largely been abandoned, partly due to recent interest in eschatology in the development of the primitive church. However, the influence of R. H. Charles may be seen in such recent studies as the Interpreters Bible. 5 Schweitzer's "thorough-going eschatology" continues to stimulate research.

1. "The whole history of 'Christianity' down to the present day, . . . is based on the delay of the Parousia, the abandonment of eschatology, the progress and completion of the 'de-eschatologizing' of religion which has been connected therewith." Schweitzer, Quest, p. 358.


5. Francis Beare, commenting on Colossians 3:3,4 says "These verses
The purpose of this dissertation, therefore, is to outline and criticize the Pauline eschatological theory of Charles in the light of Schweitzer's thorough-going eschatology with particular reference to the Parousia. If Paul's interest did in fact decline as Charles contends, then he may properly be placed within the process of Hellenization. However, if Paul's interest in the Parousia is uniform, then he stands apart from this process of Hellenization. This dissertation seeks to examine the evidence for each view.

2. Definitions

"Eschatology" may be defined as the study of the doctrines of the last or final things. The Greek word, ἔσχατος, has the sense of extremeness, the furtherest or the uttermost. When used with sufferings, there is the sense of last or worst. Eschatology suggests a climax of extremes, the intense finish of events.

For the purpose of this dissertation, eschatology will be defined as the concepts dealing with those events which immediately precede and immediately follow the Parousia. "Parousia" may be defined reflect the remarkable modification, amounting to a transformation in the Pauline eschatology, which is imposed by the theological trend of this epistle." Francis Beare, "The Epistle to the Colossians," Introduction and Exegesis in The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), Vol. XI, p. 211.

as the arrival or presence of the Lord, and it commonly refers to the New Testament hope of the return of the Christ.

3. Limitations

Due to their occasional nature, the letters of Paul contain no complete system of theology, and any attempt to describe the Apostle's thought faces this problem. Part of the problem of the dissertation is to evaluate the fact of lack of evidence on eschatological matters in certain of the letters. Arguments from silence naturally will remain somewhat inconclusive.

By focusing the analysis of Pauline eschatology primarily on events around the Parousia, a limitation is evident. Eschatology generally deals with the understanding of heaven and hell, the nature of the future life, the mechanics of resurrection, and kindred matters. The use of the Parousia as the focal point of eschatological study permits concentration upon a more sharply defined body of material, and is the method adopted by the author.

The nature of the dissertation has not made necessary the involvement of the Qumran documents.

4. Previous Research in the Field

The problem of Pauline eschatology, as outlined above, was first posed by Albert Schweitzer in 1911. In most of the works on Paul which

1. Ibid., p. 635.
2. "The idea that (Romans) is a compendium of Paulinism, in which the Apostle set down his dogmatic theology and ethics, that characteristic idea beloved of many a Pauline scholar of earlier day, at the very least implies a great misunderstanding." Gustav Adolf Deissman, St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911), p. 23.
have appeared since then, attention has been directed toward non-
eschatological elements.\textsuperscript{1} In the Pauline biographies, eschatology has
received only cursory treatment.\textsuperscript{2} An exception to this lack of atten-
tion to eschatology is \textit{The Pauline Eschatology} by Geerhardus Vos which
appeared in 1930.\textsuperscript{3} Vos presents the four stages of Charles' thought in
Chapter VII.\textsuperscript{4} He regards Charles' position as "radical and deep-cutting,"
and he attacks developmental theories regarding Paul's thought on escha-
tology. However, his arguments show no use of Schweitzer's position as
outlined in 1911.\textsuperscript{6}

Though Vos rejects the developmental position of Charles, his
position is not that of Schweitzer. Schweitzer's study of 1930,\textsuperscript{7} was an
application of radical criticism. Vos regards the developmental position
from a conservative viewpoint. Thus Vos and Schweitzer stand on opposite
sides, critically, of Charles.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Typical studies are: Morton Scott Enslin, \textit{The Ethics of Paul} (New
The Apostle Paul and \textit{The Modern World} (New York: The Macmillan Co.,
1923). Charles Harold Dodd, \textit{The Meaning of Paul for Today} (New York:
son, \textit{Paul and the Intellectuals} (Garden City, New York: Doubleday,
Doran and Company, 1928).
\item F. J. Foakes-Jackson, \textit{The Life of Saint Paul} (New York: Boni & Live-
\item Geerhardus Vos, \textit{The Pauline Eschatology} (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Berd-
\item Ibid., p. 172.
\item Ibid.
\item Schweitzer, \textit{Paul and His Interpreters.}
\item Schweitzer, \textit{The Mysticism.}
\end{enumerate}
An exception to the indifference to Pauline eschatology may be found in Martin Werner's The Formation of Christian Dogma, which makes an application of Schweitzer's thorough-going eschatology to the early development of the primitive church. The Theology of the New Testament by Rudolph Bultmann reflects a recent growing appreciation of the importance of eschatology in Paul's theology.

The paucity of Pauline literary investigation serves to emphasize the continuing relevance of the position of R. H. Charles. His ideas have been perpetuated by such men as J. R. Cohu, H. A. A. Kennedy, A. D. Nock, C. H. Dodd, and Francis Beare.

Dissertations in the general area of Pauline studies have treated only parts of the eschatological problem. "Paul's Doctrine

3. Pauline study, in general, has been limited in recent years. F. C. Burkitt wrote in 1931: "With the decay of the popularity of 'evangelical' doctrine, Paul has gone out of favour, and his letters are much too little studied by modern Englishmen." F. C. Burkitt in a prefatory note, Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. v. and vi.
of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ" by Thomas E. Wortham, ¹ emphasizes the events and significance of Jesus' resurrection and appears to regard the Pauline evidence uncritically. This study is paralleled by those of John W. Oasley's "Paul's Doctrine of the Resurrection",² and Harvey King McArthur's "The Apostle Paul and the Resurrection of the Wicked".³ These dissertations approach the problem of the millennial reign and the general resurrection. "Paul's Conception of the Believers - New Standing" by Jack L. Gratz,⁴ and "Paul's Doctrine of the Cosmic Christ" by Robert Leland Palmer,⁵ are two other studies which examine Pauline doctrines outside of their eschatological significances.

The use of the principle of developmental thought as an approach to the understanding of Paul is partially treated in "Paul's Overcoming His Jewish Prejudices Against Gentiles" by Leonard L. Burkhalter.⁶

Another study aimed more at method than doctrine is "Was Paul Consistent in His Planning?" by Warren T. Jones.⁷

Studies of eschatology have been primarily general surveys which treat Paul's thought in passing. These are "Biblical Eschatology" by J. Dwight Pentecost, and "A Survey of Eschatology" by Clarence C. Goen. Another study which treats II Thessalonians in passing is "The Effect of the Expectancy of Christ's Coming on Christians in the New Testament" by James Berry Lowell.

Studies about Schweitzer have emphasized his concepts of reverence for life and his theory of religious experience. There have been no dissertations on R. H. Charles since his death.

5. The Methodology of the Dissertation

The method of the dissertation is a statement and examination in Chapters II to IV of the positions of R. H. Charles and Albert Schweitzer on the question of the interpretation of Pauline eschatology. These positions will be compared in Chapter V on the basis of their relation to developmental eschatology, eschatological chronology, and the genuineness and dating of Paul's letters. The problems will then be located and restated in a preliminary summary.

In order to judge the adequacy of each position, it will be necessary to establish critical norms regarding the Pauline corpus. In this first class of problems are the questions of the genuineness and dating of the letters, dealt with in Chapters VI to VIII.

The second class of problems, in Chapters IX and X, has to do with the specific eschatological material in the Pauline corpus. An attempt will be made to isolate this eschatological material for the purpose of analysis under the headings of the imminent expectation of the Parousia, the eschatological chronology, and immediate resurrection upon death.

Using the critical findings of Chapters VI through X, the author will then evaluate the positions of Charles and Schweitzer in Chapter XI on the basis of the problems raised in the preliminary summary at the end of Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

THE INTERPRETATION OF PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY BY R. H. CHARLES

1. The Background of "Developmental" Thought

Developmental thought, as a means of interpreting Paul's writings, found acceptance only when it had been first demonstrated that contrary ideas existed in the letters of Paul. The original statement of internal inconsistencies in the traditionally accepted Pauline Corpus was made by F. C. Baur who outlined his "two-party" hypothesis in 1831.1 He maintained that the letters of Paul could be classified in terms of their relationship to the thought of the "Petrine" party or the "Pauline" party. It was Baur's view that the two parties moved together, gradually coalescing into the Second Century Catholic church.

The many problems in this view soon caused it to be modified.2 In place of two parties identified with two early Christian leaders, a dichotomy was established in which primitive Jewish concepts were set beside

1. The history of Baur's statement and the reaction which immediately followed is set forth by Schweitzer, Interpreters, p. 12ff.
2. Baur pre-supposed that primitive dogma arose out of the teaching of Jesus by an organic and logical process. When critical theology divided the study of the history of dogma into departments such as Life of Jesus, Primitive Christianity, Paulinism, etc., Baur's assumption was shown to be false. Paul's system of thought was compared with Jesus' teachings and many problems emerged. It was to Baur's credit that he endeavored to maintain a "synoptic"
the Hellenistic thought world. The duality of thought in Paul, as evidenced by comparing the concepts of eschatology with mysticism, sanctification with justification, and law with grace, convinced the majority of nineteenth century scholars that Paul played a major part in the Hellenizing process. This Hellenizing influence gradually displaced the primitive Jewish elements.¹

It was Auguste Sabatier who first suggested the possibility that Paul's thought "developed."² Pfleiderer in 1873 noted the difference of the early letters with the Imprisonment Letters.³ R. H. Charles made a detailed statement in the Jowett Lectures of 1899.⁴ Because of Charles' commanding knowledge of Apocryphal literature, he was in an unusually

view of the development of the Christian faith even though his assumptions crumbled. Schweitzer attempted to re-establish a synoptic view upon the principle of consistent eschatology. The absurd results of the fragmentary or departmental study may be seen in the casual conclusions of modern amateurs such as Ignatius Singer, The Rival Philosophies of Jesus and Paul (London: 1919), or Lawrence W. Neff, The Final Failure of Christianity (Atlanta: Banner Press, Emory University, 1935).

1. "I venture to claim to have shown that a large part of what are sometimes called Christian doctrines, and many usages which have prevailed and continue to prevail in the Christian church, are in reality Greek theories and Greek usages changed in form and colour by the influence of primitive Christianity, but in their essence Greek still." So wrote Edwin Hatch in the Hibbert Lectures of 1888, The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages, cited by Peabody, Op. Cit., p. 148.
good position to evaluate eschatological influences.¹ The developmental position has persisted with minor modification.²

2. Definition of Developmental Thought by R. H. Charles

Charles believes that Paul's ideas on eschatology were in a state of development.

He began with an expectation of the future that he had inherited largely from Judaism, but under the influence of great formative Christian conceptions he parted gradually from this and entered on a process of development, in the course of which the heterogeneous elements were, for the most part, silently dropped.³

Charles makes the observation that these influences were Christian conceptions.⁴ He does not say "Hellenic." Thus the argument about "where" the influences come from is avoided. It was on this point that the eschato-

1. Charles was the editor of the Oxford Edition of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, 1913.
4. Ibid.
logical debate turned in the last half of the nineteenth century.  

He proceeds to outline the four stages which are: (1) I and II Thessalonians; (2) I Corinthians; (3) II Corinthians and Romans; (4) Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians. Charles is careful to note that there is not perfect consistency in these stages. This should not be expected because the Apostle's thought was in transition and did not reach finality in his writings.

1. For a discussion of this debate see Schweitzer, Interpreters, p. 63ff. The first break-through in the study of Greek influence on Paul was the definition of "Hellenistic" and the understanding that Jewish-Hellenism is different from "Greek" thought. The end result of this study, according to Schweitzer, was the demonstration that Greek thought had no influence on Paul. The arguments against this conclusion were generally put forward by Pfleiderer, Teichmann, Holzmann, and others of the Tübingen school, (see diagram, appendix C, p. 189). Though the issue of the influence of Hellenism is outside the subject of this dissertation, it should be noted that some scholars have not entirely agreed with Schweitzer's conclusion of 1911. See Dodd, Meaning of Paul, pp. 19, 21f, 87; and Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), Vol. I, Chap. II. For a conservative conclusion which supports Schweitzer, see Machen, Op. Cit., pp. 211-290, especially p. 271. See also Enslin, Op. Cit., pp. 17-44. Or note Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, trans. William F. Stinespring (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1944), p. 464. "Hence it was inevitable that Paul should have been unconsciously influenced by Greek pagan teachings."

2. J. R. Cohu in his Saint Paul in the Light of Modern Research, organizes Chap. XXIV on Pauline Eschatology in exactly the same way as Charles, complete with the four stages. In spite of this similarity, Cohu does not acknowledge a dependence on Charles in any way, nor does he note him at any point in the discussion.

3. The First Period - I and II Thessalonians

Charles groups I and II Thessalonians together to make up his beginning period of Paul's thought. He is aware that these two letters offer conflicting views on the Parousia. He feels that despite some problems they can be considered together because some time elapses between the composition of the epistles, and some of the eschatological views of the Apostle "were in a constant state of flux." Charles does not raise the issue of the genuineness of II Thessalonians.

The beginning period covers three general topics: The first is the Apostasy and the Antichrist. Here Charles draws heavily on II Thessalonians. The end of the world is built upon the "direct intervention of God when evil has reached its climax." The day of the Lord depends upon the initial coming of the man of lawlessness who is the son of perdition. He is the consummation of evil now present, and his coming will be accompanied with "pretended signs and wonders." The son of perdition claims himself to be God. Charles suggests that he is the negation of Christ as well. The Lord Jesus slays the son of perdition with the breath of his

---

1. Ibid., p. 438.
2. All references to this topic are from II Thess. This would strengthen the position of those who find II Thess. out of harmony with Paul's authentic letters, e.g., Schweitzer.
4. II Thess. 2:3.
5. II Thess. 2:7.
The Antichrist is not to be equated with Rome for Charles believes that II Thessalonians 2:6 and 7, show that it is Rome which restrains the son of perdition. Charles concludes this section by noting that the concept of the son of perdition does not reappear in Paul's later teachings.

The second topic is that of the Parousia and Final Judgment. Paul expects the Parousia of Christ in his own lifetime. It will follow immediately after the son of perdition and will be preceded by certain signs. Despite these signs, the "day of the final catastrophe is uncertain."

The Parousia itself will be marked by various events such as cry of command, the archangel's call and sound of the trumpet of God. Judgment also takes place. The Antichrist of II Thessalonians is annihilated. The godless, careless, and actively hostile are destroyed. Here Charles suggests that Paul thinks within the narrow Jewish eschatological intol-

1. II Thess. 2:8.
7. I Thess. 5:16.
8. II Thess. 2:8.
erance.1

The reason for Paul's eschatological statement in I Thessalonians is occasioned by a concern of the church for those who were dying prior to the Parousia. Paul solves this problem by having the dead rise first and then "we who are alive."2 It is possible that the risen saints are those who accompany the Lord, but it may be angels.3 The meaning hinges on the interpretation of ψυχοι, either as "faithful" or "angels."4 Charles believes that angels are but the agents of divine judgment,5 and hence the resurrection of the faithful should occur at such a time that they can accompany Christ at his advent.6 In I Thessalonians 4:16

1. Charles, Op. Cit., p. 443. Cohu tends to restate Charles' opinions with greater force and less discretion. "In this first stage we have the traditional Jewish apocalypse in all its naked rigidity and materialism." Cohu, Op. Cit., p. 320. On the same page is this opinion: "Paul is far more modern than we are while we out-Jew Paul on his most Jewish side and ignore his true revelation."
2. I Thess. 4:16, 17.
4. Note the detailed discussion of this matter by James Everett Frame, "Thessalonians", International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 139. Favoring "angels" is the intimate connection with the Parousia as in I Thess. 4:16. General N. T. usage favors "saints" (Col. 1:26), but it is difficult to conceive of the departed and living saints arriving with the Lord at his Parousia unless the scene is placed later, perhaps at a judgment. In terms of I Thess. 3:13, it seems probable that ψυχοι does not refer to the dead in Christ who rise first in I Thess. 4:16.
the resurrection occurs after the advent. Charles concludes that the language is "vague" and "the teaching on this point is not quite clear."1

Following the resurrection, those in Christ will meet him in the air and remain with him.2 A heavenly life follows in which the blessed share in the glory of God and Christ.3

4. The Second Period – I Corinthians

The second stage of development is found in I Corinthians.4 It is in harmony with the Thessalonian Letters in many respects but with the important exception of the omission of all reference to the Anti-christ.5

Severe trials precede the Parousia which suggest that because of the short time left, the believer ought to give up the "legitimate joys" of this life.6 The coming of the Lord includes a manifestation of his glory.7 Judgment is immediately connected.8 There is no time interval between the Parousia and this judgment.

Charles acknowledges a contrary interpretation drawn from 15:22-24, in which the powers hostile to God are stripped of their influence by the time of the Parousia.9 The Parousia is accompanied by

2. I Thess. 4:14.
6. I Cor. 7:29.
7. I Cor. 1:7.
8. I Cor. 4:4,5.
the final judgment and resurrection which bring about the new age. Some scholars, leaning heavily on verse 25, "for he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet," have concluded that this passage refers to the millennium.¹ According to Charles, this is impossible for the Parousia follows the period of Christ's domination.²

The resurrection of man is connected directly with Christ. A comparison is made between Adam and Christ. Those in fellowship with Adam died; those in fellowship with Christ shall be made alive.³ The relationship is ethical and spiritual, not natural or genealogical.⁴

The nature of the resurrection body precludes the possibility of the resurrection of the dead.⁵ The nature of the resurrection body is described in 42-44 in a series of comparisons.⁶ It is clear that Paul's concept of resurrection involves the successive expression of personality on a higher plane or in a different sphere.⁷ Hence, such expression necessarily involves those who are in Christ. Without this relationship there is no resurrection at all.

The time of the resurrection follows Jewish tradition, namely after the Parousia.⁸ However, Charles notes that the doctrine of the

---

3. I Cor. 15:22.
5. I Cor. 15:35-39.
7. Ibid., p. 452.
8. I Cor. 15:51,52.
risen body has no organic connection with the traditional Jewish view. Charles concludes that this doctrine of the risen body points to a resurrection occurring at the time of the death of the believer, and unconnected with any future external event. Paul is not fully conscious of this implication in the second stage but brings it to full view in the third stage.

The final consummation in I Corinthians is the overcoming of death which follows on the resurrection of the righteous. The resurrection of the righteous precedes the transfiguration of the righteous living in the manner of I Thessalonians. The perfected Kingdom of God then begins in a new and glorious world. God is "all in all." The hostile powers have been reduced to unwilling obedience.

5. The Third Period: II Corinthians and Romans

The third period of Paul's eschatological thought is marked by a change of view as to the time of resurrection. In addition, Paul enlarges his conception of the universal spread and comprehensiveness of Christ's Kingdom on earth. This third period is represented by two letters, II Corinthians and Romans.

2. Ibid., p. 454.
3. I Cor. 15:53.
4. I Cor. 15:28.
5. I Cor. 15:28.
Charles notes that Paul's previous views are under the influence of Jewish inherited beliefs which look forward to a great apostasy and revelation of the man of sin.\textsuperscript{1} The Parousia follows upon the culmination of evil. In Romans 11, Paul proclaims the progressive transformation of mankind which culminates in the Parousia.\textsuperscript{2} The temporary rejection of the Jews simply brings about the conversion of the Gentiles, and when the Gentiles are all saved, then Israel shall be saved.\textsuperscript{3} The rise of evil power apparently is not an important matter prior to the Parousia as in II Thessalonians.

The Parousia is close at hand, and all men must appear before the judgment seat.\textsuperscript{4} Both Christ and God are judge.\textsuperscript{5} Romans emphasizes works as the basis of judgment,\textsuperscript{6} for works is where faith operates.

How can a judgment operate when resurrection follows immediately after death? Charles suggests that the individual resurrection is but a partial fulfillment of blessedness. The final fulfillment comes when the whole community has reached perfection.\textsuperscript{7} Hence, the initial individual resurrection is sort of a "waiting period" until the other matters work out.

In II Corinthians 5:1-8, Paul clearly presents the new view that

\begin{itemize}
\item[Ibid.]
\item Romans 11:25.
\item Romans 13:11, 12.
\item Romans 14:10.
\item II Cor. 5:10, Romans 14:10.
\item Romans 2:6, but note 1:17.
\end{itemize}
resurrection follows immediately after death. Paul wishes that he might be alive when the Lord comes, but in any event, upon death one comes into the possession of an immortal body in heaven. Likewise, at the Parousia there is a full manifestation of glory already possessed by the faithful. Paul no longer speaks of the resurrection of the faithful to glory at the Parousia but rather speaks of manifestation of glory already possessed. The phrase "spiritual resurrection" of the faithful becomes an equivalent phrase for "manifestation of glory" in the later epistles.

6. The Fourth Period: Philippians, Colossians and Ephesians

The final stage of Paul's eschatological thought deals with the cosmic significance of Christ. These ideas are found in Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians. In the earlier epistles the creation of the world was effected through the Son, while the consummation was to be realized in the Father. In these late epistles, the Son is "the principle of cohesion and unity whereby it is a cosmos and not a chaos."4

The Kingdom of Christ is thus of everlasting duration and is not ended by the Kingdom of God who is "all in all." All mediating functions of the Kingdom of Christ are ended.5 The new goal of the universe is the

1. Ibid., p. 458.
2. Ibid., p. 460.
3. 1 Cor. 8:6.
5. Charles believes I Cor. 15:24-28 describes a kingdom of everlasting duration.
Kingdom of Christ and God. Charles elaborates this idea with several references to I and II Timothy in which the new kingdom is called the "Kingdom of Jesus Christ."2

Along with the eternal Kingdom of Christ comes the complete spiritual power of Christ over all. Christ is the consummation of all powers.3 It is not clear if Christ's reconciling power embraces even the angels of Satan. However, at the end there is no room in the universe for a wicked being, either human or angelic. Thus every being is finally redeemed or destroyed. Charles suggests that this final punishment is not external but subjective and self-executed.4

7. Summary

Certain main features distinguish each stage of Paul's eschatological thought, according to Charles.5 In the first section, Charles depends considerably upon II Thessalonians, for the "man of sin" figures prominently in the culmination of evil preceding the Parousia. The Parousia is accompanied by the resurrection of the righteous into an internal abode. There is no temporary messianic kingdom.

1. Ephesians 5:5.
3. Phil. 2:10.
5. See Cohu's parallel opinion: "We can trace a clear development in his eschatology from the crude, popular, traditional views of Thessalonians to the far more spiritual and quite modern teaching of II Corinthians, Philippians and Colossians." Cohu, Op. Cit., p. 318.
The second stage of Paul's thought is quite similar to the first stage except that all references to the "man of sin" are missing. The suggestion of increase of evil prior to the Parousia is still present in the "severe trials." Judgment follows after the Parousia and Christ is the judge. The new doctrine of the resurrection body clearly applies to the righteous only, thus prohibiting any resurrection of the unrighteous, even for judgment. Charles concludes that there is the implication that resurrection follows immediately after death. This implication is in conflict with I Corinthians 15:51,52, which places resurrection at the Parousia, in the manner of the first stage. In addition, there is the strong suggestion of a millennial kingdom in I Corinthians 15:22-26, which Charles depreciates. Nevertheless, he also notes that the Kingdom of God replaces the Kingdom of Christ at the end of the world.

The third stage involves a shift of mood of the events preceding the Parousia. Instead of evil culminating in the Parousia, the conversion of the world takes place. It is a universal spread of the Gospel. Despite the implications of this new idea, judgment still follows the Parousia, a judgment based on works as the expression of faith. In the third stage, Paul introduces the new doctrine of resurrection immediately after death for the righteous only, II Corinthians 5:1-8. This doctrine clearly states what was only hinted at in the preceding stage. The obvious difficulties raised by this view, when compared with a Parousia resurrection, are harmonized by another doctrine of "partial" resurrec-
The righteous are resurrected at death but are "revealed" or "glorified" at the Parousia.

The final stage of Paul's eschatological thought is marked by a sharp departure from the issues considered above. Christ is the creator and goal of the universe. The Kingdom of Christ is not equated completely with the Kingdom of God and all sense of temporary millennialism, as suggested in the second stage, is gone. Furthermore, Christ redeems all beings since he created all beings. It is not entirely clear whether this refers to Satanic beings for a judgment of some kind still remains. Charles believes that such a judgment is subjective and self-executed and outside of the earlier Jewish concept of external punishment.

It is clear that Charles believes that Paul introduces several important new ideas and that his thought shifts sharply to accommodate the declining eschatological hope. The main ideas which are lost are: (1) The Antichrist. (2) Culmination of evil. (3) Immediate coming of the Parousia. (4) Judgment of external punishment at the Parousia. (5) Millennial Kingdom of Christ.

The main ideas which are introduced are: (1) The resurrection body. (2) The resurrection immediately following death. (3) Kingdom of Christ identified with Kingdom of God. (4) Subjective judgment. (5) Conversion of the world preceding Parousia.
1. Background

On September 19, 1911, Albert Schweitzer finished the Preface to *Paul and His Interpreters*. He conceived of his study as a "continuation of my history of the critical study of the life of Jesus which appeared in 1906 under the title *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*."\(^1\) Schweitzer felt that his new approach to the life of Jesus, that of "thorough-going eschatology," demanded a continuing application to the history of the development of Christian thought.\(^2\) Such an application must necessarily move from Jesus to Paul and finally to the ground of the history of dogma. Schweitzer was aware that the history of dogma began with the second century, specifically with Ignatius and Justin.\(^3\) He noted that Harnack's *History of Dogma*, starts with "solid mason work" only in the Greek period.\(^4\)

---

2. Ibid., p. ix.
3. Ibid., p. vi.
"What precedes is not placed on firm foundations but only supported on piles."

It was Schweitzer's intention in Paul and His Interpreters to "define the position of Paul." He was concerned with the place that Paul occupied in the process of Hellenization. Perhaps Paul was the first stage in this process, but on the other hand, his thought could be conceived of as purely Jewish-eschatological. Usually the former was taken for granted, for Paul's thought did not seem easily explainable. Also, if Paul were thoroughly in the Jewish framework, the problem of explaining the Hellenization of the Gospel would be more acute. Schweitzer originally conceived of Paul and His Interpreters as the opening chapter in his major work of Paul; but, as the research expanded, he decided to present the book as a background study.

2. Methodology

Schweitzer's method was that of his previous study of the life of Jesus. He attempted to lay before the reader an historical survey of scholarship on Paul to "promote the knowledge of the past periods of the science." However, Schweitzer did not develop his new view of Paul by attaching his statement to the historical survey; rather, he proposed to develop and defend his view in a separate work entitled Die Mystik des

2. Ibid., p. x.
3. Ibid., p. xi.
Apostels Paulus which was to appear at an "early date."¹ This early date turned out to be 1930, though the first draft was completed in 1906.

Schweitzer further limited his survey to books in German for he found that his limited acquaintance with the English language "raised a barrier."² The one exception was that of The Hibbert Lectures of 1888 by Edwin Hatch entitled The Influences of Greek Ideas and Usages Upon the Christian Church.³ Several works in French were also cited.⁴

3. The Beginning of Historical Method

The first chapter of Schweitzer's historical survey traces the beginning of the historical method through Semler, Schleiermacher, Eichhorn, and Usteri. It was a time of definition of critical investigation. The Reformation had a dogmatic interest in Paul and until the opening of the nineteenth century, no real critical progress had been made. At the conclusion of this first period, about 1820, literary criticism had reached the point where the genuineness of the Pastorals was doubted.⁵ Semler had noted the confusion within II Corinthians and had suggested that Romans 15 and 16 were not part of the original epistle.⁶

Among the important conclusions reached in this opening period was

---

2. Ibid., p. xi.
3. Ibid., pp. 25, 82. Hatch was translated into German in 1892 by Erwin Preuschen.
4. Ibid., pp. 22, 23, 152, 179.
5. Schleiermacher was primarily responsible for this about 1807.
the presence of two systems of thought within the writings of Paul.

First, there was a juridical system based on the idea of justification, and second, an ethical system, dominated by the idea of sanctification. However, in this early period the relationship of these two ideas was not defined.

In 1831, Ferdinand Christian Baur "gave to the study of Paulinism a new direction" with the publication of an article entitled "The Christ Party in the Corinthian Church." He suggested that Paul "developed his doctrine in complete opposition to that of the primitive Christian community, and that only when this is recognized can we expect to grasp the peculiar character of the Pauline ideas." There were two parties in the early church, a Petrine Party oriented around the conservative Jewish teachings of the original Apostles, and a Pauline Party which held divergent views, especially on the subject of the redemption wrought by Christ. These two parties gradually coalesced into the single united church under the pressure of Gnosticism.

Baur thus opened the way for a developmental understanding of Pauline thought. He suggested that any letter of Paul may be evaluated

---

3. Baur was the foremost scholar of the Tübingen School of New Testament criticism from about 1831 to 1860. The influence of Hegelian dialectic on Baur's "two party" system is obvious. Hegel died in 1831 at the height of his fame, the very year in which Baur published his theory. Though Hegel's major professorship was at the University of Berlin (1818-1831), it is noteworthy that he was first educated at Tübingen.
in terms of its relationship to the two parties. When this is done it may be properly placed in the correct period.

His first application of this method of literary criticism, which he called "positive criticism," was to the Pastorals, which he judged to be spurious, for they show evidence of the combat against Second Century Gnosticism. A continuing application of "positive criticism" led Baur to declare only Galatians, Romans and I and II Corinthians as the four certainly genuine Pauline letters. His criticism of Colossians and Ephesians rested on the "softening" of the Gentile principles and peculiarities in order that the two parties might coalesce.¹ Baur did not emphasize eschatology and the Tübingen School practically eliminated any significant consideration of Paul's thought on this matter.

Albrecht Ritschl in 1857 provided a cogent criticism of Baur.² He noted that in Paul's thought there are some points which are in common with Jewish Christianity, but Ritschl was not able to say exactly what constituted the common element. He did note that the expectation of the Parousia is a very important common element but he never really "took it seriously."³

This second period concludes with Baur's final statement published posthumously in 1864.⁴ Schweitzer notes that Baur has re-evaluated the

---

¹ Schweitzer, Interpreters, p. 15.
² Ibid., p. 17.
³ Ibid., p. 18.
⁴ Ibid., p. 20. Ferdinand Friedrich Baur published his father's works under the title Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie in 1864.
importance of eschatology and has arrived at a new conception of its importance.\(^1\) Though eschatology now received more attention, Baur's system of Paul's thought is still constructed speculatively. This speculative approach soon becomes more difficult as progress is made in the exact apprehension of Paul's ideas.

4. The "Two Thought" Concept

As the nineteenth century moved on, the definition of the genuine Pauline letters was sharpened.\(^2\) Philippians and I Thessalonians were rehabilitated from Baur's rejection. Holtzmann felt that Colossians was based upon a genuine letter which had been worked over by a later hand. The sharpening of these definitions served to point up to theologians the radical shift in Paul's thought which occurred in Ephesians and Colossians as compared to the earlier letters. It was felt that these two letters constituted a separate system of doctrine and consequently they were usually considered apart from the other letters.

A consideration of Paul's anthropology in 1872 by Herman Lüdemann opened the way for further elaboration of Paul's developmental thought.\(^3\) Lüdemann discovered two conceptions of man's nature. The first was a broad conception of the flesh in which sin came about by free will.\(^4\) Re-

---

1. Ibid., p. 21.
2. The ensuing discussion is graphically summarized in Appendix C, p. 189, which traces 19th century opinions on Pauline study.
4. Ibid., p. 29.
 Redemption consisted of a judgment and acquittal by God through an act of faith by man. Lüdemann called this set of ideas "juridical-subjective." The death of Jesus was the important point of this system.

Lüdemann's other system was "ethico-dualistic." It conceived of flesh in a more narrow way with sin proceeding from it as a natural necessity. Redemption came about only with the "abolition of the flesh." The redemptive act was baptism and the whole system rested particularly on the resurrection of Christ.

These two ideas, existing side by side in Paul's thought, posed problems. Lüdemann believed that the "ethico-dualistic" system tended to push aside the "juridical-subjective" system. As Paul's thought developed, his "real" view tended to assert itself. Thus Galatians emphasized Christ's suffering and death and righteousness by faith. Later on in Romans 5, Paul's thought veered toward the ethico-dualistic. Lüdemann concluded that Paul "is carried in the direction of Hellenism."

Lüdemann's theory was popular and was held in slightly modified form by several scholars, especially Pfleiderer. It was Auguste Sabatier who first attempted to prove the existence of different phases of thought in the life of Paul. He noted an initial simple doctrine conditioned by Paul's rabbinic training and conversion which was found in Galatians,

1. Ibid., p. 29.
2. Ibid., p. 30.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 31. See above, Chap. II, p. 11.
5. Ibid., p. 32. See above, Chap. II, p. 11.
Corinthians, and Romans. In the Imprisonment Letters, Paul advanced to a Gnostic speculative system.

Schweitzer observes that the basic problem in all of this work is that the scholars of the post-Baur period all grouped Paul's thought under dogmatic loci which prevented them from arriving at any essential unity of comprehension. The description of Paul's thought was very detailed but they failed to grasp the paradoxes and contradictions. For example, they did not decide whether the law was abolished by the death of Jesus or by his resurrection. Underlying everything, however, was a failure to grasp the notion that Paul's utterances may have rested upon a pre-supposition. Schweitzer thus regards the attempts to harmonize the various contradictions as an admission of defeat. The need for developmental theory may only have revealed the failure to understand the pre-supposition.

5. External Relationships

The next logical step in Pauline study was to determine the relationship of Paul to Greek thought, primitive Christianity, Judaism, and the milieu of his time. The conclusions of this line of study would test the theories which had been spun by Lüdemann, Pfleiderer, and the others. Schweitzer notes that this comparative study had been delayed.

1. Ibid., p. 35.
2. Ibid., p. 37.
3. Ibid., p. 38.
because the scholars of the middle nineteenth century all assumed that Paul's system of doctrine was, in the main, a purely personal creation.¹

The comparison of Paul with Synoptic tradition was done most skillfully by Ritschl, who reduced the difference between Paulinism and primitive Christianity to a minimum.² He believed that Jesus and Paul, at bottom, taught the same thing.³ The question remained why Paul did not quote the sayings of Jesus and thus shelter himself behind their authority. This confusion was possible because primitive Christianity was still regarded as essentially identical to the teachings of Jesus. Paul belonged to primitive Christianity and Ritschl's effort to reduce the differences showed his failure to place Paul in his proper position. For Ritschl, Paul was still an independent phenomenon.

Another result of the study of relationships was the uncovering of the fact that Paul did not attach himself to Old Testament ideas. He was rather a "child of late Judaism."

The claims of late Judaism on Paul were therefore taken to be discharged when his rabbinic dialectic and his exegesis, and to a certain extent his eschatology also, had been ascribed to it.⁵

Paul's eschatology was related to Rabbinism as a convenient way of explaining some of the weird problems which presented themselves.
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Characteristic of this period is the interpretation of Pauline eschatology by the developmental method. Paul has a "simple" eschatology in I Thessalonians superceded by the more complicated view of Corinthians. Schweitzer notes that the loci system of presenting Paul's doctrine still prevented anyone from trying a new path in Pauline interpretation.¹

Otto Everling in 1888 presented a comprehensive picture of Paul's thought on angelology and demonology.² Angels played a prominent part at the giving of the law; Demons were the power behind the heathen gods. Christ's death and resurrection abolished all evil powers, and believers in Christ were liberated from their sway. Legalism was the corruption of the Gospel by angelic powers. Everling's conclusions pointed the way for a reappraisal of Paul's concept of redemption. Redemption was a deliverance from the powers which have their abode between heaven and earth. It is therefore essentially a future good, dependent on a cosmic event of universal scope.³

Richard Kabisch's Die Eschatologie des Paulus in 1893 was the first to clearly point out and describe the eschatological essence of Paul's thought.⁴ He saw the Apostle's views about the future world expressed in disconnected fragments throughout the text. Paul's thought on eschatology did not develop; rather, the Apostle drew on it whenever he wished just "as easily as an educated European uses the multiplication table."⁵

1. Ibid., p. 54.
2. Ibid., p. 56.
3. Ibid., p. 57.
4. Ibid., p. 58.
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Kabisch pictured Paul as:

thrilled with the eager desire for life, shaken with the dread of destruction. His faith, hope, and fear all revolve about one center - the abolition of corruption and the bestowal of incorruption.¹

Kabisch attempted to explain the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit purely on the ground of the late Jewish metaphysic. In this he did not succeed, partly because he failed to give a clear and simple picture of the order and relation of the final event pre-supposed in the letters. However, Kabisch did succeed in a new formulation of Paul's thought and had successfully avoided breaking up the Apostle's doctrine into loci.

The relationship of Paul's thought to Greek ideas was next investigated. In this discussion there was a confusion between Jewish Hellenism and Greek thought. Scholars were continually confusing the two ideas because the exact definition of Hellenism had heretofore been blurred. The issue in Pauline study was whether or not Paul received any influence from Greek thought apart from Jewish Hellenism.

From the time of Baur onward, most scholars assumed that Greek thought influenced Paul and none of them denied the influence of Jewish Hellenism on Paul.² These assumptions were rarely supported with any research into Greek thought. The point at which the principle was first applied was in II Corinthians 5:1ff. Here Pfleiderer considered the Apostle's thought to depart from the Pharisaic mold under the pressure of

¹. Ibid., p. 59.
². Ibid., p. 65.
Alexandrian Platonism. Paul increasingly put his thought of the Parousia in a spiritual form. Thus in I Thessalonians, Paul still conceived of the resurrection in physical terms such as were shared by the primitive Christian community. In I Corinthians 15, the Greek ideas were observable and in II Corinthians and Philippians they became dominant. Pfleiderer thus explained the reason for the developing thought of Paul, namely, Platonic influence.

Schweitzer raises two strong objections to Pfleiderer's position. First is the problem of two inconsistent positions, side by side in the mind of Paul. Pfleiderer saw no problem here, but Schweitzer considers this condition impossible. Second, Pfleiderer assumed that Greek spiritualizing future hope displaced the Jewish Pharisaic hope. But Schweitzer continues to see them side by side, even in the final period.

Teichmann's overstatement brought the whole idea of Hellenization into disrepute and Schweitzer concludes, with Kabisch, that "A Hellenization of the eschatology is quite impossible to prove."

Another important relationship was clarified about this time. If Paul introduced Greek thought into the primitive Gospel, then the later Greek theology would certainly look to Paul as its spiritual father. A

1. Ibid., p. 70.
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5. Ibid., pp. 74, 76. Though Kabisch reached this conclusion in 1893, English scholarship has not generally followed this opinion, as has been shown above (Chap. II, p. 13).
comparison of Justin and Paul indicated that there was no community of thought between them. Harnack made this clear in his *Dogmengeschichte* of 1885.¹ The history of dogma began after Paul, not with Paul. Edwin Hatch arrived at the same conclusion.²

Thus it was not Paul that recast the Gospel in the molds of Greek thought. Rather, it was the Greek popular mind, as represented in the Gentile church, which Hellenized the Gospel for itself. After a lengthy analysis, Schweitzer concludes that Paulinism and Greek thought have "nothing, absolutely nothing, in common."³

6. H. J. Holtzmann

Heinrich Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 1897, followed the *loci* method. Holtzmann took Paul's objective statements, and, in order to interpret them, made some subjective.⁴ He used the Damascus experience as a source of theoretic knowledge which thus removed the obligation of rendering an account to philosophic thought.⁵ It is clear that Holtzmann stood within the Baur tradition. Furthermore, he followed Pfleiderer in admitting a comprehensive influence of Greek ideas upon Paul.⁶ Holtzmann's treatment of eschatology was hesi-
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tant and thoroughly inadequate. He rejected with distaste Kabisch's work.¹

In summary, Holtzmann attempted to bring together Pfleiderer, Holsten, and Harnack. From Pfleiderer he took the view of wide-reaching Greek influence on Paulinism. From Holsten he took the theory that this system had its birth in the Damascus road experience. But though these two views can be reconciled, Holtzmann could never bring into harmony Harnack's position that Paulinism had no part in the formation of early Greek theology. If Paulinism was Greek, how is it conceivable that the Greeks should not have recognized and understood it? Thus Holtzmann's work breaks down. Inasmuch as Holtzmann adopts the "developmental thought" idea about Paul from Pfleiderer, Schweitzer regards "developmental thought" as inadequate and useless as a base for further study.

7. The Radical Dutch School

It was Bruno Bauer, in 1850, who led the way in the radical criticism of the Pauline corpus.² He declared all of Paul's letters spurious. Though his criticism was dismissed because of its carelessness and obvious problems, the "radical Dutch school" under Pierson, Loman, Steck, and van Manen revived Bauer's position about 1880 and


². Ibid., p. 120.
pressed on with destructive criticism. Part of their argument was built upon the internal problems of Paul's writings. Illogical transitions, inconsistencies, and the impression of disconnectedness suggested to them a patch-work literary effort of the Gnostic period in the second century. Perhaps Paul's "letters" were created by the Marcion School itself.  

The primary assumption of the radical Dutch critics was that Paulinism signifies the Hellenization of the Gospel. In this they were at one with the Tübingen School and Schweitzer concludes that if either position must perish, the other would go down with it. The emphasis of the Greek element in Paul's thought thus drew the two positions together. The consideration of the time required for a transition of the Gospel from Jewish to Greek thought, forced the radical critics into pushing the dating of Paul's letters down into the second century. Whenever the Tübingen critics considered the time question, they, too, were forced into speculative thought regarding dating and Gnostic influences and thus joined the radical Dutch critics.

Steck believed that Paul was the starting point of the theology which reached its development in the second century letters attributed to the Apostle. The question then became one of determining the interpolations and reactions which had taken place on primitive authentic Pauline letters. This criticism used as its method either style or content.
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Völter presented an ingenious analysis of genuine and non-authentic elements in Paul's letters. Yet the assumptions for his criticism still rested upon the Baur hypothesis.¹

8. Comparative Religions

Wrede's restatement of Pauline redemption in objective terms brought Pauline scholarship to the study of comparative religions.² Wrede conceived of redemption as a universal event in which the individual has a place; his view turned attention again to the Parousia. Wrede's conception of redemption applied to all mankind, not simply to the Pauline "elect." Because redemption was so bound up in the person of Christ, Wrede described it as a "physical" redemption, directed toward future events with super-natural powers, judgment, bodily resurrection and transformation. Wrede saw here a close dependence upon late Judaism, but the problem of the sacraments seemed to point beyond Judaism and so Wrede turned to comparative religions.

There was a growing suspicion by Wrede that dying and rising with Christ was "physical" and that late Judaism did not provide this mysticism. Since Paul did not create it out of his own consciousness, there was no alternative but to search elsewhere for this idea.³

A thorough survey of the study of comparative religions, especially

¹. Ibid., p. 147.
². Ibid., p. 166. Wrede's Paulus appeared in 1904.
³. Ibid., p. 178.
by Dieterich and Reitzenstein, served only to show that Paul was not dependent upon the mystery religions in his sacramental interpretation. If this dependence could have been demonstrated, it would have been no more than a restatement of the original Baur thesis using "mystery religion" instead of "Hellenism." Schweitzer returned to the idea that Paul cannot be detached from primitive Christianity and therefore cannot be described as the Hellenizer of the Gospel. Insofar as the students of comparative religions attempted to show this fact, they were wrong.

9. Summary

In the study of Paul, Schweitzer detects two essential problems:
1. What did Paul's doctrine have in common with primitive Christianity?
2. What did it have in common with Greek ideas?

From Baur to Holtzmann, the scholars were attempting to solve the second question by a dogmatic belief that Paul was the Hellenizer of the primitive Gospel. They were foiled by their loci method which served only to categorize Paul's thought by mechanical techniques. Holtzmann brought this technique to its highest point, and ironically, to a close. Whenever the loci method was abandoned, by men such as Lüdemann and Kabisch, there was a breakthrough of understanding. It is clear to Schweitzer that this method prevented a unifying view of Paul.

The end result of eighty years of scholarship was the conclusion

1. Ibid., p. 228.
that Paulinism and Hellenism had nothing in common in terms of ideas. The religious terminology, however, was similar.

Eschatology never received much emphasis from the Tubingen School for attention was fastened on Hellenism. A convenient method to explain the presence of eschatological elements in Paul's thought was to picture his Hellenistic doctrines as evolving from primitive Jewish hope. This position reached its apogee in Pfleiderer. Since it was later demonstrated that Paul had little relationship with Hellenism, the notion of development in his thought was therefore rejected.

The rejection of Greek influence on Paul forced scholars to look to comparative religions where little help was found. The relationship to late Judaism remained confused.

With these fruitless conclusions, the scholars turn again to the relationship of Paul to primitive Christianity. This now becomes the central problem, according to Schweitzer, and study must now progress from this standpoint alone. Paul's eschatology must receive its full recognition. It needs first of all to be explained. Sacraments and Christ-mysticism must be re-evaluated in the light of eschatology. Paul's attitude toward the law, universalism and pre-destinarianism needs to be reconsidered. And finally, the enigmatic silence of subsequent generations in regard to Paul must be explained. It is questions such as these with which Schweitzer proposes to deal in his second work on Paul.
CHAPTER IV

SCHWEITZER’S INTERPRETATION OF PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY IN

THE MYSTICISM OF PAUL THE APOSTLE

1. Background and Purpose

The second major work on Paul by Schweitzer was originally laid out in 1906, but the chapter which was to have served as the introduction grew to the book, Paul and His Interpreters, first published in 1911.1 At that time Schweitzer expected to complete his Pauline study by 1913, but preparations for Lambaréné overruled his plans. During his first leave in Europe he was prevented from continuing his Pauline studies by his illness caused by prison confinement. In addition, he was occupied by work on his Philosophy of Civilization. Thus he was unable to take up his studies on Paul until 1927, on his second leave in Europe. Work at this time involved the reshaping of the original manuscript which had lain idle for sixteen years.

Schweitzer’s purpose in this second volume was to give a full exposition of the mysticism of Paul and so he gave up attempting to go into the literature about Paul in the same way as in the 1911 volume. Nevertheless, he expresses his debt to Lietzmann, Dibelius and other commentators.

Schweitzer believes that with his Mysticism of Paul the Apostle he has brought to a completion the application of thorough-going eschatology to his theological work.¹ He believes that he has presented the evolution of thought in the first generation of Christianity. The cardinal principle in all of his writings is that the preaching of Jesus could be interpreted only by an eschatological point of reference. The assumption that there were uneschatological elements in Jesus' teachings is incorrect.² The central problem of the evolution of thought in the first century is thus how a purely eschatological belief developed into the Hellenistic one. The purpose of the book is to outline Paul's place in this development. Schweitzer's premise is that Paul is thoroughly eschatological along with Jesus and that the Hellenization process began after Paul. The bridge from Jesus to Ignatius is through Paul, but Paul was not the Hellenizer. Rather, Paul's eschatological concept of the "Being in Christ" was re-interpreted in the second century in Hellenistic terms by Ignatius and others.³

It is important to note that Schweitzer considers it essential to link Paul's eschatological ideas with those of late Judaism in order to show Paul's relationship with Jesus.⁴

¹. Ibid., p. viii.
². Ibid.
³. Ibid., p. ix.
⁴. Ibid.
2. Pauline Mysticism and Eschatology

Schweitzer begins his study with a description of Pauline mysticism. He notes that Paul is the only Christian thinker that knows only Christ-mysticism unaccompanied by God-mysticism. Schweitzer lists twelve Pauline quotations illustrating Pauline mysticism on pages 3 and 4 but omits any reference from I and II Thessalonians.

Paul does not use the concept of rebirth but speaks only of resurrection. Schweitzer considers this to be but another demonstration of the remoteness of Pauline thought to Hellenism. The eschatological world view is what really conditions Paul's mysticism. This is further illustrated by Paul's use of predestination in which the believer shares some of the future glory through Christ.

The recognition of Paul's sacramental ideas also serves to highlight the sharp distinction with Hellenism. Paul considers baptism as the beginning of the being-in-Christ and closely related to his return in glory. In the Hellenistic mystery religions, the sacraments reach into the mysterious past. Paul conceives of sacraments as temporary and soon unnecessary. He illustrates this with Biblical incidents which happened only once such as the Red Sea crossing, wanderings beneath the cloud, manna, and the drinking of water from the rock, all of which occurred during the Exodus.

1. Ibid., p. 5. This distinction appears to be unique with Schweitzer. Even Deissmann in his elaborate analysis of mysticism does not make this observation. Op. Cit., p. 149ff.
2. These are Gal. 2:19-20; 3:26-28; 4:6; 5:24-25; 6:14; II Cor. 5:17; Romans 6:10-11; 7:4; 8:1-2, 9-11; Romans 12:4-5; and Phil. 3:1-11.
3. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 16.
4. Ibid., p. 22.
5. Ibid., p. 23.
Thus the eschatological world view conditions the sacraments, particularly baptism.¹

Schweitzer then proceeds to a discussion of Paulinism as a temporary system of thought. He believes that Paul was so dominated by his eschatological conviction that he built for one generation only and that succeeding generations found him hard to understand. Far from being the Hellenizer of Christianity, Paul was rather misunderstood by the Hellenizers and was little used until Marcion, precisely because Paul's eschatological hope was unusable. Marcion, the only one who did understand Paul, really misunderstood him, to paraphrase Overbeck's well-known mot.² Schweitzer thus again tries to show that eschatology is the most important thing in understanding Paul and that he must be clearly separated from the Hellenistic trend.


² Overbeck coined this mot in table talk with Adolf Harnack in the middle eighties imitating the current saying about Hegel and his disciples. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 38.
3. Questions of Authenticity and Dating

Schweitzer next discusses the authenticity of the Pauline epistles. Absolutely authentic are Galatians, I and II Corinthians and Romans. Schweitzer rules against Tübingen objections about I Thessalonians, Philippians and Philemon and finds them unquestionably genuine.1 A primary argument against II Thessalonians is that it opposes the idea that the return of Jesus is immediately at hand. II Thessalonians "enumerates all that must happen before that Day can dawn."2 He considers II Thessalonians to come from that period when Christian teachers were seeking to reconcile believers to the day of the Parousia.

Schweitzer follows the traditional arguments against the Pastorals, placing them in the midst of the Gnostic controversies of the second century.

Schweitzer notes that Ephesians and Colossians present unusual problems because they have so much in common with other genuine epistles yet are clumsier and more elaborate in style. In Ephesians 3:5, Paul speaks of the "holy Apostles" as though he did not belong to the same generation and did not hold himself to be an Apostle.3 Schweitzer's conclusion is that neither Colossians nor Ephesians, along with II Thessalonians and the Pastorals, is of primary importance in the exposition of Paul's teaching. The teachings of Ephesians and Colossians do not coincide easily with the rest of the Pauline letters and must be placed alongside of them.

1. Ibid., p. 41.
2. Ibid., p. 42. II Thess. 2:1-12.
3. Ibid., p. 42.
Schweitzer then establishes an order of writing. Earliest is I Thessalonians followed by Galatians. Galatians was probably written in Ephesus during Paul's two and a quarter year's stay, in the midst of his third journey. Likewise I Corinthians was composed while at Ephesus, Corinthians in the spring prior to Paul's leaving. II Corinthians was written in Macedonia in the autumn, and, in the following winter at Corinth, the letter to the Romans was composed. "The three main epistles thus originated at short intervals in the course of a few months."

Philippians is the first Imprisonment Letter followed by Philemon which may have been written in Caesarea or some other place of Paul's imprisonment. The phrase "they of Caesar's house" most naturally refers to a church formed among slaves of the Emperor's house in Rome. Schweitzer dates the letters as follows: 1. I Thessalonians - "beginning of the fifties." 2. Galatians, I and II Corinthians, Romans - "middle and the second half of the decade." 3. Philippians and Philemon - "beginning of sixties." He next considers whether or not the letters of Paul have come down to us in original form. I Thessalonians and Galatians give the impression of a literary unity, but I and II Corinthians probably contain

four letters which have been assembled into the two bulky canonical literary units. The distribution of the four letters cannot be done with certainty.  

The first letter is probably contained in the so-called Four Chapters Letter (II Corinthians 10-13). This is the tearful, scornful letter in which Paul demonstrates his right to be an Apostle.

Another early letter mentioned in I Corinthians 5:9 is probably reproduced fragmentarily in II Corinthians 6:14, 7:1ff. Identification is difficult. I Corinthians 10:1-33 is a possible fragment of an earlier letter because of its disconnectedness with what precedes and follows. Such disconnectedness is frequent in the Corinthian correspondence and Schweitzer believes that these problems are best explained by the interweaving of four letters in I and II Corinthians.

Philippians shows some disconnectedness beginning at 3:2 and there may possibly be two distinct sections. The greetings to friends in Romans 16:1-23 are probably not original and may belong to a letter to the Ephesians. The directions on the flesh and wine and other things of Rome, 14:1-15, 15:13, may well be part of another letter for the specific instructions there do not fit a church which is unknown to Paul.

Thus Corinthians, Romans, and Philippians possibly contain fragments of additional letters. There is little doubt that there has been some working over of the Pauline text. Also, it is possible that some

2. Ibid., p. 49.
letters of Paul have been lost and the astonishing thing is how such critical letters as Galatians would have been preserved at all.

4. Uniform Eschatology

Schweitzer is certain that Paul's thought is dominated by the expectation of the immediate return of Jesus. Quotations may be taken from all of the genuine Pauline letters.¹

1. I Thessalonians 1:10. "And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come."

2. I Thessalonians 2:19. "For what is our hope or joy or crown of boasting before our Lord Jesus at his coming? Is it not you?"

3. I Thessalonians 3:13. "So that he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before our God and Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints."

4. I Thessalonians 5:23. "May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans, the eschatology, though incidental, is clear.

¹ Ibid., pp. 52, 53. The "genuine" letters are those defined by Schweitzer. II Thess., Colossians, and Ephesians are omitted.
5. Galatians 1:4. "Who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father;"

6. Galatians 6:10. "So then, as we have opportunity, let us do good to all men, and especially to those who are of the household of faith;"

7. I Corinthians 7:29. "I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short; from now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none;"

8. I Corinthians 10:11. "Now these things happened to them as a warning, but they were written down for our instruction, upon whom the end of the ages has come;"

9. I Corinthians 7:31. "And those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it. For the form of this world is passing away;"

10. I Corinthians 6:3. "Do you not know that we are to judge angels? How much more, matters pertaining to this life!"

11. I Corinthians 3:13-15. "Each man's work will become manifest; for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each one has done. If the work which any man has built on the foundation survives, he will receive a reward. If any man's work is burned up, he will suffer loss, though he himself will be saved, but only as through fire."
12. I Corinthians 11:26. "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes."

13. I Corinthians 1:7–8. "So that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift, as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who will sustain you to the end, guiltless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."

14. I Corinthians 16:22. "If any one has no love for the Lord, let him be accursed. Our Lord, come!"

15. II Corinthians 1:14. "As you have understood in part, that you can be proud of us as we can be of you, on the day of the Lord Jesus."

16. II Corinthians 5:10. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body."

17. II Corinthians 11:2. "I feel a divine jealousy for you, for I betrothed you to Christ to present you as a pure bride to her one husband."

18. Romans 8:19. "For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God;"

19. Romans 13:11, 12. "Besides this you know what hour it is, how it is full time now for you to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; The night is far gone, the day is at hand. Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light;"
20. Romans 16:20. "Then the God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you."

Likewise in Philippians the expectation is clear.

21. Philippians 1:6. "And I am sure that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ."

22. Philippians 1:10. "So that you may approve what is excellent, and may be pure and blameless for the day of Christ,"

23. Philippians 2:10. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth,"

24. Philippians 3:20-22. "But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself."

25. Philippians 4:4-5. "Rejoice in the Lord always, again I will say, Rejoice. Let all men know your forbearance. The Lord is at hand."

If then Paul's thought underwent a development it certainly did not consist in the slacking of his eschatological expectation as time went on.¹

5. Eschatological Redemption

"Jesus Christ has made an end of the natural world and is bringing in the Messianic Kingdom."² The believer is transferred from one world to

¹ Ibid., p. 54.
² Ibid.
another and has a share in the final cosmic event. This eschatology conditions all thinking on Christian redemption.¹

The natural world is characterized by the power of demons and angels. The evil in the world is because the demons and the angelic beings have come between God and mankind. Redemption puts an end to this condition.² Jesus and Paul both follow this Jewish eschatology.³

The historic Jesus did not die for humanity as a whole, but only for the elect.⁴ Together, Jesus and the elect faced tribulation and death, God having delivered them for a time into the power of the "evil One." The anticipation of trials and troubles is clearly seen in Jesus' instructions to his disciples.⁵ His sending forth of the disciples begins the pre-Messianic tribulation at the end of which time the Kingdom of God shall come. However, the disciples' return to Jesus occurs prior to the appearance of the Son of Man.⁶ This is not what was planned. Jesus then withdraws and re-interprets his eschatology in the light of Isaiah 53 and believes that God has simply appointed him to die alone, a ransom to free the elect from the pre-Messianic tribulation.

1. The Jewish eschatological view may be found in the later prophets, Psalms of Solomon, ca. 63 BC; Book of Jubilees, ca. 120 BC; Testament of Twelve Patriarchs, ca. 120 BC; Book of Enoch, ca. 160-70 BC; Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra, ca. 70 AD; and the Ascension of Moses, 1st Century AD.
This original idea of Jesus was lost for two reasons. First, Jesus was obscure about the matter simply because all would be clear shortly following his death. Second, the failure of the Messianic Kingdom to arrive forced ideas to change. Thus Jesus' concept of his own death as the substitute for the pre-Messianic tribulation was soon lost. Jesus expects his immediate resurrection and the immediate coming of the Messianic Kingdom. Without tribulation there can be no Messianic Kingdom. If Jesus suffers death which God can accept as the equivalent of that tribulation, he can bring the kingdom at once.

Paul follows the early Christians in the concept of the atoning death of Jesus. Likewise, Paul understands Jesus as the resurrected Messiah who will soon appear. By his death and resurrection he is exalted above all angelic beings but full authority awaits the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom.

Paul expands his concepts in an important way. He steadily believes that because of the death of Jesus, his followers are no longer subject to angel powers as before, even though the evidence of the Messianic Kingdom is not yet obvious. Paul understands the coming redemption to have begun. Specifically, the elect now have Christ as a representative before God instead of the angels of the Presence. Though the angels still have power on earth to torment, before God, the elect are above the power of angels.

2. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 60.
3. I Cor. 15:2.
5. I Thess. 1:10.
Hence, earthly tribulation is of no real importance.  

The destruction of the dominion of the angels will be completed by the sudden return of Jesus. The classic statement of this triumph is in 1 Thessalonians 4:16-17. Messianic judgment follows.

Though Paul does not give a description of the Messianic Kingdom, he implies that it is not peaceful blessedness but a struggle with angelic powers. Paul expects the whole of nature will pass through a transformation of mortality to immortality. Death is one of the angel powers and with the final overcoming of Death, the Messianic Kingdom comes to a close. The length of the Messianic Kingdom is uncertain. Paul does not say. The Apocalypse of Ezra says 400 years; The Apocalypse of John says 1000 years. Paul has Satan bound at the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom. Revelation has Satan bound and loosed again for further trouble.

At the end of the Messianic Kingdom is a General Resurrection for everyone who has ever lived on earth, unless they have already risen during the Messianic Kingdom. Then follows the last judgment where the final de-

1. Illustrations of the earthly power of the angels and Paul's answers in the light of temporary nature of the matter may be found in I Thess. 3:3-5, 2:18; I Cor. 7:1-6; II Cor. 2:5-11; II Cor. 12:1-7.
2. I Thess. 5:1-4.
3. Christ as Judge: II Cor. 5:10; I Thess. 4:6; I Cor. 4:4-5, 5:5; II Cor. 1:14; Philippians 1:10, 2:16. God as Judge: Romans 14:10; Romans 1:18, 2:2-10, 3:6. God judging through Christ: Romans 2:16.
5. Romans 8:19-22.
6. 4 Ezra 7:26-42.
9. Rev. 20: 2,3; 7-10.
cisions are made. Paul does not mention these events specifically in I Corinthians 15:23-28, for they are grouped by him under the general category "The End." At the conclusion of the judgment, the Messiah gives up his power to God so that God will be all in all. World history then comes to a close. Paul introduces a new interpretation of the Law which prepares the way for Gnosticism. The Law was given by angels to make men subservient. With the death of Jesus, the angel power is broken and the Law is no longer in force. The death of Jesus was done in ignorance by the angel powers who did not know that their power would thereby be lost. The death of an un-accursed Jesus on a tree in contradiction to the Law of Deuteronomy, marked the end of the Law's power for here was a flat violation of the Law.

This annulment of the Law is another demonstration of the beginning of the Kingdom, the Messianic Period. The realization of this present redemption needs to be more clearly felt. The elements of Gnosticism are here present in Paul, awaiting development by future Hellenizers. Though Paul remains strictly in the eschatological framework, the general structure is the same as Hellenism. The primary difference was suggested by Marcion, namely, that the God of the Jews is not the same as the supreme spiritual Being.

1. Rev. 20:6,14,15.
2. I Cor. 15:24.
6. The Background of Pauline Eschatology

Pauline eschatology revolved around two central ideas: 1. A synthesis of the Prophetic eschatology and the Danielic "Son of Man", and 2. The appearance of the Messiah in the person of Jesus, a fact unforeseen in Jewish eschatology.¹

The earliest period of Jewish eschatology, namely the pre-Exilic and Exilic prophets, expected a Messiah of David's line to rule a terrestrial kingdom with supernatural powers. This rule was to be the consummation of world history. Zerubbabel (520 B.C.), a prince of the House of David, was the disappointment of these eschatological hopes. His failures ended Messianic expectation for a time.

Eschatology then postulated a kingdom ruled directly by God to replace the Messianic Kingdom. Typical of this view was Malachi and Isaiah 24-27, dating from 400 to 300 B.C. This notion was refined by Daniel (168-164 B.C.), so that the Kingdom of God was ruled by the Son of Man acting as an angelic agent for God.

The time of tribulation was refined also. The original pre-exilic "sifting out" of God's people was expanded into a revelation of glory among the heathen in Isaiah.² In Daniel, the God opposing world power wreaked its rage upon the saints who are called to his kingdom. But most important,

¹. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 76. The various eschatological systems which are hereafter described are charted in Appendix D, p. 191. A comparison of these charts will summarize the argument.
². Ibid., p. 77.
Daniel introduced the idea of resurrection. Before Daniel, only the immediate living participated in the Kingdom of God. But with Daniel, the dead rose and were judged. Thus Daniel demonstrated the kingdom, not as the outcome of a happy evolution brought on by God's omnipotence, but rather as a result of a cosmic catastrophe. The kingdom was transcendent and supernatural.

According to Schweitzer, the Book of Enoch was a further expansion of the Danielic eschatology. There was no Messiah and the resurrection was emphasized.

The Psalms of Solomon (63 B.C.) returned to the Davidic Messiah as though Daniel and Enoch had never been written. This was because the writer of the Psalms of Solomon was a student of scripture and returned to the pre-Exilic and Exilic thought-world. Furthermore, the restoration of the Maccabean Kingdom restored the old Messianic hope. The destruction of that kingdom by Pompey set up once again the same exilic conditions which fostered the expectation of the Davidic Messiah.

The Psalms of Solomon did not have a resurrection of the dead prior to judgment, and entrance into the kingdom was for those elect who were alive at the time of the Messiah.

The two historic views of eschatology existed side by side right up to the time of Jesus. John the Baptist's position is not clear, but Jesus clearly follows the eschatology of Daniel and Enoch.

2. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 78.
There is a final judgment, including angels. There is a resurrection. The resurrected life is supernatural and not in the Davidic terrestrial mood. Jesus' confidence in the resurrection makes the preservation of life unimportant.

The final tribulation is not the work of God but of forces opposing God. Daniel holds the elect to be immune from this evil power for they are under the protection of the angel Michael. However, Daniel did allow for the righteous to die as in the earlier exilic views. The elect come under Michael's power only after a certain intensity is reached. Jesus brings this notion to a consistent conclusion in which all the elect in the kingdom partake.

The familiar question to the scribes of Mark 12:35-37 about David's son is thus not a disputing of the Messiah's descent, but an attempt to combine the Messiah with the pressing issue of the supernatural Son of Man.

In summary, Jesus' eschatology is straightforward. 1. A general resurrection. 2. Appearance of Son of Man with immediate judgment. 3. The eternal Kingdom of God under the Son of Man.

7. Baruch and Ezra

The Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra attempt to harmonize the Danielic and Prophetic eschatologies. This is done by the simple method of regarding the Messianic Kingdom as temporary, which is to give way to the eternal Kingdom of God. The Messianic Kingdom is pictured exactly as in the Exilic prophets, the elect being those who are alive.

The Messianic Kingdom follows the usual tribulations and begins with a judgment of the living by the Messiah. The kingdom itself is a happy time and will last for 400 years, according to Ezra. The Messiah finally returns to heaven and there is a general resurrection of the dead. The living of the Messianic Kingdom are transformed into the resurrection mode of existence. The Messiah is supernatural and not of the House of David. The Son of Man does not figure in the eschatological scheme of Baruch and Ezra.

There are two judgments, the judgment of the Messiah upon living survivors at the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom and the final judgment of God at the end of the Messianic Kingdom upon the whole of risen humanity. There are also two kingdoms, the temporary Messianic and the eternal theocracy. Jesus accepts one judgment, that of the Messiah which is eternal, and one kingdom, the eternal kingdom of the Son of Man Messiah. Thus Jesus places the resurrection at the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom and

2. Ibid., p. 86.
Baruch and Ezra place it at the end.  

8. Paul's Eschatological Chronology

The significance of the eschatology of Baruch and Ezra lies in the fact that it approximates Paul's system. Though Baruch and Ezra date after the fall of Jerusalem and thus could not have directly influenced Paul, they nevertheless represent the thinking of the Scribes which Paul apparently shared.

Paul believes that death is destroyed only at the end of the Messianic Kingdom and that the immediate living elect participate in the Messianic Kingdom. Those who have died prior to the Messianic Kingdom remain dead until the final resurrection and eternal blessedness.  

Paul does not use the expression "Son of Man" (nor does Baruch), but he regards the Messiah as supernatural and as appearing on the clouds of heaven.

Paul supplies a new interpretation to the elect of the tribulation which may be considered a mid-way position between the Danielic eschatology and that of the Scribes. The elect of the last generation have already obtained the resurrection mode of existence at their entry into the Messianic Kingdom. Even if they have died prior to the Messianic Kingdom, they will be able, through the resurrection, to become participants in it. Thus Paul introduces a second resurrection of the elect which takes place at the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom.

---

2. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 90.
Because of the temporary nature of the Messianic Kingdom as held by the Scribes, it will be evident that immortality is not yet attained by the elect. Yet Paul talks about the resurrection mode of existence in the Messianic Kingdom. Inasmuch as the scribal eschatology holds no possibility for a pre-Messianic resurrection, Paul is aware of the problems which he raises by his forced interpretation and he goes out of his way to inform the Thessalonians on this matter in I Thessalonians 4:13-18. He even appeals to a saying of the Lord. The dead which are in Christ who arise first are the elect of the Messianic Kingdom. This special resurrection is added to the scribal eschatology because of the new presence of Jesus, and is not foreseen in the original chronology. Belief in Jesus seems to guarantee an entrance into the Messianic Kingdom even though death comes before Jesus' return. The delay of Jesus' coming thus presents this first problem which is responded to in I Thessalonians 4. Paul's answer is "that by an earlier special resurrection they become participants in the glory of the Messianic Kingdom just as much as the other elect of the last generation."3

The introduction of a pre-Messianic resurrection for the elect was not accepted by all Christians. In the Corinth Church a body of conservatives continued to follow the older view that only the living were able to take part in the Messianic Kingdom. Paul counters this objection with I Corinthians 15 by connecting the pre-Messianic resurrection directly with

1. Ibid., p. 91.
2. I Thess. 4:15, "For this we declare to you by the word of the Lord . . . ."
Christ's resurrection. It is possible that these conservatives deny the possibility of any resurrection at all, either before or after the Messianic Kingdom thus severely limiting the eschatological hope to those who are alive at the coming of the Messiah. Such an extreme view reflects the Psalms of Solomon and the pre-exilic prophets. In any event, Paul may be considered the creator of the doctrine of two resurrections.

Participants in the Messianic Kingdom, whether the resurrected elect or the living, are transformed into an eternal mode of existence. Flesh and blood will not enter the kingdom. In this idea, Paul sounds like Jesus but he could not have taken it from Jesus for his teaching does not follow Jesus' much simpler eschatological scheme. Rather, Paul considers the death and resurrection of Jesus as the authenticating circumstance. Those who have died in Christ are resurrected. Thus, in the kingdom, Paul conceives of all men in a resurrected state, even though only the dead were literally resurrected.

The immediate problem then presented is how the living of the last days can enter into a resurrected state without death when the Messiah comes. Paul's answer is a mystical one - the "being in Christ." Believers mysteriously share the dying and rising of Christ and are swept up out of ordinary humanity - be they living or dead, and form a special category of human

1. I Cor. 15:13,16.
2. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 93.
3. Ibid., p. 94.
4. I Cor. 15:50-53.
5. I Thess. 4:14.
beings. At the coming of the Messiah the dead in Christ rise first and then the living are transformed. Paul's need for proving this doctrine is the immediate cause for his emphasis on the "dying and rising" in Christ.1

Paul further regards the resurrection of Jesus as the initial event of the rising of the dead in general. Jesus is "the first fruits of those that had fallen asleep."2 Hence Paul concludes that he is living in the supernatural age, the resurrection period, even though the resurrection of others is yet to come. Though the world appeared to be in natural form, Paul is convinced that the supernatural powers are at work within the created world. The natural and supernatural are intermingling in this, the beginning of the Messianic age. The immediate return of Jesus would manifest the supernatural world which was already under way. Thus Paul is able to develop a mystical concept of the present age which does not obliterate the eschatological hope, but rather is built upon an intensification of that hope. The time of waiting for the coming of Jesus is a time of intermingling between the natural and supernatural.

Paul sets up a peculiar eschatologically conditioned mysticism - which speaks of outward appearances and inward reality. The powers which were manifest in the death and resurrection of Jesus are already at work in the elect of the Messianic Kingdom. The complete manifestation of the mystical powers awaits the coming of the Lord.

2. I Cor. 15:20.
9. Summary

Schweitzer does not believe that Paul's eschatology developed in any way. The introduction of pronounced mystical elements, particularly in the late letters, is but an expression of his eschatological expectation. The resurrection of Jesus began the Messianic Age and Paul seeks to describe and explain the presence of the supernatural powers side by side with the natural powers. The concept of "being in Christ" and especially the doctrine of dying and rising with Christ, are not outside of the eschatological framework, but stem directly from the unfulfilled hopes of the last generation before the Parousia. Paul is thus not the Hellenizer despite some resemblance of his mystical doctrines with Hellenistic thought forms.

Throughout Paul's letters, Schweitzer sees consistent evidence of eschatological hope, occasionally "peeking out" from strong mystical sections which are seemingly unrelated to eschatology. His quotations are from all of the letters with the exception of II Thessalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians, which he feels are not related to the primary streams of Paul's thought. The mere presence or absence of direct eschatological statements in no way changes the basic fundamental assumption of Paul.

Paul chooses the scribal eschatology of Baruch and Ezra and does not follow the simpler eschatology of Jesus. He introduces the new concept of resurrection of the dead in Christ prior to the Messianic Kingdom to explain the problem of the delay in the coming of Christ. The development of this idea forces the reconstruction of the idea of existence in
the Messianic Kingdom. A resurrection mode for both the living and the
dead evolves, which in turn is explained by dying and rising.

Paul's thought on this general topic does not change in his various
letters, but again is consistent throughout. The parallels from Baruch and
Ezra come from the period following the fall of Jerusalem and thus could
not have influenced Paul. Rather, Paul may be considered the creator of a
dual resurrection eschatology, which lays upon the scribal eschatology a
combination of Jesus' simple Parousia and Paul's own mystical re-interpre-
tation. Paul does not Hellenize nor does he show any accommodation for
increasing skeptical pressure caused by the delay of the Parousia. His
own interpretation may be considered a radical restatement of the whole
eschatological issue which was not really accepted by the early church
until the middle of the second century, namely with Marcion. This restate-
ment hardly needed modification in the short time that Paul wrote, and cer-
tainly not in the direction of a lessened eschatology. If anything, Paul
is aware of his radical new ideas and is at pains to justify them.

In conclusion, Paul's eschatology is a consistent whole picture
in which his mysticism is developed in complete support and agreement.1

1. The above summary of Paul's eschatology scheme is charted in
Appendix E, p. 193.
CHAPTER V

A COMPARISON OF THE POSITIONS OF CHARLES AND SCHWEITZER ON PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY

The comparison of Charles and Schweitzer may be divided into four different categories: 1. Developmental Eschatology. 2. Eschatological Chronology. 3. Authenticity and Genuineness. 4. Chronology and Dating of Paul's Letters.

1. Developmental Eschatology

Charles' position is built around his belief in the declining eschatological hope of Paul.1 His first stage, composed of I and II Thessalonians shows strong eschatological hope and is modified only slightly in the second stage, namely I Corinthians. Schweitzer would agree with Charles on the eschatological emphasis, but only insofar as he holds that all of Paul's letters show eschatological conditioning. This agreement, however,

---

1. Charles' position finds continuing restatement. "The line I Thess. - I Cor. - II Cor. 1-9 - Romans would still show to us the gradual waning of the immediacy of the Second Coming in Paul's mind . . . " Nock, Op. Cit., p. 222. "Paul, in his earlier letters, and no doubt in his earlier preaching, made free use of this imagery, though it is clear that he was all the time re-interpreting it . . . the apocalyptic imagery of the earlier days tended to disappear . . . " Dodd, Op. Cit., p. 136.
is not very important because Charles and Schweitzer do not interpret the eschatology in parallel ways.¹

In Charles' third state, II Corinthians and Romans, the eschatological hope continues, though with modification such as the new emphasis of immediate resurrection upon death.² Charles regards this emphasis as Paul's conscious break with traditional belief. "There is a diminishing of the immediate hope of the Parousia in the face of delays."³ Schweitzer does not regard II Corinthians 5:1-9, as a change of basic Pauline thought and explicitly denies that the resurrection occurs immediately after death.⁴

According to Charles, the fourth and final stage of Paul's letters, that of Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians, has little left of the imminent hope. The cosmic Christ occupies Paul's attention and Charles does not present any evidence of sharp eschatological hope. In contrast, Schweitzer presents five quotations from Philippians to show eschatological expectation.⁵ Schweitzer does not accept Ephesians as genuine, nor does Colossians figure in his study, so further comparisons are difficult.

The relative positions of Charles and Schweitzer may be summarized with two quotations:

From his first letter to his last, Paul's thought is always uniformly dominated by the expectation of the immediate return of Jesus of the Judgment, and the Messianic Glory.⁶

---

1. See Section 2 and 5 below.
2. II Cor. 5:1-9.
(Paul) began with an expectation of the future which he had inherited largely from Judaism but under the influence of great formative Christian conceptions he parted gradually from this and entered on a process of development, in the course of which the heterogeneous elements were, for the most part, silently dropped.¹

2. Eschatological Chronology

A basic difference between Charles and Schweitzer is their description of eschatological chronology. Schweitzer believes that Paul is the creator of the theory of two resurrections, which is based upon a harmonization of two distinct eschatological traditions.² Charles holds no such theory but applies all of the eschatological evidence to one resurrection.

This basic difference produces some contradictions in interpreting critical passages. Charles states flatly that there can be no resurrection of the wicked.³ The exceptions to this view found in Acts 24:15; John 5:28, 29; and Revelations 20:12, 13, are variously dismissed as being an "inaccurate report," or "contrary to the spirit of the fourth Gospel," or from the "Judaistic source of the book." ⁴ Thus when Paul speaks in

4. There are no exceptions to this view in the Pauline correspondence, as will be shown below. Charles prefers not to defend his position from the narrower base of Paul's writings alone but seeks to demonstrate that the resurrection of the righteous is the universal teaching of the New Testament. Though his arguments are well taken, the passages, especially in Revelation and John, raise serious problems which are beyond the scope of this dissertation. This distinction is important because Schweitzer attempts to prove the opposite point of view, namely a general resurrection, on the same non-Pauline evi-
I Corinthians 15:22 of these "in Christ" being made alive, it is obvious to Charles that this precludes the wicked. "There can be no resurrection but in Christ."¹

Schweitzer regards I Corinthians 15:22 as referring to the first resurrection which precedes the temporary Messianic Kingdom. At the conclusion of the Messianic reign, a general resurrection takes place following the pattern of Baruch and Ezra in which everyone is judged and the final consignment is made.

It is noteworthy that Charles finds in Baruch the same evidence as Schweitzer for the temporary nature of the Messianic Kingdom.² But even though the Messianic Kingdom is doomed to corruption, Charles does not see a second resurrection.³ He rather speaks of apocalyptic literature finding the Messianic period corrupt. The resurrection continues to follow the Parousia.⁴ But Charles notes the problems in explaining the concept of the risen body in Christ and the mechanical time-determination of the Parousia. The handling of this problem results in Paul's development of a new theory of immediate resurrection. Though this immediate resurrection is foreseen in the second stage,⁵ it finds its full development

dence. The whole matter would have been greatly simplified if both men had confined themselves to the Pauline evidence. This issue is discussed below in Chap. XI, Section 4, p. 173.

4. I Cor. 15:51, 52.
in the third stage. Thus Charles is able to preserve a single resurrection from a chronological standpoint yet he can accommodate the mystical "being in Christ" resurrection as occurring immediately after the death of the individual.

Schweitzer is aware that "being in Christ" makes for a special resurrection but he never attributes to Paul the idea that this occurs upon death. Rather, those in Christ are raised prior to the Messiah's coming in the manner of I Thessalonians. Along with those yet alive, the ones in Christ are transformed into a resurrection mode of existence and participate in the temporary Messianic Kingdom.

Charles implies that the waning eschatological hope forced a radical revision of the eschatological hope by personalizing the resurrection. Schweitzer suggests that the dead in Christ will be raised very soon with the still living when the Messiah arrives.

At bottom this basic difference rests upon an understanding of Pauline mysticism and the Kingdom of God. Both Schweitzer and Charles are aware that glory, δόξα, is already the possession of the faithful. Charles suggests that when Christ comes that glory will be manifested. There will be a spiritual resurrection of the faithful. All of these events happen at the Parousia. Schweitzer, however, suggests that Paul's mysticism is based on the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, which really

1. Ibid., p. 457. The argument rests on II Cor. 5:8.
2. Charles regards I Thess. 4 as referring to the final resurrection.
began the Messianic age.\(^1\) The coming of the Messiah simply manifests the glory of the Messianic Kingdom which will include a resurrection of the dead in Christ and a transformation of the living.\(^2\)

A further elaboration of these differences of eschatological chronology occurs in Charles' fourth stage where the eternal duration of the Kingdom of Christ is found in Colossians and Ephesians. Christ is blended completely with God as "all in all."\(^3\) Again Charles notes the Kingdom of Christ as "mediatorial," but he does not dwell upon whatever temporary duration is implied in this passage.\(^4\)

Schweitzer, though he does not deal with Colossians, specifically refers to I Corinthians 15:24-28, as the end of the Messianic Kingdom.\(^5\) The passages in Colossians could only refer to the post-general resurrection period of the cosmic age when history is finally concluded.

Charles sharply attacks this interpretation.\(^6\) He notes that the I Corinthians, 15:24-28, puts the period of Christ's domination before the Parousia. The character of this domination is one of strife and Charles suggests that in Apocalyptic literature the Messianic reign is peaceful. His final conclusion is that the Messianic reign is but a temporary occurrence between Christ's exaltation and judgment.\(^7\) In the later epistles Paul conceives of this reign as unending.

1. Schweitzer, Mysticis\(m\), p. 95.
2. I Thess. 4:14.
3. Ephesians 1:23; Col. 3:11.
5. Schweitzer, Mysticis\(m\), p. 313.
7. Ibid., p. 448.
3. Genuineness

Schweitzer holds a more critical position than Charles and rejects the Pastorals and II Thessalonians as non-Pauline. His argument on II Thessalonians is based on suspicions raised by language and by the enumeration of events that must happen before the Parousia.1 Schweitzer believes that such arguments reflect a later period when Christian teachers "found themselves obliged to find such means of reconciling believers to the delay of that event."2 The Pastorals reflect the struggle with Gnosticism and must be dated at the beginning of the second century.

Charles uses II Thessalonians as one of the distinguishing features of his first stage. The first stage is delineated by the figure of the "anti-Christ," the references to whom are found only in II Thessalonians. If it were not for this difference, the second stage, I Corinthians, might well be included with the Thessalonian correspondence.3

However, Charles is conscious of the problem of reconciling I and II Thessalonians and he has "with some hesitation used both epistles as depicting the first stage of St. Paul's eschatological views."4 Of particular trouble is the manner of the Parousia. In II Thessalonians the Parousia is preceded by certain signs while in I Thessalonians it is

1. II Thess. 2:1-12.
2. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 42.
4. Ibid., p. 438.
wholly unexpected. Charles believes that even this contradiction does not rule out II Thessalonians because "some time elapses between the composition of the epistles, and some of the eschatological views of the Apostle were in a constant state of flux."\(^1\)

Charles does not use the Pastorals in the main body of his argument. In the fourth stage,\(^2\) he picks up a few references to I and II Timothy, more as a commentary than a main argument. It is probable that Charles either does not find much eschatological material in the Pastorals or does not wish to draw upon this source, being aware of the doubtful authenticity.

Schweitzer notes the special problem of Ephesians and Colossians, with their similarity to the genuine Pauline letters, yet with their peculiar differences from Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians. The clumsier and more elaborate use of compound words and the length of the periods set Ephesians and Colossians apart.\(^3\) Schweitzer believes that Paul's thought has undergone a transformation in these two letters. Paul can speak of the "Holy Apostles" as though he did not belong to the same generation.\(^4\) In any event, Schweitzer believes that neither Colossians nor Ephesians are of primary importance in the exposition of Paul's teaching. The material within the letters does not "dove-

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid., footnote on p. 462.
4. Ephesians 3:5.
"tail" into the rest of Paul's letters "but must in some way be allowed to take a place alongside of them."¹

Charles has observed the same differences in thought in Colossians and Ephesians but uses this fact to delineate the fourth stage. It is precisely because Paul's thought has been transformed that the eschatological emphasis of Colossians and Ephesians is so dim. Accordingly, he leans heavily on Colossians and Ephesians. Though he includes Philippians in his fourth stage, it is interesting to note that there is not a single reference to it in the section.²

In summary, Schweitzer uses seven letters of Paul which he considers "certainly genuine."³ They are Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, I Thessalonians, and Philemon. Charles accepts this list and hesitantly adds II Thessalonians. He footnotes the Pastorals and adds Ephesians and Colossians.

4. Chronology and Dating of Paul's Letters

Charles' order of Paul's letters may be taken from his four stages. It is: 1. I Thessalonians; 2. II Thessalonians; 3. I Corinthians; 4. II Corinthians; 5. Romans; 6. Philippians; 7. Colossians; 8. Ephesians.⁴ Galatians is omitted from his ordering along with any references in his study.

¹. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 43.
³. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 43.
Schweitzer's list is as follows: 1. I Thessalonians; 2. Galatians; 3. I Corinthians; 4. II Corinthians; 5. Romans; 6. Philippians; 7. Philemon. There is thus basic agreement in the order of the letters, allowing for the substitution of Galatians for II Thessalonians by Schweitzer.

However, insofar as chronology is concerned, there is an important divergence of opinion. Charles is convinced that the passage of time produced marked changes in the thought of Paul. Thus he explains the difference between I and II Thessalonians partly on the basis of the passing of time. A whole stage separates I and II Corinthians, Paul's thought having shifted during that time. Charles believes that between the writing of I Thessalonians and Romans there is "an essential change in the Apostle's views of the future." Charles sees these changes taking place in an orderly fashion. In the final stage, Charles is convinced that Paul may not have fully completed his eschatological development, but because of the consistent movement his thought shows, Charles believes that it is possible to extrapolate into the future to approximate a final picture of Paul's eschatological thought. Charles hints that he may attempt this in a later work in which Paul would arrive at a Hellenistic position. There is no indication as to exact dating or specific estimates of the gaps of time between the letters.

Schweitzer dates Thessalonians in the beginning of the fifties.

Galatians, I and II Corinthians and Romans belong to the middle of the fifties or perhaps to the second half of that decade. Philippians and Philemon belong to the early sixties. Of particular importance is Schweitzer's grouping of the Corinthian and Roman correspondence. During the stay in Ephesus in the third missionary journey, Paul wrote the first letter to the Corinthians in the spring. The second letter to the Corinthians was written the following autumn in Macedonia. In the following winter at Corinth, the epistle to the Romans was composed. Thus the three main epistles originated "at short intervals in the course of a few months."

Schweitzer further holds the multiple source theory of I and II Corinthians, maintaining that at least four letters are preserved in the two bulky letters which have come down to us. The distribution of the contents of the four letters cannot be done with certainty. Schweitzer sees evidence for the following distribution:

1. I Corinthians.


4. II Corinthians 1-9.

---

1. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 47.
2. Ibid., p. 44.
3. Ibid., p. 48.
The disconnectedness of I and II Corinthians suggests these four letters are interwoven into the two canonical letters.

Charles shows no evidence of discerning any fragmentation in the Corinthian correspondence and treats both letters as complete and unified. He separates I and II Corinthians as two distinct stages in Paul's thought. However, in I Corinthians Paul anticipates the doctrine of the immediate resurrection,¹ which is brought to its full flowering in II Corinthians. Because Paul's thought was in a state of flux, the fragmentation of the letters would not prove nor disprove his thesis for "perfect consistency within these stages is not to be looked for."²

5. Summary - The Problems Restated

A comparison of Charles and Schweitzer reveals several questions which need further examination.

1. Have both Charles and Schweitzer fairly surveyed the evidence at hand? It is interesting that Charles sees no eschatology in Philippians, but neither does Schweitzer see any eschatology in Colossians. Charles' unwillingness to admit eschatological evidence in the late letters can be compared with Schweitzer's refusal to consider Colossians because it is "not of primary importance."³ It is clear that a re-examination of the evidence would be fruitful.

---

1. I Cor. 15.
3. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 42. No reason is given.
2. Is there a consistent imminent expectation of the Parousia as Schweitzer believes or does this hope fade in the later letters as Charles holds?

3. Is II Thessalonians genuine? Schweitzer dismisses it on a doctrinal basis and thus supports his case. Charles makes II Thessalonians the defining feature of his first stage. Clearly, some more neutral standards must be found for measuring the worth of II Thessalonians than the fact of its agreement or disagreement with a theory. If such neutral standards are available, it would help in measuring the relative worth of each theory.

4. Is Colossians genuine? Is Ephesians genuine? Schweitzer dismisses both of these letters as unimportant. Charles uses the evidence of these two letters as the basis of his fourth stage. Again, it appears that the two theories may be determining the inclusion or exclusion of these letters. Are there more neutral standards by which to measure these letters?

5. Is the Messianic Kingdom of limited duration? Schweitzer's main thesis is based upon a survey of two streams of eschatology theory which Paul combines into a brand-new synthesis. Charles, surveying the same material, sees only a single kingdom which is re-interpreted by Paul from a temporary Messianic one into a permanent eternal cosmic kingdom.

6. And are there two resurrections or only one? Is there a general resurrection or are only the righteous raised up?

7. Does Paul develop a theory of the resurrection immediately following death, as Charles believes?
8. Is there any evidence concerning a growing disillusionment about the Parousia in Paul's letters? Charles suggests such growth. Schweitzer rejects II Thessalonians by utilizing this very point. Is there any other evidence?

9. Do the chronology and dating of Paul's letters allow time enough for a change in Paul's thought regarding the Parousia and immediate resurrection after death?
CHAPTER VI

THE GENUINENESS OF II THESALONIANS

1. Introduction - A Criterion of Historicity

In a consideration of genuineness of the Pauline letters, the central problem is the criterion of historicity. It is because Charles and Schweitzer use different criteria that their conclusions about II Thessalonians (and Colossians and Ephesians) are contradictory. Schweitzer's criteria is "thorough-going eschatology" and the application of this principle to II Thessalonians suggests that the work is of a later period.\(^1\) The delays expressed in II Thessalonians 2:1-3 point to a time of disillusionment and declining eschatological expectation.

In II Thessalonians, Charles sees a strongly developed doctrine of the second coming which does not necessarily conflict with I Thessalonians or I Corinthians. Using his criteria of "development" in measuring the genuineness of Paul's letters, he finds the heightened eschatology of II Thessalonians a first stage of Paul's thought.\(^2\)

---

1. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 42. For a sympathetic evaluation of Schweitzer's criterion of historicity see Werner, Op. Cit., Introduction p. 12ff. Werner holds that Schweitzer's criterion is the most satisfactory solution of the Gospel problems. Werner suggests that Schweitzer's rejection of II Thessalonians and Colossians and Ephesians is but another example of his caution.

The real problem underlying Charles' and Schweitzer's opinions is a criterion of historicity. In evaluating the genuineness of the Pauline letters, it is impossible to use either the criterion of thorough-going eschatology or developing eschatology. Application of these criteria simply produces conformity with the theories of either Charles or Schweitzer.¹ When dealing with the Pauline letters there is a firmer ground for establishing a criterion of historicity than when dealing with the Gospels. A definition of genuineness in Paul can begin with the universally accepted letters as a standard. Apart from the radical Dutch School of Pierson, Loman, and Bruno Bauer, there has been unanimous agreement that Romans, Galatians, and I and II Corinthians are genuine.² F. C. Baur and the Tübingen School defended these four letters. In addition, I Thessalonians, Philippians and Philemon have been generally accepted since the turn of the century.³

These genuine letters may be used as a standard to test the questionable letters by comparing such matters as style, vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and phraseology. By adhering to literary issues, the use of an eschatological opinion as a criterion of historicity is avoided and a

¹. The bold criteria which Johannes Weiss establishes in the opening pages of his History of Primitive Christianity, trans. Frederick C. Grant (New York: Wilson-Erickson, [1914], 1937), p. 2, reveals the earlier trust in the critical method. Weiss does not attempt to prove his methods. "The proof lies in the process itself which can be vindicated only by its results." Schweitzer approximates this attitude in his attack of the Pauline issues.
². Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 41.
³. Ibid.
more objective appraisal of the positions of Charles and Schweitzer may be made.

2. Background

The problems of genuineness are not settled simply by holding that a suitable criterion of historicity may be found. Literary analysis does not entirely settle the matter, for opinions divide on Paul's grammar, syntax, and vocabulary.

Though Charles and Schweitzer may be passing judgment on II Thessalonians essentially from a doctrinal position, their conclusions reflect the general pattern of English versus German scholarship. Since F. C. Baur there has been a more critical attitude toward II Thessalonians among German scholars than among the English scholars. Pauline authorship of II Thessalonians has been rejected by H. J. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Wrede, von Soden, Spitta and van Manen, among others.1

Among English speaking scholars, the rejection of the genuineness of II Thessalonians has not found much support. "Contemporary English and American scholars have held to the authenticity of both letters (Thessalonians)."2 Opinion favoring Pauline authorship may be cited among

---


such men as James Moffatt,¹ John W. Bailey,² A. H. McNeile,³ Albert B. Barnett,⁴ William Neil,⁵ Ernest Findlay Scott,⁶ John Knox,⁷ C. H. Dodd,⁸ as well as the conservative opinion of Ronald Knox.⁹ Morton Scott Enslin is an example of an American scholar who rejects the genuineness of II Thessalonians.¹⁰

It is clear that despite the possibility of finding a literary criterion of historicity, opinion on II Thessalonians remains divided.

3. The Problem of II Thessalonians 2:1-12

Exhaustive treatments of the problems involved may be found in several studies.¹¹ There are two central issues which raise questions about Pauline authenticity: The nature of II Thessalonians 2:1-12, and the similarity of style, structure, and phraseology with I Thessalonians.

¹⁰ Enslin, Op. Cit., p. 239.
II Thessalonians 2:1-12, notes that the day of the Lord will not come until the rebellion comes first.¹ In addition, the man of lawlessness must be revealed and take his seat in the temple of God.² Signs and wonders will accompany these events.³ These passages may be contrasted with I Thessalonians 5:2, in which "the Lord will come like a thief in the night."

Charles, noting these distinct differences, says "I have with some hesitation used both epistles as depicting the first stage in St. Paul's eschatological views."⁴ However, this issue is not in itself sufficient ground for rejecting II Thessalonians because some time elapses between the composition of the epistles, and some of the eschatological views of the Apostles were in a constant state of flux.⁵

Enslin cautions against exaggerating the differences of I and II Thessalonians.⁶ Though II Thessalonians 2:1-12, looks like an apocalypse, there is no reason to conclude that a large time delay is involved. Signs can go hand in hand with events. Enslin notes that ἐνεστηκέν means "has come" and concludes that this would support the position that II Thessalonians does not emphasize a long delay.⁷ But Enslin warns that Paul no-

1. II Thess. 2:3.
2. II Thess. 2:4.
5. Ibid.
7. Ibid. II Thess. 2:2. Arndt and Gingrich support Enslin's views. The three passages which suggest "imminence" or "threatening" can all be translated "present" or "has come." Arndt and Gingrich, Op. Cit., p. 266. See also Gerhard Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, verlag von W. Kohlhammer (Stuttgart, 1942); Vol. ii, ἐνεστηκέν must not be rendered imminent," p. 540.
where else suggests that the day of the Lord has already come.¹ It has been noted above that Schweitzer believes that this is what Paul does believe, that the resurrection of Jesus inaugurates the Messianic age, and that in these last days, the believers are already partaking of the benefits of the Messianic age.² The coming of the Lord becomes the manifestation of the glory of the elect.

Neil maintains that to argue II Thessalonians 2:1-12, from the standpoint of eschatological "time sequence" is not germane to the basic issue. He suggests that in the nature of eschatological thought, the "question of time sequence does not arise."³ The preliminary events alluded to might well be extremely close to the day of the Lord, so close that there would be no essential lapse of time between the appearance of the man of lawlessness and the coming of the Lord.

The identification of the man of lawlessness with the risen Nero is no longer generally accepted since Bousset's study of the Anti-Christ Legend and hence may be dismissed as an argument to putting the dating of II Thessalonians in the post-Neronian period.⁴

A further objection to II Thessalonians 2:1-12, is on the basis of its foreignness to Paul's thought. The wild apocalypticism seems out of character "with the lofty religious teachings of the great Pauline

¹. Enslin, Op. Cit., p. 241. But see the opinion on Colossians in Chap. X.
². See Chap. IV, p. 62ff.
⁴. Ibid.

Yet the stream of apocalyptic prophecy in the New Testament
Epistles."¹ Yet the stream of apocalyptic prophecy in the New Testament
can hardly be dismissed as altogether outside of the Christian message.²
Schweitzer would find apocalypticism not too distant from the central cri-
teration of historicity, namely the eschatological hope. But the primary
objection to the rejection of Pauline apocalyptic is that there is no real
means of judging what Paul did or did not write. The criterion of histori-
city becomes subjective. The absence of eschatological material in Gala-
tians is no reason for rejecting that indisputably genuine letter. Simi-
larly, the presence of an apocalyptic passage in II Thessalonians does not
automatically rule that letter out. Neil even believes that the apoca-
lyptic section may well be the most genuine and authentic bit of the whole
letter.³

In summary, the arguments, pro and con, on the apocalypticism of
II Thessalonians 2:1-12, fall for lack of any objective criterion by
which to measure the mind of Paul.⁴

2. Mark 13; Matthew 24:15; I John 2:18, 4:3; Revelation.
4. The danger always is that the modern critic attempts to read into
Paul his own views. "The amazing thing is that this primitive es-
chatology, preached with so much energy, was able to produce a type
of Christianity so steadfast and amiable as that displayed by the
earliest converts in Macedonia." So Foakes-Jackson remarks on II
Thess. 2:1-12, Op. Cit., p. 148. It is the reluctance of contempo-
rary scholars to see any relevance in primitive eschatology which
has made Schweitzer's position so very strong at this point. While
Schweitzer's critics stumble over the eschatology of II Thess.,
Schweitzer does not hesitate to reject the letter by using the same
principle, albeit from the opposite point of view. This is why the
conservative approach to Pauline authenticity finds recurring favor
as those criterions of historicity, which seek to read the mind of
Paul, contradict one another and fall of their own weight.
4. The Similarity of Style, Structure and Phraseology

The vocabulary by itself is not sufficient to excite comment. There are occasional words such as κρίσις 115, θροέω 212, which are not found in the other genuine epistles of Paul, though they are common in primitive Christian vocabulary.¹ Most of the single occurrences can be attributed to the Septuagint.

The style, however, is normal, almost official, with a "curious poverty of expression."²

In the treatment of a subject like this, it was inevitable that one or two phrases and terms should recur fairly often, e.g. the θλήνη -group, the πίστις -group, εργάζεσθαι and allied terms, παραγγέλω and ειρήνη. Still, it may be confessed elsewhere, e.g. in the description of God and Christ, the giving of thanks, and the repetition of παράκλησις, etc., there is a stereotyped adherence to certain forms of expression or terms which admittedly is unusual in Paul.³

In addition, the style of certain passages is different from all other letters of Paul. In 1:6-11, the language is broad and inflated and somewhat digressive.

Other critics of Pauline authenticity declare that II Thessalonians is a slavish reproduction of I Thessalonians.⁴ It would be possible to consider this reproduction as simply another proof of genuineness were it not for a subtle change in mood. The warmth and affection are absent and

³ Ibid.
"the impression is given that some other writer is striving hard to imitate I Thessalonians." Hence similarities in style and language constitute an objection to authenticity.

5. Possible Solutions

When considering the objections which have been raised, particularly in the matter of style, several theories may be considered.

1. The epistle is a forgery. This would explain 2:1-12, and would also explain the similarities in style and language.

2. The letter was written by Timothy or Silvanus. This theory ranges from independent creation and dispatching by either of the two subordinates, to creation by them and approval by Paul.

3. Paul dictated the letter and in so doing made a subtle shift in style and language.

4. II Thessalonians was written by Paul but intended for formal public use and hence lacks the familiarity of the earlier letters.

5. II Thessalonians was written by Paul but intended for a different audience, namely Jews. I Thessalonians was written for Gentiles. It was Harnack who ably argued this view.

For the purpose of this dissertation, all but the first of these

---

1. Ibid., p. 243.
theories have no relevance to the final issue. Paul either wrote, dictated, or approved or stamped his thought upon the letter in any of several possible ways. The single alternative is that the letter is a forgery which is non-Pauline.¹

6. External Evidence

The external evidence for II Thessalonians is as good as that of the certainly genuine letters. Polycarp appears to have been acquainted with the letter.² Justin Martyr may echo some of the eschatological sections.³ This evidence, along with its inclusion in the Canon of Marcion, "prove the existence of the writing early in the second century and therefore tell against any theory of its composition between 100 and 120 A.D."⁴ Further evidence is that of the Muratorian Canon. II Thessalonians is quoted in Tertullian,⁵ Irenaeus,⁶ Clement of Alexandria.⁷

7. Conclusion

Until F. C. Baur, the genuineness of II Thessalonians was never

---

1. If Timothy or Silvanus independently created II Thess., it may be assumed that it is a "Pauline forgery." J. Weiss regarded Silvanus as the author of both II Thess. and I Peter. Because of lack of evidence, such interesting theories are more of a scholarly "tour de force" than anything else and have won little support.
7. Clement, Stromata 5:3.
questioned. Since then, the grounds for rejecting it have been shifted from eschatological issues to the tone and content of the epistle as a whole, that is to say, from doctrinal criticism to literary criticism.

Yet, when all the arguments are considered, the burden of proof still seems to be upon those who would reject the genuineness of II Thessalonians. Several reasons appear:

1. In terms of content, the arguments against authenticity and in favor of forgery are mutually contradictory. On the one hand, it is argued that the material in II Thessalonians is foreign to Paul's thought, while on the other a slavish dependence upon I Thessalonians is noted. In order to support these positions, it is necessary to fragmentize the letter and find different strands and layers of authorship, redactions, and editings. Such theories produce more problems than they solve.

2. External evidence is as good as the certainly genuine letters.

3. Matters of style, structure and phraseology are hardly decisive.

4. The solutions offered do not really eradicate Pauline authorship of II Thessalonians with the sole exception of the forgery idea. If the letter was written by an amanuensis such as Timothy (Spitta), Silas (Burkitt), Titus (R. Scott), or Silvanus (J Weiss), Paul's mood hovers over the creation. Paul may have dictated directly, he may have simply edited or approved, or he may have commissioned. In any event, if Paul did not directly dictate or write the letter, we may consider it close to his thought.
CHAPTER VII

THE GENUINENESS OF THE PASTORALS AND THE IMPRISONMENT LETTERS

1. The Pastorals

Since the rise of critical scholarship in the nineteenth century, the three pastorals, I and II Timothy and Titus, have generally been rejected as authentic Pauline letters. Some scholars hold that there may be fragments of authentic Pauline correspondence contained in the three letters. "Critics generally admit . . . that fragments at least of genuine letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus are here present." This position has been held by such scholars as Harnack, von Soden, E. F. Scott, McGiffert, Moffatt, and Streeter. The present tendency is to reject the fragmentary theory along with Pauline authorship as a whole. Holding this position among others are Jülicher, Enslin, Goodspeed, and Dibelius. B. S. Easton notes cautiously: "On the possibility of genuine Pauline fragments in the Pastorals - no final decision seems possible." 

1. The Council of Trent also declared Hebrews to be Pauline. This position is generally modified by modern Roman scholars such as Ronald Knox, Op. Cit., p. 2. Its inclusion in the Pauline Corpus has not been seriously considered since Calvin by non-Roman scholars.
4. Ibid.
Neither Charles nor Schweitzer use the Pastorals in their arguments although Charles has one footnote in which I and II Timothy are quoted.¹ By rejecting the genuineness of the Pastorals, neither argument will be unduly prejudiced.

2. Philemon

The genuineness of Philemon is universally accepted. The only serious attack in recent times was by Baur who reluctantly rejected it for he believed that he thus exposed himself to the charge of hypercriticism.² Baur's rejection was based upon his need to be consistent with his rejection of the other imprisonment letters. Since Baur, this Tübingen position has found little support.

3. Philippians

Both Schweitzer and Charles use Philippians in their arguments and they both place this epistle among Paul's genuine letters. There is general agreement among modern scholars that the letter is authentic.³

Again the first serious attack on Philippians began with F. C. Baur

---

3. The only argument turns on the use of ἐπισκόποις and διακόνοις in 1:1. "The titles appear suspicious only when we read into them the significance they came to acquire in the later ecclesiastical system." Ernest F. Scott, "Introduction to Philippians," _Interpreters Bible_ (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), Vol. 11, p. 8.
in 1845.\(^1\) Baur found evidence of the two-party controversy symbolically represented by Euodia and Syntyche.\(^2\) This position has been abandoned.\(^3\)

An attack on the letter by Holsten in 1875 turned mainly on questions of style and content. The chief objection was the lack of authentic Pauline polemic without which no letter could be genuine. This criterion has long since been seen to be faulty.\(^4\) The various objections raised can all be readily handled and since the Tübingen attack no critical questions have succeeded in undermining the growing confidence among scholars of the authenticity of this letter. Philippians may be regarded as a prime example of Paul's imprisonment thought.

4. Colossians

i. Introduction

Charles bases his fourth stage upon Colossians, Ephesians and Philippians. This stage he calls "the cosmic significance of Christ."\(^5\) Schweitzer concludes that Colossians and Ephesians, though presenting the thought of Paul,

have begun to undergo a process of transformation ... Whatever solution may be given, however, to the complicated problem of the Colossians and Ephesian Epistles it is not of primary importance for the exposition of Paul's teaching. There is so much that is peculiar in their ideas that these cannot in any case be simply

\(^2\) Phil. 4:2.
\(^3\) Moffatt, Op. Cit., p. 171.
dovetailed with those from the certainly genuine epistles, but must in some way be allowed to take a place alongside of them.1

Because of these differing views as to the significance of Colossians and Ephesians, it is clear that their admission or rejection as genuine Pauline letters may have an important bearing upon the relative merits of the positions of Charles and Schweitzer.

As in the case of II Thessalonians, the criterion of historicity should again be literary inasmuch as Schweitzer's rejection of both letters appears to be doctrinal.

ii. External Evidence

Though not equal to that of the earlier epistles, the external evidence may be regarded as strong.2 Allusions to Colossians may be found in Barnabas, Ignatius to the Ephesians, Polycarp and Justin, though the relationships are limited.3 It was early thought to be in the genuine works of Paul and is attested to by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Origen.4 Marcion and Valentinus also recognized Colossians as did the Muratorian Canon.

iii. Early Criticism

German criticism led by Mayerhoff first raised questions about Colossians in 1838 and the Tübingen school generally followed.\(^1\) The issue was complicated by the close relationship to Ephesians. Some scholars like Mayerhoff believed Colossians an abridgment of the genuine Ephesians while others like De Wette believed that Ephesians was a later expansion of a genuine Colossians.

The literary endeavors to prove the composite construction of Colossians may be summarized by the brilliant work of H. J. Holtzmann who suggested that Colossians was an expansion of a small genuine epistle. Other reconstructions were undertaken by von Soden and Mayerhoff. The end result of this elaborate criticism was to bring into suspicion the whole method and its conclusions. Furthermore, De Wette's theory began to find support. Attention shifted from Colossians to Ephesians. Goodspeed's theory of Ephesians as a "cover letter" to the Pauline Corpus\(^2\) represents recent refinement of De Wetté's position.

Similarly, the Tübingen criticism was weakened as the parallels with Philippians were demonstrated.\(^3\) Baur believed that the Gnostic thought which he found in Philippians argued against the authenticity of Colossians. But since Philippians was shown to be genuine, the

---

opposite was true and the doctrinal objections on the basis of Gnosti­
cism were lessened.

A further point in favor of Colossian authenticity was its close
relationship to Philemon. This relationship forced Baur to reject Phi­
leon despite overwhelming internal evidence favoring authenticity of the
small letter.1 This extreme position helped to bring about the general
discrediting of the Tübingen criticism and the restoration of confidence
in the authenticity of Colossians.

iv. Recent Criticism

Though the initial criticism based on doctrinal considerations
brought by the Tübingen school has now largely been answered, the case
for the genuineness of Colossians cannot be said to have been success­
fully concluded. Modern scholars have pointed out at least three major
difficulties which must be faced, namely, the difference in style be­
tween Colossians and the accepted epistles, the nature of the relation­
ship to the Ephesians, and the affinity of thought with post-Pauline
works such as the Fourth Gospel and the Hebrews.

It will be perceived that the first two problems are literary
while the last problem is a new issue relating to the general matter
of mysticism and Christology. If Paul's thought has pronounced affini­
ties with the Fourth Gospel in Colossians, it is possible that such a
shift in thought could produce shifts in eschatology. It is not un-

---

1. Ibid., p. lviii.
reasonable to postulate a negative correlation between the Christ-mysticism of Colossians and the eschatological hope. Schweitzer endeavors to demonstrate that the mysticism directly relates to eschatology, partly by his re-defining of mysticism. It is outside the scope of this dissertation for the author to enter into a discussion of Pauline mysticism, however, the relationship to eschatology, if any, will be reserved to succeeding chapters. The authenticity of Colossians will be considered on the basis of the literary criticism as raised in the first two problems.

v. Questions of Style and Vocabulary

The features which help to cast doubt upon the authenticity (of Colossians) are . . . the long involved sentences; the concatenation of genitives; the measured liturgical cadences; the absence of the quick and eager dialectic. An example of cumbrous overweighted sentences may be found in 1:25-27, which might well be compared to I Corinthians 2:6-16. An ex-

1. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 97. If Paul's mystical thought takes a new turn in Colossians, a turn which is sharply different from his earlier position, it might be strong evidence for the developmental theory. Such development may be assumed to have taken place not only in the matter of Christ-mysticism but in the general area of eschatology. In comparing the development of Christ-mysticism and eschatology it is conceivable that they might move in negative correlation, or reverse proportion: the more eschatology, the less need for any mystical real presence; the less eschatology, the more need for a mystical re-statement of the presence of Christ. Such a relationship has been observed in the Fourth Gospel where the eschatology has received very little emphasis and the real presence of Christ defined as the παρακλήτος has been introduced.

ample of involved syntax may be seen in 2:8-15, a "concatenation of genitives." The "nervous vigor" of Corinthians gives way to a difficult involved sentence structure which hardly seems the working of the same mind.¹

The style is different from the earlier Pauline epistles. The question that remains is whether or not such differences in style necessitate the complete separation of the letter from the hand of Paul. There is much to argue that evidence will not support such a radical conclusion. Differences in style can be observed in all writers in works composed at different times and places in their lives. If Paul was in prison at the time of the writing of Colossians, there is reason to suppose that he may have had the time for more reflective or speculative thought. The "nervous vigor" of the earlier letters could well have been caused by the pressures of his campaigning. It may well be impossible to determine that degree of difference in style of a writer which finally compels one to deny genuineness of authorship.

In addition, there are sufficient affinities of style between Colossians and the major epistles to balance considerably the criticisms raised. The involved long sentences of 2:8-15 and 1:9-20, have their parallels in Romans 1:1-7, 2:5-10, 14-16, 3:23-26; Galatians 2:3-5, 6-9; Philippians 3:8-11.² There are also many turns of expression which are strikingly Pauline, such as 2:4, 8, 17, 23; 3:14; 4:6, 17.³

² Ibid., p. liii.
³ Ibid., p. liii.
The lack of polemic in Colossians might be another reason for a stylistic difference. Paul was under no attack and he is not writing under the pressure which produced Corinthians or Galatians.

In summing up the stylistic differences, though it is clear that Colossians differs from the larger letters, in the face of similarities it cannot be concluded that genuineness is to be denied by this test alone. A survey of vocabulary by Abbott reveals no more ἀπαξ λέγομενον than would be expected in a letter dealing with novel questions. The alleged absence of Paul's favorite terms and turns of expression are not without parallels in other letters. Altogether, the vocabulary of Colossians, though possessing some few novelties, is hardly outside the realm of Paul's experiences. His presence in prison in Rome could well have added to his current choice of words and might bring some new expressions into his thought.

On matters of vocabulary and style, the burden of proof must remain upon those who would declare for non-genuineness of Pauline authorship.

vi. Relationship to Ephesians

The relationship between Colossians and Ephesians is close. A reading of the two letters reveals agreement in the use of a number of

1. Ibid., p. liii. The complete survey and conclusions may be found on pp. li - liii, lix - lx.
2. Ibid.
technical words of a theological vocabulary which are not elsewhere used by Paul. Goodspeed says that "three fifths of Colossians is reflected in Ephesians."\(^1\) Again and again there are verbally identical phrases such as parallels between Colossians 4:7, 8, and Ephesians 6:21, 22.\(^2\) Similarities of style are frequent and the liturgical cadences of Ephesians appear only less conspicuously in Colossians.\(^3\)

Two questions are important when considering these two epistles. Is Ephesians dependent upon Colossians or is Colossians an abridgment of Ephesians? Did the same author write both letters?

The problem of dependence has been attacked from both sides ever since the genuineness of Ephesians was called into question by Schleiermacher.\(^4\) The priority of Ephesians was argued by Holtzmann "with great labour and minuteness."\(^5\) He deduced that a genuine epistle to the Colossians was used by the writer of Ephesians and later interpolated. Hence Ephesians became somewhat of a model for the edited Colossians.

This position has not generally been followed\(^6\) because other difficulties attending the defense of the genuineness of Ephesians seem to weigh more heavily than the difficulties surrounding Colossians.\(^7\)

4. See below, p. 105.
7. See below, p. 106ff, for a statement of the evidence.
Hence the problem centers on whether or not Ephesians is genuine.
If Ephesians is not genuine, it is more satisfactory to conclude that it is based in some way upon Colossians.\(^1\) The close relationship of Colossians to Philemon, an unquestionably genuine letter, has tended to place the three letters in a descending order of genuineness; i.e., Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians.

In summary, the evidence for the genuineness of Colossians is certainly not as complete as the attestation of the major letters and the question of authorship must remain open.\(^2\) However, despite the fact of textual corruption and the tendency of scribes to conform Colossians to Ephesians,\(^3\) the objections, singly or cumulatively, are not sufficient to set the work aside from the genuine writings of Paul. The reaction to the initial Tübingen criticism appears to have broadened the criterion by which Pauline authenticity has been measured; the narrow confines of doctrine and style established in earlier days now appear to do injustice to the breadth and creative power of Paul. In such an atmosphere, the authenticity of Colossians tends to become more secure. For the purpose of this dissertation, it shall be regarded as genuine.\(^4\)

---

4. Apart from the Tübingen criticism listed above, there is substantial agreement on the authenticity of Colossians. The following authorities all hold for the Pauline authorship: Deissmann, *Op. Cit.*, "The results of Paul's contemplation flow in the clearest stream in the letter to the Colossians.", p. 107. Dibelius,
5. Ephesians

The problems of ascribing the authorship of Ephesians to Paul are many. The genuineness of Ephesians has been under heavy attack ever since the Tübingen school opened the way on doctrinal grounds.

i. External Evidence

Allusion to Ephesians may be found in Clement of Rome, \(^1\) the Didache, \(^2\) and Ignatius, \(^3\) Polycarp's *To the Philippians* in Chapter I contains two quotations from Ephesians. \(^4\) The *Shepherd of Hermas* has an allusion. \(^5\)

By the time of Irenaeus the epistle was accepted as Paul's. \(^6\)

From the above external evidence it seems probable that the letter existed by 95 A.D. (Clement) or at least by 115 (Ignatius, Polycarp) with absolute attestation by about 175.

---

1. c. 64, 46 compared with Ephesians 4:4-6, c. 36 cf. Ephesians 1:18, c. 38 cf. Ephesians 5:21.
3. Epistle to Ephesians c. 12.
6. Irenaeus Ad. Her., 5:2, 3, "Just as the blessed Paul wrote in his epistle to the Ephesians."
Schleiermacher was the first who questioned the genuineness of Ephesians\(^1\) though Evanson is given this credit by Beare.\(^2\) The Tübingen school rejected Ephesians along with the other Imprisonment Letters on the grounds that they represented second century Gnosticism. Baur even found traces of Montanism in Ephesians.\(^3\) A clarification of the gnostic position brought about a shifting of the argument to literary grounds. The Tübingen position has fallen with the almost universal acceptance of the genuineness of Philemon and Philippians.

Though De Wette postulated the dependence of Ephesians on Colossians, it was H. J. Holtzmann in 1872 that focused study on the relatedness of the two epistles.\(^4\) He concluded that the writer of Ephesians had before him a primitive Colossians which was subsequently interpolated. Since Holtzmann "the weight of the arguments inclines upon the whole to favour the authenticity of Colossians and the sub-Pauline origin of Ephesians."\(^5\) Moffatt makes a detailed comparison of the parallels passages with the conclusion that Ephesians is a "set of variations played by a master hand upon one or two themes suggested by Colossians."\(^6\)

---

4. Ibid.
6. Ibid., pp. 375-381
More recently, E. J. Goodspeed in his *The Meaning of Ephesians* has brought forward the theory that Ephesians is a cover letter accompanying the initial collection and publication of the Pauline Corpus.\(^1\) Its address was not Ephesus, but simply "to the saints who are also faithful." The theory is attractive and to many scholars persuasive.\(^2\) The net effect is to reinforce the non-Pauline authorship.

### iii. The Issues

The study of Ephesians is a complicated literary matter, and there is a great deal of confusion on matters of origin, dating, first readers and occasion and purpose. Though these issues affect the question of genuineness, the internal evidence seems decisive in demonstrating non-Pauline authorship.

That evidence may be summarized as follows:

1. The author is non-Jewish.\(^3\)
2. The readers are Gentiles.\(^4\)
3. The author has no personal knowledge of his readers, a most unlikely circumstance in view of Paul's lengthy stay at Ephesus.\(^5\) This objection may be met by removing the reference to Ephesians but this in turn provides a further argument against Pauline authorship.\(^6\)

---

2. See footnote 4 below, p. 108.
3. Ephesians 2:3 cf., Galatians 2:15, II Cor. 11:22, Phil. 3:4.
4. Ephesians 2:2, 11.
5. Ephesians 1:15, 3:2, 4:21.
4. The only relationship between author and readers is through written messages.¹

5. The apostles are consciously heightened in importance when compared with genuine Pauline letters.²

6. The church is the channel of revelation.³

7. Heretical sects are operating⁵ and the unity of the church is endangered⁶ suggesting a second century situation.

8. The literary dependence upon Colossians argues against genuineness instead of for it. This may be demonstrated by subtle changes which have occurred. Christ is the "head of the body" in both epistles.⁶ In Colossians the body is the κόσμος while in Ephesians the body is the ἐκκλησία.

9. The anonymity of the Ephesians' address, argued by those who would make the letter a circular, does not fit the personal method of Paul's writing as typified by Colossians.

10. Nor does the substitute of "Laodicēa" (following Marcion) ease the situation for the question immediately arises why it is necessary to send for it.⁷ Tychicus would probably have brought it to Colossae with him. Furthermore, the similarity of the letter to the Colossian epistle would make its reading at Colossae redundant.

---

¹ Ephesians 3:2, 3; 3:16-20.
² Ephesians 2:20-22 cf., I Cor. 3:11, II Cor. 3:17.
³ Ephesians 3:10.
⁴ Ephesians 4:14.
⁵ Ephesians 4:3-6.
⁶ Col. 2:10, 19, with Ephesians 4:16.
⁷ Col. 4:16.
11. The vocabulary is strikingly different from other Pauline epistles. Almost every commentator has noted this fact,1 with the typical frequent conclusions that "Another mind than that of the Apostle is at work in Ephesians."2

The cumulative effect of the above arguments is considerable. Against them is the general argument that Ephesians bears the stamp of Paul's thought, albeit in a more advanced form. The similarity to Colossians argues for, rather than against, Pauline authorship, and the complicated style does resemble Romans which is not altogether lucid and simple.3

For the purpose of this dissertation, Ephesians will be considered post-Pauline.4

---

2. Moffatt, Ibid.

Finding for Pauline authorship are the following: Deissmann,
6. Summary

The Pastorals, I and II Timothy, and Titus, are set aside as non-authentic letters of Paul. These letters have almost no bearing upon the arguments of Charles or Schweitzer.

On the other hand, Philemon and Philippians are considered genuine. No real opposition to these letters can be found in recent scholarship and both Schweitzer and Charles rely upon Philippians.

Ephesians is a confusing issue. "It is only fair to say that in our present stage of knowledge 'Ephesians' still remains one of the great enigmas, nor is there much reason to hope that it will ever be otherwise." Enslin's conclusion is cautious and critical. Despite the lack of finality on the whole question, it seems better to declare Ephesians post-Pauline. This conclusion supports Schweitzer and is against Charles.

On the other hand, Colossians appears to be authentic in spite of several difficulties. This conclusion supports Charles and is against Schweitzer.

---


CHAPTER VIII

THE DATES OF THE LETTERS

1. Introduction

One further issue needs to be considered before an analysis of the eschatological material can be made. It is necessary to date the genuine letters of Paul as accurately as possible. If Paul's thought developed in an orderly way, then dating the various letters will determine whether his ideas developed gradually or in some sudden traumatic way. On the other hand, if evidence for similar stages of Paul's thought is found to come from letters having wide differences in date, the developmental argument is sharply challenged. A certain chronological coherence should reasonably be demonstrated, if the theory of Charles is correct.

The dating of the letters is necessary to test the developmental theory as well as to provide a general frame of reference in which to examine consistent eschatology.

2. A Terminus a Quo

Paul's Christian activity may be divided into two periods: The first is from his conversion to the crisis in Jerusalem,\(^1\) the

\(^1\) Acts 15:36ff.
second is from the crisis to the great mission in Asia Minor, Macedonia and Achaia, followed by imprisonment and death. Paul's literary activity is within the second period.

The first period may be said to occupy about 14 to 17 years, based on evidence of Galatians.¹ The date of conversion is uncertain, but it is after the death of Jesus in the early apostolic period, the history of which is chronicled in the opening chapters of Acts. The actual date of the conversion is variously put between 31 and 38 A.D., with the earlier date being closest to the general consensus.² By adding 17 to this date, the crisis at Jerusalem is put somewhere around 48-49 A.D.

Accuracy of dating can never be assured and, for the purpose of this dissertation, is not primarily essential. However, it should be noted that the 17-year period, as an approximation, suggests that Paul was well along in his mature consideration of the Christian faith. This maturity would argue for Schweitzer's view that Paul had reached a stability of thought and a reasonably coherent and well worked-out theology.

Of more importance is the relationship of the letters to themselves. Though the terminus a quo of Paul's correspondence must remain vague, for lack of external evidence, the internal evidence gives several clues to the inter-relationship of the letters.

¹ Gal. 1:18, 2:1.
3. The Three Periods

The letters of Paul may be said to fall into three periods.¹ The first period involves the writing of I and II Thessalonians. This was in the middle of the second journey, no doubt during the eighteen months' ministry in Corinth noted in Acts 18:1-17.² The dating of this Corinth stay varies from Harnack's 48 A.D. to c. 53 A.D. of Zahn, Lightfoot and Renan.³

The second period is during the third missionary journey when I and II Corinthians and Romans were written. I Corinthians was written from Ephesus,⁴ toward the end of his three-year stay.⁵ Soon afterwards, while in Macedonia, Paul wrote II Corinthians. After a three-month stay in Macedonia,⁶ Paul wintered in Corinth and wrote Romans. It is thus conceivable that if I Corinthians was written at the very end of Paul's stay in Ephesus, and Romans at the beginning of Paul's winter in Corinth, the three major letters of Paul could all fall within a six-month period. Schweitzer places I Corinthians in the spring, II Corinthians in the autumn, and Romans in the winter. In any event, these three letters probably fall within a year's time and may be grouped together.

The amount of time separating the first period from this second

³ Ibid., p. 63.
⁶ Acts 20:3.
period is about four years, allowing approximately three years for the Ephesian ministry and a few months for the completion of the second missionary journey following the writing of the Thessalonians letters.\(^1\)

The third period of Paul's correspondence is during the imprisonment when Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon were written.\(^2\) Paul was "two whole years" in Rome.\(^3\) The letters could have been written any time during this stay. The separation of time between the second and third period is considered to be three to four years which includes such events as the completion of the third journey,\(^4\) fifth visit to Jerusalem,\(^5\) arrest and imprisonment,\(^6\) the imprisoning at Caesarea,\(^7\) and the voyage to Rome.\(^8\)

It is possible that the Imprisonment Letters may have been written from Caesarea or Ephesus. Despite some ingenious arguments in favor of these two places, "... the old view that the Epistle was sent from Rome is still by far the most probable."\(^9\)

Within the third period, Colossians appears to be slightly earlier than Philippians despite the fuller theology of that epistle.\(^10\) However,

9. Scott, Philippians, p. 6, Scott's balanced evaluation of the evidence is persuasive. See also Moffatt, Op. Cit., p. 169, who summarizes the arguments against Caesarea.
it is sufficient to state that these two letters fall closely together.

4. Galatians

It is impossible to accurately fix the time of the writing of Galatians and it cannot be relied upon to give any exact clues as to the development of Paul's thought.

Galatians may have been written from Antioch at the close of the first mission tour which makes it the earliest of the Pauline letters. A second possibility is at Corinth during the second tour. A third possibility is Antioch at the close of the second tour. A fourth possibility is Ephesus in the third mission tour during the three-years stay. A fifth possibility is Corinth in the winter at the time of the writing of Romans. The letter thus can fall almost any time in the first and second period of Paul's writing. Fortunately, the eschatological material in Galatians is limited and the dating of this letter is not critically important.
5. Summary

The three periods may be summarized as follows:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Place or Time</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
<td>Acts 18:1-17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Thessalonians</td>
<td>(18 Months in Corinth)</td>
<td>50-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Corinthians</td>
<td>Ephesus (Acts 19)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Corinthians</td>
<td>Macedonia (Acts 20:3)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Corinth Winter</td>
<td>54-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>Rome Imprisonment</td>
<td>58-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>Rome Imprisonment</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Rome Imprisonment</td>
<td>59-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. McNeile's dates are slightly later. I and II Thess, 51; I Cor. 55; II Cor. 56; Romans 57; Col. 61; Phil. 62. This would allow more time for development between periods. Barnett, Op. Cit., agrees with the dates as given above except that he puts Col. at 61-62.
CHAPTER IX

A SURVEY OF PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY

Passages of the genuine Pauline letters dealing with eschatology will now be set forth. Some of the passages will be of distant relevance but nevertheless are included so that in the ensuing discussion, no evidence is overlooked. The purpose of the commentary is not that of exegesis. It has been included only to clarify or to justify the inclusion of a passage with possible obscure meaning. The longer passages usually need little comment.

1. I Thessalonians

1:3b Your work of faith and labor of love and steadfastness of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.

It is possible to connect τοῦ κυρίου with πίστεως or ἀγάπης, but it seems better to let τοῦ κυρίου simply qualify ἐλπίδος as an objective genitive. 

1:10b And to wait for His Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come.

In Matthew 3:7, the phrase "wrath to come" is from μελλοῦσα, which might better be translated "wrath which is certain to come."

Paul's use of ἐρχομένης emphasizes immediacy, and accentuates the eschatological hope.¹

2:12 To lead a life worthy of God, who calls you into his own kingdom and glory.

βασιλεία, infrequently used by Paul, "denotes the redeemed society of the future over which God rules."²

2:16b But God's wrath has come upon them at last:

εἰς τέλος cannot be used intensively in the sense of "utterly" or "completely" but must be used in the sense of "temporarily."³ Schweitzer, following Moffatt and others, inclines to consider the phrase a later gloss referring to the fall of Jerusalem.⁴

The consensus of criticism seems to support immediacy.

2:19 For what is our hope or joy or crown of boasting before our Lord at his coming?

Coming is here παρουσία and is the term specifically used by Paul for the advent.⁵

---

1. Ibid., p. 502, c.d. For parallels see below Col. 3:6, p. 131 and Ephesians 5:6, p. 132.
2. Frame, Op. Cit., p. 105. But note Romans 14:17 which puts the kingdom into the present experience of the believer, though not ruling out an eschatological interpretation. Schweitzer regards the kingdom as beginning immediately though its manifestation may be delayed, Mysticism, p. 120.
5. Other uses of παρουσία by Paul may be cited in I Thess. 3:13, 4:15, 5:23; II Thess. 2:1, 8; I Cor. 15:23.
3:13 . . . so that he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before our God and Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints.

A confusing issue is the translation ἁγίοι as "saints" or "holy ones." In II Thessalonians 1:7, Christ appears with his mighty angels in flaming fire. However, the phrase πάντων ἅγιων is also found in Colossians 1:26. In the light of the problem of I Thessalonians 4:13-17, a possible interpretation of ἁγίοι would be those risen in Christ just prior to his coming. Frame suggests that πάντων places the event at a time after the Parousia.

4:13-17 But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep. For this we declare to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command, with the archangel's call, and with the sound of the trumpet of God. And the dead in Christ will rise first; then we who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so we shall always be with the Lord.

5:2-5 For you yourselves know well that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night. When people say, "There is peace and security," then sudden destruction will come upon them as travail comes upon a woman with child, and there will be no escape. But you are not in darkness, brethren, for that day to surprise you, like a thief. For you are all sons of light and sons of the day; we are not of the night or of darkness.

1. See below, p. 144.
The surprise of the Parousia appears to be only for the sons of night. This meaning would tend to diminish the sharp contradictions of II Thessalonians 2:10-12, which are noted above.  

5:23 May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

2. II Thessalonians

1:7-11 ... and to grant rest with us to you who are afflicted, when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, inflicting vengeance upon those who do not know God and upon those who do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus. They shall suffer the punishment of eternal destruction and exclusion from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his might, when he comes on that day to be glorified in his saints, and to be marveled at in all who have believed, because our testimony to you was believed. To this end we always pray for you, that our God may make you worthy of his call, and may fulfill every good resolve and work of faith by his power,

2:1-12 Now concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our assembling to meet him, we beg you, brethren, not to be quickly shaken in mind or excited, either by spirit or by word, or by letter purporting to be from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord has come. Let no one deceive you in any way; for that day will not come, unless the rebellion comes first, and the man of lawlessness is revealed, the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God. Do you not remember that when I was still with you I told you this? And you know what is restraining him now so that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work; only he who now restrains it will do so until he is out of the way. And then the lawless one will be revealed, and the Lord Jesus will

1. There was a curious belief in the early church that the Lord was to return at night, especially on Easter Eve. So Jerome on Matt. 25:6 and Lactantius, Institutes 7:19. Frame, Op. Cit., p. 180.
2:13  ... because God chose you from the beginning to be saved.

The phrase "to be saved" only serves to give a general impression of future action and finds its greatest eschatological significance from the preceding section.

2:14  ... so that you may obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The glory of Christ should be differentiated from the glory of God of I Thessalonians 2:12, which is more clearly identifiable as eschatological material. The glory of Christ might well be a present circumstance unrelated to the Parousia.

3. I Corinthians

1:7  ... so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift, as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The thought parallels that of Romans 8:19.

1:8  ... who will sustain you to the end, guiltless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The recurring use of ςμέρα by Paul, usually connected with "of our Lord" becomes a formal term for the Parousia.1

2:6  ... although it is not a wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age, who are doomed to pass away.

1. For the many citations involving ςμέρα as the day of judgment and specifically Christ's day, see Arndt and Gingrich, Op. Cit., p. 347, 3, b.
The "passing away" καταρροματένων refers to the ἀφοντών. A double negative is not possible, thus showing a clear eschatological emphasis.

2:8 None of the rulers of this age understood this.

The use of the aorist ἔγνωκεν continues the thought of 2:6.

3:13 ... each man's work will become manifest; for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each one has done.¹

3:14 If the work which any man has built on the foundation survives, he will receive a reward.

μισθός usually means "pay" or "wages" and the sense of "reward" should have this connotation.²

3:15 If any man's work is burned up, he will suffer loss, though he himself will be saved, but only as through fire.

3:18 ... If any one among you thinks that he is wise in this age, ...

The two-age view is common in Paul.³

3:22 ... or life or death or the present or the future ... Robertson and Plummer suggest that this passage has no eschatological significance.⁴

¹ For the eschatological use of ἐν (fire) see Arndt and Gingrich, Op. Cit., p. 737, b.
² The eschatological use of "reward" may be found in Arndt and Gingrich, Op. Cit., p. 525, a.
⁴ Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, "First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians," International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), p. 73. These scholars tend to find little eschatological significance throughout their commentary, perhaps representative of English criticism of 1910. For example, note the laborious non-eschatological interpretation of 10:11b or 13:12.
Therefore do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purpose of men's hearts. Then every man will receive his commendation from God.

For I think that God has exhibited us apostles as last of all. Paul's personal sense of impending doom is in sharp contrast to the mood of the Corinthians whom he here chides.

... that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. Paul's personal sense of impending doom is in sharp contrast to the mood of the Corinthians whom he here chides.

Do you not know that the saints will judge the world? This passage may be a reference to the Messianic Kingdom of Christ.

Do you not know that we are to judge angels? How much more matters pertaining to this life!

Angels are members of the kosmos. Paul here sharpens the separation of those in Christ with those of the present age.

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither the immoral, nor idolators; nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the kingdom of God.

And God raised the Lord and will also raise us up by his power.

I think that in view of the impending distress it is well for a person to remain as he is.

I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short;

---

1. See Cor. 1:8 above, p. 120.
2. See below 15:23. The evidence for the Messianic Kingdom is considered in Chapter X under Section 2, "Eschatological Chronology," p. 143.
The two verses above should not be considered as a personal reference to Paul's impending death, but find their meaning primarily in the general eschatological hope.¹

7:31b For the form of this world is passing away.

"Form" χρήμα here means "outward appearance," that which can be apprehended with the senses.² It is conceivable that the mean—here refers only to the temporary or transient things of life with no eschatological force.³

10:11 ... but they were written down for our instruction, upon whom the end of ages has come.

The defining of ages as "successive periods" in history with no eschatological significance is forced.⁴

10:13b ... God is faithful, and he will not let you be tempted beyond your strength, but with the temptation will also provide the way of escape, that you may be able to endure it.

The only reason for ascribing this verse to an eschatological list is the use of πεπαθμός (temptation) in connection with Messianic woes in I Peter 4:12 and Revelation 3:10. In Hebrews 3:8 it is a time of testing in the wilderness.

---

11:32 But when we are judged by the Lord, we are chastened so that we may not be condemned along with the world.

Presumably this is the condemnation occurring at the Parousia.

13:10 . . . but when the perfect comes, the imperfect will pass away.

13:12 For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall understand fully . . .

It is not entirely clear whether or not this verse refers to the Parousia or simply death. Craig suggests the Parousia.\(^1\) Robertson and Plummer interpret the passage "symbolically."\(^2\)

15:13 But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised;

15:16-20 For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins. Then those also who have died in Christ have perished. If in this life we who are in Christ have only hope, we are of all men most to be pitied. But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep.

15:23-28 But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ. Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom of God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. "For God has put all things in subjection under him," it is plain that he is excepted who put all things under him. When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to everyone.

15:49 . . . we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven.

The substitution of \(\phi o\rho \varepsilon \varphi \mu \varepsilon \nu\) for \(\phi o\rho \varepsilon \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu\) , "let us bear" rather than "we shall bear," would suggest that the attainment

---

of the glorified body is through self effort. The use of the
hortatory subjunctive is out of place and the meaning may best be considered as a result of the anticipation of the Parousia.¹

15:51,52 Lo! I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed.

16:7 For I do not want to see you now just in passing; I hope to spend some time with you, if the Lord permits.

The phrase "if the Lord permits" may not have any particular eschatological significance. Paul's future may have seemed uncertain to him.²

16:22 Our Lord, come!

The best form of this phrase is μαράνα θα and should be considered typical of the expectation of the Parousia. The inferior form μαραν δθα is translated "The Lord has come" or "is coming."³

4. II Corinthians

1:10 . . . on him we have set our hope that he will deliver us again.

It is possible that Paul here considered delivery only from the recurring sins of his life and not from death or any future event.

1:14 . . . that you can be proud of us as we can be of you, on the day of the Lord Jesus.⁴

---

1. Ibid., p. 375.
2. Romans 1:10.
4. See I Cor. 1:8 above.
4:14 Knowing that he who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and bring us with you into his presence.

This may be an echo of I Corinthians 6:14, the expression of Paul's doubt of his own living until the Parousia.

4:17 For this slight momentary affliction is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison.

5:10 For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body.

Both 4:17 and 5:10 may be interpreted in terms of personal death and judgment apart from the Parousia.\(^1\)

6:2 Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation.

"By \(\nu\nu\) is meant all the time between the moment of writing and the Advent."\(^2\)

5. Romans

1:18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth.

2:5 But by your hard and impenitent heart you are storing wrath for yourself on the day of wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed.

---

1. See Plummer, Op. Cit., pp. 155-160, for a lengthy commentary on 5:10. Plummer's additional note on II Cor. 5:1-10, pp. 160-164, examines the relationship of the above to I Cor. 15. The interpretation of this passage depends upon the conclusions regarding immediate resurrection which will be considered in the following chapter, p. 157. The conclusions of Plummer are presented below, Chap. X, p. 161, n. 7. Study might be made of the relationship of the vocabulary of the Wisdom of Solomon and this passage.

The day of wrath is generally equated with the Day of the Lord or day of judgment.¹

2:6 For he will render to every man according to his works;
The significance of this phrase is the allusion to a future judgment, and not to any discussion of the relative efficacy of faith and works.

2:9 There will be tribulation and distress for every human being who does evil, the Jew first and also the Greek.
A priority of privilege indicates a priority of penalty. This passage should not be used to indicate any particular chronological order of judgment.²

2:12 All who sinned without the law will also perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law.
A repetition of the argument of 2:9 indicates a consistent anticipation of judgment.

2:15-16 ... and their conflicting thoughts accuse or perhaps excuse them ... on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus.

5:2b ... and we rejoice in our hope of sharing the glory of God.

5:9b ... much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God.

5:17 If, because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ.

6:5 For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his.

Though similar in appearance to I Corinthians 15:13, Paul is here arguing forward from death to resurrection. In Corinthians Paul starts with the resurrection in an argument about death.¹

8:18-25 I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us. For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God; for the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of him who subjected it in hope; because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God. We know that the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now; and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies. For in this hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope, for who hopes for what he sees? But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience.

9:28 ... for the Lord will execute his sentence upon the earth with rigor and dispatch."

11:26 ... and so all Israel will be saved; as it is written, "The Deliverer will come from Zion ... .²

13:11,12 Besides this you know what hour it is, how it is full time now for you to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand. Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light;

14:10b ... For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God:

Compare this passage with the "judgment seat of Christ" in II Corinthians 5:10. Paul apparently uses interchangeably the

---

². A discussion of the Jewish background of this passage may be found in Sanday, Op. Cit., pp. 336, 337.
So each of us shall give account of himself to God.

... and further Isaiah says, "The root of Jesse shall come, he who rises to rule the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles hope."

This passage may possibly be a reference to a Messianic Kingdom based on Isaiah 11:10. The Septuagint, which is here quoted, paraphrases the Hebrew.

6. Galatians

... who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father;

And let us not grow weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we do not lose heart.

The use of an agricultural phrase brings to mind the "harvest" with its eschatological implications.

7. Colossians

... because of the hope laid up for you in heaven...

Abbott finds difficulty in assigning the motive for Christian love to hope for the future, presumably the Parousia. Of the many explanations which are offered to explain this idea away,

1. Ibid., p. 389.
2. Ibid., p. 399.
3. See note on I Cor. 3:18 above, p. 121.
none seems to adequately solve the problem, and the eschatological force of the argument remains.¹

1:12 ... giving thanks to the Father, who has qualified us to share in the inheritance of the saints in light.

"In light" is frequently a substitute for "heaven."²

1:13 He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son.³

1:22,23 ... in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him, provided that you continue in the faith, stable and steadfast ...  

Though Beare suggests that a wider meaning may be attached to this verse than simply the appearance of men before God on the judgment day, the eschatological meaning is evident.⁴

2:17 These are only a shadow of what is to come.

This verse is probably not of eschatological importance despite its appearance.⁵ It may refer to the seasonal observances of heretics.⁶

3:4 When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory.

There is some divided opinion as to whether this verse may be interpreted chronologically in the Jewish framework or on the

---

3. See 1:12 above.
basis of manifestation of realms or orders of being in the Hellenistic framework.¹

3:6 On account of these the wrath of God is coming upon the sons of disobedience,

"These" refers to the earthly impurities of verse 3:5. For an understanding of the "wrath of God" see above, Romans 1:18.

3:24 . . . knowing that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward; . . .

There is a ready willingness of modern commentators to interpret this passage non-eschatologically.²

8. Philemon

There are no passages of eschatological importance in Philemon.

9. Philippians

1:6 And I am sure that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ.

1:10 . . . so that you may approve what is excellent, and may be pure and blameless for the day of Christ.

Note the uses of the phrase: "day of Christ" above.³

2:16 . . . holding fast the word of life, so that in the day of Christ I may be proud that I did not run in vain or labor in vain.

---

1. Beare, Op. Cit., p. 211. This matter is considered below in Chap. X in the section on "Eschatological Chronology"; p. 143.
2. Ibid., p. 228. Scott, Colossians, p. 81.
3. 1 Cor. 1:8.
But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Lord is at hand.

might better be translated "near." 1

10. Sub-Pauline Epistles

The passages cited below are not related to the main body of the dissertation and are presented only in passing.

i. Ephesians

We who first hoped in Christ have been destined and appointed to live for the praise of his glory.

which is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it, to the praise of his glory.

not only in this age but also in that which is to come.

That in the coming ages he might show the immeasurable riches of his grace.

And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption.

for it is because of these things that the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience.

Apart from the "two-age view" of 1:21, and 2:7, there is little distinctive eschatological material.

ii. The Pastorals

The eschatological hope appears occasionally in the Pastorals.

When taken together there is the impression of some expectation of the Parousia.

1. I Timothy

4:8 ... godliness is of value in every way, as it holds promise for the present life and also for the life to come.

4:10 For to this end we toil and strive, because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those who believe.

6:14 I charge you to keep the commandment unstained and free from reproach until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ ... 

2. II Timothy

1:12 ... I am sure that he is able to guard until that Day what has been entrusted to me.

3:1 But understand this, that in the last days there will come times of stress.

4:1 I charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus who is to judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom.

4:3 For the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching ... 

4:18 The Lord will rescue me from every evil and save me for his heavenly kingdom ...

3. Titus

2:13 ... awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ,
CHAPTER X

ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE

1. The Imminent Expectation of the Parousia

The first analysis of the evidence will be to determine if there is an imminent expectation of the Parousia throughout Paul's letters. The description of that Parousia will be established from Paul's thought itself, in those letters where such an expectation is clear and unmistakable.

i. I Thessalonians

From I Thessalonians it may be concluded that Paul expected the return of the Lord within his lifetime.\(^1\) Inasmuch as Paul was certainly in middle age, seventeen years having elapsed since his conversion, the amount of time remaining to him could not reasonably be expected to exceed a few years. The anticipation of the Lord's coming was sufficiently strong in Thessalonica to bring great distress to those alive who were worrying about those who had already died. The only reasonable explanation of this concern, to which Paul address himself, was that it was the

---

1. I Thess. 4:15.
common belief that the coming kingdom was inherited by the living only.¹

In view of the fact that the Thessalonians were so convinced of the immediacy of the return of the Lord that they had not even thought out the implications of intervening death, it is conceivable that their expectation may be thought of not in terms of years, but perhaps in terms of months. It is not improbable that there was a feeling of being on the brink of the finale of history when Paul intimates that the judgment has already commenced.²

Other references in I Thessalonians suggest that the event is very near despite appearances to the contrary.³ Paul thus believes that the Parousia may not be related to an impending calamity which may be detected, charted, analyzed and used as a prediction. The Lord comes "like a thief in the night,"⁴ and the mere fact that life proceeds as normal is no indication that the eschatological hope is fading. Such an argument would have been most useful in sustaining the eschatological hope as time passed. I Thessalonians 5:2, may be considered as Paul's argument to disarm any objectors who might point out a reason for delay. It thus falls into

2. I Thess. 2:16b. "But God's wrath has come upon them at last." In view of the eschatological bearing of ἐφοδασεν this disputed passage cannot refer to a specific event in the past such as the loss of Jewish independence or the famine (Acts 11:28) nor the banishment from Rome (Acts 18:2) nor even to the destruction of Jerusalem. The passage must refer "simply to the day of judgment which is near at hand." Frame, Op. Cit., p. 114.
3. I Thess. 5:3.
4. I Thess. 5:2.
line with the imminent expectation of the Parousia.

The remaining passages in I Thessalonians all indicate a strong hope for the return of the Lord though none of them can be pressed into proving a very imminent expectation. These passages harmonize with the references quoted above and suggest a consistent picture of very strong hope for the imminent return of the Lord Jesus Christ.

ii. II Thessalonians

In the first chapter of II Thessalonians the imminent hope is sustained. The coming of the Lord Jesus is pictured more in judgmental terms, with such elements as mighty angels and flaming fire. The concept of revelation is more pronounced. Despite these additions to Paul's thought of I Thessalonians, the imminent hope of the Parousia remains.

However, in the second chapter there is a serious challenge to the concept of imminence, so serious that many commentators consider it a direct contradiction to I Thessalonians. The issue revolves about the introduction of events which precede the Parousia, the effect of which is to delay the day of the Lord. These events are the rebellion, the revealing of the man of lawlessness, and the proclamation of man of lawless-

1. I Thess. 1:3b, 1:10, 3:19, 3:13, 5:23.
2. See above, Chap. IX, p. 116ff.
4. II Thess. 1:8,9.
5. II Thess. 1:7.
6. Critical opinion on these matters may be found above, Chap. VI, p. 85.
7. II Thess. 2:3.
ness as God in the temple seat. Other signs and wonders will take place.

These signs and wonders would seem to contradict the "thief in the night" idea of I Thessalonians. This section remains the strongest evidence for discarding II Thessalonians as a genuine Pauline letter. However the reasons for retaining the confidence in this epistle are outlined above and the thought of the second chapter may be related to the previous concept of I Thessalonians.

Charles, having noted these problems, explains the difference in thought on the basis of the passage of time. The amount of time is not suggested, "some" time being the only word. Rather than attempt to explain the differences by a lengthy time lapse, it is more reasonable to assume a very short time lapse in which the reaction to Paul's first letter produces the immediate conditions for which the second letter was written. A figure of five to seven weeks would not be unreasonable.

The extreme sense of imminence in I Thessalonians has been noted above. A likely reaction to this would be the belief and credulity which would produce an agitation among the Thessalonian readers. This mood would fit Paul's reaction precisely in 2:2: "We beg you, brethren, not to be quickly

1. II Thess. 2:3,4.
2. II Thess. 2:9.
3. The sons of light, however, are not surprised in I Thess. 5:4,5 which would accommodate II Thess. See above Chap. IX, p. 119.
4. See Chap. VI, p. 91.
7. See above, p. 134ff.
shaken in mind or excited . . ." The issue then resolves as to whether or not Paul is allowed to be sufficiently flexible and creative in his thought to shift his ground to meet the needs of a local situation. In view of the diversity of the authentic letters, any attempt to confine Paul's eschatological thought is less than reasonable. A more logical question is to attempt to discover if Paul's eschatology, having been literally believed and producing some confusion in Thessalonica, would not be modified a bit for future use. This would be the natural consequence of the Thessalonian experience.

In summary, II Thessalonians contains some evidence for suggesting delay, but this evidence, when seen in the context of the situation, reveals again the imminent eschatological hope of the first letter, both in the mind of Paul and of his readers.

iii. I Corinthians

There is ample evidence of I Corinthians to suggest a very imminent eschatological hope. A striking example is 7:29: "I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short." Other passages which reveal an imminent hope are 1:7, 4:5, especially 7:26, as well as much of the fifteenth chapter, and also Paul's closing salutation of 16:22: "Our Lord Come."

The Lord is "revealed" in the manner of II Thessalonians, but despite this parallel and others, the general concept of the Parousia seems

1. I Cor. 1:7, 3:13, 4:5.
to be that of I Thessalonians. In 15:52, Paul speaks of the change occurring at the last trumpet "in the twinkling of an eye." Admittedly, this change could occur at the conclusion of the events of the "man of lawlessness," but in the absence of other support or any continuation of the ideas of II Thessalonians on this matter, it is reasonable to conclude that Paul retains a simple hope of the imminent conclusion of this age.1

iv. II Corinthians

The eschatological emphasis of this letter is far less than that of I Corinthians. There are but six passages with any reference to eschatology and these occur in the first six chapters.2

The eschatological hope remains,3 following the familiar phrase "day of the Lord Jesus."4 This identification with the previously defined idea argues for an imminent expectation. But one passage strongly suggests immediacy and this is 6:2: "Behold, now is the acceptable time; now is the day of salvation." Paul here conceives of the new age, and the "now" rightly refers to the time between the writing of the epistle and the advent.5

1. Paul's concept of the "two age" view is clear in I Corinthians, See 2:6, 2:8, 3:18, 7:31b and 13:12.
2. This gives incidental support to the fragmentation theories on Corinthians. See Chap. IV, p. 49, for Schweitzer's opinion.
3. II Cor. 1:10, 4:17.
4. II Cor. 1:14. See I Cor. 5:15, 1:8, 3:13, etc.
v. Romans

The general eschatological hope is assumed throughout Romans. 1 There are two quite specific references dealing with imminence, 13:11b, 12: "For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand." The second reference is 8:22: "we know that the whole creation has been growing in travail together until now." It is clear from these passages that there is no decline in Paul's imminent expectation of the Parousia and that the passage of time may well have increased his anticipation. If Paul's eschatological thought declined, it must have been after this letter.

vi. Galatians

There are but two references in Galatians which can be even distantly associated with eschatology and these give us no evidence of imminence. Verse 1:4 reflects the two-age view of Paul as noted above. 2 The other reference employs the phrase "For in due season we shall reap, if we do not lose heart." 3 Both of these references can be interpreted in a variety of ways without implying imminence. 4 It must be concluded that there is no direct evidence in Galatians for an imminent hope of the Parousia, nor is there evidence to suggest a contrary conclusion.

1. See above, Chap. IX, p. 126ff.
2. See above p. 129, footnote 3.
4. The phrase "in due season," though suggesting a fixed time of perhaps a year, does not give any conclusive evidence.
vii. Colossians

Of the several references with eschatological possibilities that have been assembled,¹ there appears to be a general anticipation of an eschatological event. Paul speaks of a "hope laid up for you in heaven,"² "knowing that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward."³

The most explicit reference to an imminent hope is 3:4: "When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory." Note also 2:17: "these are only a shadow of what is to come." Though these verses probably have the urgency of a Romans 13:11b,12, or a I Corinthians 7:29, in view of the nature of Colossians and its handling of the "cosmic Christ,"⁴ these references are probably of greater significance than their number might suggest. The continued anticipation of a judgment time,⁵ coupled with the expectation as noted above, constitutes a significant bit of evidence in this late imprisonment letter.

viii. Philippians

The evidence for an imminent eschatological hope is clear in Philippians. The familiar phrase "day of the Lord Jesus" reappears

¹. See above, Chap. IX, p. 129ff.
². Col. 1:5.
⁴. See above, Chap. II, p. 21.
⁵. Col. 3:6, 1:22.
in 1:6 as "the day of Jesus Christ" and in 1:10, 2:16, as "the day of Christ." In 3:20, Paul notes the continued expectation of the Saviour. Likewise, in 4:5, there is the forceful "The Lord is at hand." Despite the late date of Philippians, it is clear that the eschatological hope is strong and imminent.

ix. A Summary of the Evidence

The preceding survey produces the following summary of evidence concerning the imminent expectation of the Parousia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
<td>Conclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Thessalonians</td>
<td>Very probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Corinthians</td>
<td>Conclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Corinthians</td>
<td>Possible to probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>Little evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Conclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen from the above table that the evidence for the imminent expectation of the Parousia has no relationship to the dating of the letters and appears from all three periods of Paul's writings. This strongly suggests that a deciding factor in the determining of the content of Paul's letters is not date but the particular circumstances of the readers. This would apply very specifically to II Thessalonians, Philemon and Galatians, all of which are aimed at a narrow and well-
defined issue.¹

2. The Eschatological Chronology

It has been noted above that Schweitzer and Charles have a different understanding of the eschatological chronology.² The main point of disagreement revolves about a temporary Messianic Kingdom which is begun by a resurrection of the righteous and ended with a resurrection and judgment of all men.

The next question raised will be that of a general reconstruction of the chronology of Pauline eschatology with particular reference to the issues of a temporary Messianic Kingdom and a dual resurrection.

i. I Thessalonians

The Parousia is identified as the "wrath to come" from which Jesus is the deliverer.³ This wrath apparently is upon those who oppose God and "all men," Paul having himself in mind at this point.⁴ In terms of imminence, the wrath appears to be immediate, or perhaps already begun.⁵ Judgment appears to be by God and the believer is encouraged to face God

---

1. It should be noted in passing that the imminent expectation is clear in I Timothy 6:14; II Timothy 3:1; Titus 2:13. The presence of such eschatological passages in sub-Pauline epistles adds weight to the conclusion that dating does not particularly influence the eschatology of the epistles.
4. I Thess. 2:15,16.
5. I Thess. 2:16.
"unblamable in holiness" at the coming of the Lord Jesus.\(^1\)

The position of the previous dead is explicitly dealt with in 4:13-17. The dead are to be raised by God,\(^2\) prior to the living. In both cases it will be those who are in Christ who are raised.\(^3\) The meeting place of both groups is with the Lord in the air.\(^4\) It is not clear if the dead are raised prior and descend with the Lord,\(^5\) or whether their resurrection is immediately preceding those who are living in Christ.\(^6\)
The end result of this resurrection is that all are with the Lord always.\(^7\)
There is no suggestion of any temporary kingdom.

The events prior to the day of judgment give no hint as to what is coming.\(^8\) However, if one is in Christ, there is no need to fear the moment of judgment.\(^9\)

The eschatological events of I Thessalonians may be summarized as follows:

1. Peace and security.
2. Sudden destruction - by God.
3. Resurrection of the dead in Christ.
4. Rising into the air of those "alive in Christ."
5. Being with the Lord always.

---

1. I Thess. 3:13.
2. I Thess. 4:14.
3. I Thess. 4:16-17.
4. I Thess. 4:17.
5. I Thess. 4:14.
6. I Thess. 4:16.
7. I Thess. 4:17.
8. I Thess. 5:3.
The relationship of the sudden destruction to the resurrection of the dead is not clear but the implication is that the destruction is first. Two reasons appear: (1) 2:16b speaks of the wrath in most imminent terms, the resurrection being clearly at some future time, and, (2) the sudden destruction following on peace and security sets up the dreadful conditions under which the resurrection of the dead in Christ (along with the living) has any meaning.

There is no evidence of a second resurrection. The resurrection at hand is only of the righteous. Apparently the sinful dead stay dead and buried. There is no evidence of any temporary Messianic Kingdom.

ii. II Thessalonians

Conditions appear to be slightly different in II Thessalonians. There is suffering among the readers of the epistle which Paul believes is making them worthy of the Kingdom of God. The "peace and security" of I Thessalonians is not present. The figure of Jesus is strengthened by the introduction of mighty angels and flaming fire who inflict vengeance upon those who do not know God. Their punishment is eternal destruction and exclusion from the presence of the Lord at the Parousia.

Thessalonians II notes those events which are to transpire before the Parousia. A rebellion must come first and the man of lawlessness,

1. II Thess. 1:5.
2. II Thess. 1:8.
who takes the seat in the temple, proclaims himself to be God.\textsuperscript{1} Jesus will finally slay the lawless one.\textsuperscript{2}

II Thessalonians does not give specific information on the condition of the blessed after the Parousia, apart from their presence in the kingdom. There is no evidence of a second resurrection, and judgment appears to take place at the coming of the Lord. The resurrection is for those who are saved, having been pre-destined by God from the beginning.\textsuperscript{3}

There is no evidence of a Messianic Kingdom; however, the phrase "kingdom of God" is introduced in 1:15. This phrase re-occurs five times in I Corinthians, and in I Corinthians 15:24, in a context of strong Messianic implication.\textsuperscript{4} In the absence of any supporting ideas, it is not reasonable to press this common figure into a special usage at this juncture.

The events of II Thessalonians may be tabulated as follows:

1. The rebellion.
2. The revealing of the man of lawlessness.
3. His various activities in the temple.
4. The coming of the Lord Jesus with angels in flaming fire.
5. Vengeance and judgment - eternal punishment.
6. The righteous in the glory of the Lord.

---

1. II Thess. 2:4.
2. II Thess. 2:8.
4. See below, p. 149.
iii. I Corinthians

There is a continuing expectation of the day of the Lord, and, as has been previously noted, the expectation is imminent.2

Paul introduces the concept of the "two age" view and the contrast is drawn sharply between "this age" and the "age to come."3 "This age" is headed by evil rulers who crucified the Lord of glory.4 The end of this age is the coming of the Lord at which time there is a resurrection of the righteous dead.5 Paul here repeats the argument with which he reassured the Thessalonians.6 Christ is the first of the dead to be raised and is equated with the resurrection of the righteous which occurs at the coming of the Christ.7

After the resurrection of the righteous, Christ reigns until he has put all his enemies under his feet.8 Every rule, authority and power is destroyed,9 and finally death.10 Then Christ delivers the kingdom to God and subjects himself to God's power "so that God may be everything to everyone."

The events of judgment could occur simultaneously and immediately after the coming of the Lord if it were not for the evidence which suggests

1. I Cor. 1:8, 3:13, 5:5.
2. I Cor. 7:29.
3. I Cor. 3:6, 2:8, 3:18, 6:3, 10:11.
4. I Cor. 2:8.
5. I Cor. 15:12ff.
6. I Cor. 15:18.
7. I Cor. 15:22.
8. I Cor. 15:25.
10. I Cor. 15:26.
some sort of struggle. 1 It is in this context that Paul's ideas on the saints judging the world make greatest sense. 2 Paul expects his Corinthian readers to take part in the judgment. The necessity of such a judgment is redundant in the face of the Lord's mighty power unless some sort of intervening time is conceived of in which the resurrected righteous are near the evil power and authority.

This evidence suggests a temporary Messianic Kingdom in which Christ is the ruler and judge. The righteous in Christ are resurrected to partake in this kingdom. The evil who are living are progressively destroyed by Christ and his saints until death itself is subdued. Then the Messianic Kingdom is delivered over to God. There is no evidence of a general resurrection of all mankind for final judgment is based on the evidence of 15:24.

Charles maintains that there is no mention of the Messianic Kingdom in I Corinthians 15:22-24, because Christ's reign precedes the Parousia. Charles places the resurrection at the conclusion of Christ's reign. 3 But clearly this is impossible in view of 15:23 and 24, in which the righteous in Christ are raised and then Christ's reign begins: "... then at his coming those who belong to Christ. Then comes the end, ... For he must reign ..." The only way to interpret this passage to support a non-Messianic Kingdom is to insert verse 25 prior to the events of verse 23, an unwarranted interpolation.

1. I Cor. 15:25.
2. I Cor. 6:2.
It is not clear whether "Kingdom of God" refers to the temporary Messianic period or the future moment when all powers are delivered to God. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God,"1 but this does not help to differentiate between the two because the resurrection occurs at the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom. There is no way to tell what the kingdom here means. "The kingdom" is the description of the Christ's reign in 24, but not the "kingdom of God." In 4:20, the phrase seems to be used with an imminent overtone. In 6:9,10, Paul speaks of those who inherit the "kingdom of God." These three verses make no differentiation of any future condition. Though the evidence is inconclusive, the phrases may point to the reign of Christ.

The events of I Corinthians may be summarized as follows:

1. Time of testing in the corruption of "this age."2
2. The coming of the Lord.
3. The resurrection of the righteous.
4. The Messianic reign of Christ on earth - destruction of evil power (Kingdom of God?).
5. Destruction of death.
6. Christ delivers his Kingdom to God.

---

iv. II Corinthians

The chronology of II Corinthians is sketchy. The present is a

---

1. I Cor. 15:50.
2. I Cor. 1:8, 3:15, 7:26, 7:31b, esp. 10:13b, 11:32.
time of "momentary affliction and testing." The day of the Lord will be a time of resurrection and judgment. There is no mention of the "kingdom of God" nor any hint of a temporary Messianic reign.

In 5:10, Paul speaks of the judgment seat of Christ for all. Paul here speaks of the living and there is no evidence to suggest any general resurrection.

The chronology of II Corinthians may be summarized as follows:

1. Testing and affliction.
2. The coming of the Lord.
3. Resurrection of righteous.

v. Romans

The concept of judgment dominates most of the eschatological thought of Romans. The "day of the Lord" becomes the "day of wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed." The judgment is by Christ Jesus and is based on works. The judgment is for all men, Jew and Greek, and although God is supposed to show no partiality, he will render the honor and glory and peace to the Jew first. The tribulation

1. II Cor. 4:17, 1:14.
2. II Cor. 4:14.
3. II Cor. 5:10.
4. II Cor. 4:14 - resurrection of righteous.
5. Romans 2:5.
6. Romans 2:15.
8. Romans 2:10.
and distress is connected with the judgment. However, the judgment will be with "rigor and dispatch" which would preclude the extended post-judgmental existence of the evil ones.

The letter has but one reference, in 6:5, which suggests a resurrection of the righteous. The judgment of all men, Jew and Greek, may be assumed to refer to those living at the imminent coming of the Lord, as in the previous letters. There is no evidence of a second or general resurrection.

It is conceivable that the tribulation and evil could refer to a temporary Messianic Kingdom. But the connection with the day of wrath points to the single quick judgment. There is no further evidence for any Messianic Kingdom. The phrase "kingdom of God" is mentioned once as meaning "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." This description does not relate to I Corinthians 15:22-24 and, in the absence of any other evidence, could not refer to a temporary Messianic Kingdom.

The chronology of Romans may be summarized as follows:

3. Romans 2:10.
6. Romans 2:5.
1. "Day of Wrath" (coming of the Lord).
2. Resurrection of righteous.
4. Glorious life with Christ and God.

vi. Galatians

Galatians has one reference reflecting the two-age view (1:4), but no information concerning any details of the eschatological chronology.

vii. Colossians

The two-age view continues to be present, but is attentuated by the presence of other references which suggest a shift in definition of the kingdom. Paul suggests that the Kingdom of Christ is a

2. Beare, in a comment on 3:4, believes that the two-age view has been abandoned by Paul in favor of a "hellenic conception of realms or orders of beings." The whole eschatology of Paul has undergone a transformation in which the Parousia is now conceived of, not as the beginning of a new age, but in terms of the manifestation of the invisible. Op. Cit., p. 211. Beare's conclusion is based upon his decision that "little more than a vestige of the Jewish 'historical' eschatology remains." Col. 3:4 can hardly carry this implication. Arndt and Gingrich specifically cite it as suggesting the Second Advent, Op. Cit., p. 860. Moreover, in view of the strong imminent hope in Philippians, it is premature to suggest
present reality which is apparently going to extend through the coming distresses. This kingdom has not begun by any judgment, but is a description of the Christian community. Paul speaks of his fellow workers for the Kingdom of God. Though this may refer to some future event, the abundant evidence elsewhere suggests a mystical definition of this fellowship in Christ which is the kingdom.

There is no specific reference to a Messianic period, but in 2:15, there is an echo of the struggle of I Corinthians 15:22-24. If this passage is to be equated with the Messianic Kingdom of Corinthians, then that kingdom has already begun and will be terminated at some future time. However, the concept of resurrection of the righteous is absent, the definition heretofore, of the beginning of the new age. Furthermore, judgment is still in the future or at least has not occurred.

Hence to force a Messianic concept out of 2:15 requires a radical re-definition of resurrection, judgment and the two-age view. Inasmuch as the continued anticipation of the Parousia is still evident, any references to the present must be interpreted apart from the usual anticipation.

The chronology of Colossians may be summarized as follows:

3. Col. 4:11.
1. Mystical union of Christ now.

2. The coming of the Lord in Glory.

3. The glorification or recognition of those in Christ.

There is very little evidence for judgment or on the whole matter of the resurrection. This shortened chronology perhaps hints at the shift of the definition of the kingdom.

viii. Philippians

The figure of the "day of Christ" is prominent but there is very little description about other events. There is suffering for Jesus' sake in the present age. Paul speaks of the power of Jesus' resurrection and his desire to know that power. There is no mention of the Kingdom of God, or judgment.

The events of Philippians may be summarized as follows:

1. Suffering.

2. The day of Christ.

3. Resurrection (?).

ix. Summary

The various evidence on the matter of eschatological chronology with particular reference to the Messianic Kingdom and the dual resurrection may now be summarized:

---

1. Phil. 1:29.
2. Phil. 3:10.
1 2 3 4 5
I Thess. peace and sudden destruction by resurrec- coming of with Lord security God tion of Lord and always righteous rising in air
II Thess. rebellion man of lawlessness coming of judgment righteous revealed Lord in glory
I Cor. testing coming resurrection messianic destruction messianic coming of Lord reign of evil and kingdom delivered righteous to God
II Cor. testing coming resurrection judgment of living righteous of the Lord Romans day of wrath- resurrection judgment glorious "coming" of of the Lord righteous life with Christ
Col. mystical union now coming in manifestation with Christ glory of glory among believers
Phil. suffering day of resurrection Christ

It will be observed from the above summary that there is hardly any over-all coherence of the eschatological chronology. The end result of the eschatological scheme is a certain "glory in the Lord" which is evident in all periods of Paul's thought. But this cannot be identified with any second resurrection or blessedness for which there is no evidence.

An interesting development of Paul's thought which appears is the advancement of the coming of the Lord relative to other events. In I Thessalonians, a great deal occurs prior to the Lord's coming; the judg-
ment and resurrection are by God alone and are all completed when the Lord comes. In II Thessalonians, the judgment is placed after the coming of the Lord along with the destruction of the man of lawlessness by Christ with his mighty power.¹ In I and II Corinthians, the coming of the Lord is moved further forward in the eschatological chronology. The time of testing precedes his coming. In Romans, the day of wrath is at the beginning of the eschatological scheme.

By interpreting the mystic union of Colossians as the presence of the Lord, there is a logical and coherent outcome of this advancement of the coming of the Lord. However, there is also the persistent eschatological hope in Colossians and Philippians, even in the presence of a new mysticism, hence identification here is questionable.

A further comparison is at the point of Paul's conception of the present age. In I Thessalonians, Paul conceives of this time as peaceful. It is possible to assume the same condition in II Thessalonians, apart from the unsettled minds of the people on the matter of the Parousia. In all of the other letters, Paul is conscious of various trouble, suffering, tribulation, afflictions and evil as indications of the impending Parousia.

Had troublesome conditions developed to such an extent in the Pauline world that a new appraisal of the present age was necessary? Or was Paul facing a peculiarly peaceful situation in Thessalonica? It may

¹ The various events prior to that coming have been noted. See above, p. 146.
be that Paul's tension with society was increasing, culminating with his imprisonment, and this would tend to foster a growing consciousness of evil and suffering. As his difficult experiences built up and as his churches faced persecutions, his concern might naturally manifest itself in his letters. The whole issue remains conjectural.

It will be observed that the evidence for the Messianic Kingdom is confined to I Corinthians, but it is strong evidence. The obscurity of Colossians permits a possible equation with the Messianic period, but such identification is difficult in the light of persistent hope for the Parousia.

Likewise, there is no evidence for a general resurrection in any of Paul's letters. The righteous are raised, at one time or another, but the evil dead remain dead. All judgment apparently refers to the living of the final age. The need for a general resurrection would not have been necessary in view of the imminent hope of the Parousia.

3. Immediate Resurrection Upon Death

i. I Thessalonians

The earliest letters of Paul show no evidence of any concept of immediate resurrection. As outlined above, the chronology of I Thessalonians is distinct and the resurrection moment vividly portrayed in terms of trumpets, meeting in the air, and the cry of command.1 The

1. I Thess. 4:13-18.
very issue raised in I and II Thessalonians precludes the doctrine of immediate resurrection. The concern of the Thessalonians about those who had died prior to the Parousia could not have arisen if there was any belief in immediate resurrection.

ii. II Thessalonians

Likewise, a vivid chronology of the Parousia precludes the possibility of any immediate resurrection in II Thessalonians. Although Paul does not outline a specific moment when resurrection takes place, there is no evidence that any immediate resurrection upon death will over-ride the events listed in 2:1-12. The glory of the Lord is something obtained at the Parousia.

iii. I Corinthians

The identification of man's resurrection with that of Christ opens the possibility of an immediate resurrection. It is the fellowship with Christ that makes the resurrection possible. Hence, if the fellowship is a present reality than it follows that the resurrection can be immediate.

In the discussion of the resurrection body, Charles makes the

1. II Thess. 2:14.
2. I Cor. 6:14, see also II Cor. 4:14. Robertson and Plummer, Op. Cit., p. 347.
3. I Cor. 15:22.
5. I Cor. 15:35-40.
point that the sowing in corruption is the equivalent of life on earth.\(^1\) The perishable body of this life cannot inherit the kingdom.\(^2\) The imperishable body or spiritual body is the clothing of the new age and this takes place upon the death of the physical body.\(^3\) Charles does not see the "sowing" as mere burial but as the total life upon earth of the physical man:

> At death the energies of the human spirit are set free to organize from its new environment a spiritual body . . . Thus in a certain sense the resurrection of the faithful would follow immediately on death, not to be adjourned to the Parousia.\(^4\)

Some important objections must be noted to the above interpretation. No sooner has Paul finished his elaborate discussion of the resurrection body,\(^5\) than he restates the familiar eschatological scheme. "For the trumpet will sound and the dead will be raised imperishable."\(^6\) If Charles' interpretation is correct, then it flatly contradicts the evidence of this adjacent passage for Paul conceives of the state of death as a perishable condition, the time in the grave being a sort of suspended animation. There is no evidence to indicate that the imperishable nature is granted at death to accompany the believer while he awaits the Parousia in the grave. It is clearly granted upon resurrection.

---

1. I Cor. 15:42, see Romans 8:21, "creation of bondage"; II Cor. 4:16, "Our outer nature is wasting away."
2. I Cor. 15:50.
3. I Cor. 15:44.
5. I Thess. 5:35-50.
6. I Thess. 15:52.
Likewise, Charles' interpretation of the sowing is forced. The obvious application of Paul's parable of the seed is that upon death the individual is returned to the ground, as the seed is. But Paul makes the important point that the seed is not dead and hardly the form of what will eventually grow. To press this figure in terms of the two-age view requires more imagination than this obvious simple application. Paul is not talking about this life or this age as corruptible. He is talking about the condition of dead persons. The interpretation should stay with this idea. Paul is attempting to deal with the problem of death in the intervening time preceding the Parousia. His illustration of the seed with its seeming inactivity in the ground, yet with its miraculous regeneration, perfectly illustrates the existing condition of the dead at the time Paul was writing.

Hence, it would seem that Charles' argument at this point is forced and does not satisfactorily meet the evidence. There remains no evidence for the immediate resurrection of the dead.

iv. II Corinthians

Charles here believes that Paul explicitly states a doctrine of the immediate resurrection of the body upon death based on 5:1-8: "For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Charles

1. I Thess. 15:37.
emphasizes the "we have", \( \epsilon \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \), as indicating immediate possession. The new body in Christ is something which is put on at the time of conversion; it is made manifest upon death.\(^1\)

However, the passage does not support such a position so easily. Charles is correct in assuming that Paul is concerned about the resurrection and the new body. As Charles rightly notes in verse 4, Paul prefers to see the Parousia while still alive.\(^2\) But Paul's desire to be alive at the Lord's coming springs from his reluctance to face death. Paul wants to put on "the heavenly dwelling" so that he may not be found naked.\(^3\)

Paul still is aware that some will die before the Lord comes and that his own death is a possibility. He still holds the position that death brings a "slight momentary affliction" which "is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison."\(^4\) Paul is seeking to reassure his readers that even if death comes and there is a time of disembodiment, there is a guarantee from the Spirit that the heavenly dwelling will soon transform the dead at the time of resurrection.\(^5\)

In view of the further references to the imminent hope of the Parousia in II Corinthians,\(^6\) as well as the notes above, the concept of the immediate resurrection cannot find support in this epistle.\(^7\)

---

3. II Cor. 5:3.
4. II Cor. 4:17.
5. II Cor. 5:5.
6. See above, p. 139.
v. Romans

There is ample evidence in Romans to indicate that Paul conceives of the resurrection in terms of the Parousia.

Though Charles does not use Romans in the development of the idea of immediate resurrection, there are some passages which might be pressed into service. In 6:5, Paul compares the believers' resurrection with that of Jesus. It could be assumed that resurrection takes place upon death or within a day or two. In 8:21, creation is set free from decay into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Similarly, "we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies."\(^1\) Despite the possibilities which are here for interpreting an immediate resurrection, other evidence indicates that the resurrection remains as an event of the Parousia. All of the previous passages on imminence are relevant here.\(^2\) "For salvation

resurrection. At death a "closer communion" with Christ takes place. Yet Plummer notes that the interval between death and resurrection is neither assumed nor denied. Generally speaking, English scholarship has leaped to identify resurrection with death. See Cohu, \textit{Op. Cit.}, p. 319: "This process culminates at the moment of death, when we entirely cast aside the flesh body and put on the spirit body which is awaiting us in heaven." See also J. Agar Beet, \textit{The Last Things} (5th ed.; London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1905), p. 42ff. Beet notes the declining expectation of Paul about his own survival until the Parousia. In II Cor. 5:6-8, Paul ponders the possibility of his own death. Yet Beet cautiously reminds the reader, in note B, p. 270: "that judgment will be pronounced not at death, but at a definite time beyond it. The difficulties he raises warn us not to hastily dogmatize on the condition of the departed before judgment."

\(^{1}\) Romans 8:23.

\(^{2}\) See above, p. 140.
is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand."¹

Similarly, "for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God."² The emphasis on judgment in Romans tends to group the other eschatological events around that moment. Immediate resurrection of each righteous individual indicates an individual judgment for each person upon death. It is not possible to assume that "being in Christ" during the present life does away with the need for judgment despite such passages as "for those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son."³ Judgment is for all,⁴ and this judgment is intimately connected with the Parousia.⁵

Hence, the epistle of Romans does not allow for an immediate resurrection upon death because of the imminent expectation of the Parousia, the necessity for judgment, and the absence of any clear evidence to the contrary.

vi. Galatians

The paucity of eschatological evidence in Galatians precludes any firm conclusions about immediate resurrection. The phrase "in due season we shall reap" tends to confirm the anticipation of the Parousia and what-

---

1. Romans 13:11,12.
2. Romans 14:10b.
3. Romans 8:29.
4. Romans 2:6, 14:12, 14:10b.
5. Romans 2:5.
ever implications that it may have for the future resurrection.¹

vii. Colossians

Paul conceives of the Kingdom of Christ as a present reality into which the children of darkness are delivered.² There is reason to believe that Paul conceives of the resurrection as part of this delivery into the new kingdom: "... and you were buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead."³ Note also "If you then have been raised with Christ ... "⁴ The possibility of an immediate resurrection is set forth in 3:3: "for you have died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life appears, then you will also appear with him in glory."⁵

Paul here refers to some sort of consolation in death, a hidden communion with Christ which will not be fully manifested until the Parousia. The real issue is whether or not communion with Christ in the present carries over directly after death. In view of the above evidence, such a possibility is certainly suggested.

The confusion of evidence regarding imminent eschatology in Colossians along with some doubts on eschatological chronology have been outlined above.⁶ In the absence of a clearly stated eschatological

². Col. 1:13, 1:22.
³. Col. 2:12.
⁴. Col. 3:1.
⁶. See above, p.
hope, it may be assumed that the doctrine of immediate resurrection is allowed to manifest itself. This doctrine is connected with the anticipating of the Parousia in such a way that Paul preserves much of his previous thought while allowing for communion with Christ in the "blank" period between death and the Parousia.

viii. Philippians

The doctrine of immediate resurrection finds support in Philippians: "My desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better." Paul considers the alternatives of life with further service, and death with the presence of Christ, and though he prefers the latter, he will do the former out of a sense of duty. Paul insists that one put no confidence in the flesh and that whatever losses come about in present life simple help one to gain Christ. He further equates death and resurrection as a sharing with Christ, in the manner of Colossians 3:10,11.

There is no confusion about any mystical change during one's lifetime as is suggested in Colossians. The changes take place at the Parousia or at death. The presence of these two ideas, side by side, is interesting inasmuch as in Colossians there is the suggestion that one excludes the other. In Philippians there is a clear concept of im-
minent eschatological hope, as noted previously. But Paul can now also conceive of death with hope. Gone is the fear and concern of I Thessalonians in which the fact of death prior to the Parousia poses major problems.

It is conceivable that Paul equates the passages on immediate death and its results with the imminent hope of the Parousia. Such an explanation, though harmonizing these two ideas, does not fit the evidence. Paul conceives of death not in eschatological terms but as an alternative to further service. Hence it is clear that the resurrection or some equivalent of "being with Christ" is placed side by side with the imminent eschatological hope.

ix. Summary of Evidence

The evidence for immediate resurrection after death may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I Thessalonians</th>
<th>II Thessalonians</th>
<th>I Corinthians</th>
<th>II Corinthians</th>
<th>Romans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no belief whatever</td>
<td>no evidence but context supports I Thessalonians</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>some confusion; probably no immediate resurrection</td>
<td>strong eschatological judgment suggests no immediate resurrection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See above, p. 141.
2. Phil. 1:25.
3. Phil. 1:23.
The implication of this summary is that there is reason to believe that Paul's thought develops in the direction of immediate resurrection. The lack of evidence for an immediate resurrection in the first three letters gives an accurate picture of Paul's early thought. The evidence of Colossians and Philippians suggests an immediate resurrection. II Corinthians could be a turning point in Paul's thought. The difference of opinion on this letter thus does not challenge the point of development; the question is really only that of time of change. The evidence in Romans is not strong enough on this issue to bear upon the interpretation of II Corinthians.¹

This development appears to occur despite a consistent eschatological hope. What appears to be a mutually exclusive statement in Colossians, that is, eschatology giving way to immediate resurrection, is sharply reversed by Philippians in which both doctrines appear together. Paul apparently had reached the point in his thought where the problem of death, raised first in I Thessalonians, had forced another solution apart from

¹ Charles' arguments based on I and II Corinthians are generally disappointing. It is interesting that he never uses Philippians to buttress his position inasmuch as the strongest evidence for his position seems to occur here.
the hope of the Parousia. A further question is whether or not this may suggest a decline in his imminent eschatological hope. The evidence of Philippians would indicate that this was not the case.
CHAPTER XI

EVALUATION OF THE TWO POSITIONS

The results of the preceding chapters have brought to light certain evidence regarding the positions of both Charles and Schweitzer. This evidence will now be applied in a comparison and evaluation of the two positions.

1. II Thessalonians

Schweitzer rejects the genuineness of II Thessalonians for two basic reasons, language and content.1 The issues of language have been discussed in Chapter VI with the conclusion that the evidence is insufficient to reject Pauline authorship.2 The argument from content has less weight because it feeds on the very result it supports. The rejection by Schweitzer of this epistle suggests a convenient method to remove contrary evidence. The establishing of a normative Pauline doctrinal system on the basis of four or five primary letters places an unreasonable confinement on the creative power and imagination of Paul.3 Accordingly,

2. See above, p. 89ff.
3. The use of I Thess. for a definition of imminent eschatology in Chap. IX does not violate this principle but simply establishes a starting reference point. The evidence there adduced is never used critically to reject contrary evidence by the establishing of some "norm." The priority of I Thess. allows its use as a beginning point of definition.
the critical position of the Tübingen school on II Thessalonians reflected in Schweitzer should be viewed with suspicion.

In his arguments, Schweitzer does not use II Thessalonians. Charles makes the characteristics of II Thessalonians the defining ones of his first stage. It should be noted that Charles' application here of II Thessalonians is not coherent. There is very little intermingling of I and II Thessalonians. Part (a) of Charles' argument of the first stage is based entirely on evidence from II Thessalonians.¹

The lack of coherence is to be expected inasmuch as I and II Thessalonians have different approaches to the eschatological chronology.² Charles notes the difference in the two epistles on the matter of "signs" but the other divergences are not stated.³

In conclusion, Schweitzer's opinion, that II Thessalonians neither enriches nor makes clearer the picture of Paul's doctrine arising from the other epistles, has some validity in view of the lack of coherence.⁴ But II Thessalonians does add evidence and the opinion that this evidence should be rejected simply on the basis of its non-relationship to the other epistles is unwarranted.

². See Chap. IX, p. 145.
⁴. Supporting Schweitzer's opinion is Peabody who writes about II Thess.: "What does (Paul) say that has more than local or temporary importance? One must frankly answer that little of such material is found." Op. Cit., p. 83.
2. The Genuineness of the Imprisonment Letters

Schweitzer's rejection of Colossians because it is "not of primary importance for the exposition of Paul's teaching" must be criticized on approximately the same basis as II Thessalonians. Schweitzer's rejection here seems to be wholly doctrinal. He is aware of the problems of style and grammar but makes his major objection from the doctrinal position.2

A most significant statement is Schweitzer's admission that the thought of Paul has begun a "process of transformation" in Colossians and no longer has the same clear outlines of the other epistles. This is precisely what Charles argues and constitutes an admission of the developmental principle. However, as a reason to dismiss the letter, obtuseness of thought can hardly have much standing. Again the Tübingen criticism should be judged too radical. Schweitzer uses Colossians but once.4 Charles uses Colossians five times in the fourth stage of his argument.5

The cumulative effect of the critical problems pertaining to Ephesians seems to argue against Pauline authorship. Fortunately, the rejection of Ephesians as a genuine epistle has no bearing upon the basic issues of either position. Schweitzer quotes Ephesians nine times, five of which are from a single passage refuting Pauline authorship.6

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 128.
6. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 120.
Charles quotes Ephesians four times, two of which are paralleled by Colossians.\(^1\) From the survey it is clear that the arguments from Ephesians are not determinative.\(^2\) Apart from two references to the two-age view,\(^3\) there is little eschatological material in the epistle.

Both Schweitzer and Charles use Philippians. Charles' use is in name only, for despite his inclusion of Philippians in his fourth stage, there is not a single quotation from it. Two footnotes occur in previous sections.\(^4\) Charles' failure to use the evidence of this imprisonment letter poses a major obstacle in the acceptance of his thesis, as will be shown immediately below. In summary, both Charles and Schweitzer tend to handle the imprisonment letters from a doctrinaire position.

3. Imminent Eschatology

It is clear from the evidence that there is a consistent imminent eschatological hope in all periods of Paul's writing. This hope is not found in all letters but seems to occur at random in both early and late writings. This is normal, for Paul should not be expected to deal with eschatological matters in all correspondence.

The letters to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans are in the main so occupied with arguments about the law, righteousness of faith, being in Christ, predestination, and the particular affairs of the churches, that it is possible to forget the expectation which dominates the soul of the writer. But suddenly, in some incidental saying,

---

2. See above, p. 132.
the eschatological belief stands there in all its strength as something which underlies the whole.¹

This is correct, especially in the imprisonment letters where such evidence might seem unlikely. Accordingly, the eschatological testimony of Philippians is of central importance and is decisive. Charles' complete omission of references to this epistle constitutes a major flaw in his concept of development. His formal inclusion of Philippians in his fourth stage conceals the fact that he does not draw upon it in any way and indicates a failure to adequately consider the testimony of this epistle.

We have noted that the evidence on imminent eschatology in Paul's letter is of unequal strength. This does not work against the theory of consistent eschatology because the lapses of eschatological emphasis occur both in early and late letters, i.e., Galatians and Colossians or Philemon. The issue is not uniformity of evidence but the assumption of the underlying principle as a point of view. On this issue there can be no doubt that Schweitzer is correct.

4. Eschatological Chronology


In the analysis of the evidence, there is no reason to assume that

¹ Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 52.
Paul's concept of the resurrection refers to anything but the righteous in Christ. This conclusion agrees with that of Charles. ¹

The alternative view specified by Schweitzer is that a general resurrection follows the temporary Messianic Kingdom which in turn has followed the resurrection of the righteous. There is not a single reference in the Pauline letters to a general resurrection. The only evidence which Schweitzer can produce to support his position is I Corinthians 15:24, in which he takes the phrase "then comes the end . . . " to mean the general resurrection. ² He assumes that the events of the end, including a general resurrection, are "taken for granted as well-known."³ In view of the lack of evidence, this is an unwarranted assumption.

It is true that there is other New Testament evidence on the general resurrection:

. . . for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgment.⁴

In this Johannine resurrection picture, the evil are raised simultaneously with the righteous. There is no evidence to support this view in Paul's writings.

A concept of general resurrection is clearly stated in Revelation:

"And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne, and books

---

2. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 68.
3. Ibid.
opened, . . ."1 This picture is of more importance to the Pauline argument for it follows upon a 1000 year Messianic Kingdom,2 a concept conceivably suggested in I Corinthians 15:22-24. But again, it is an apocalyptic idea with no support in the Pauline correspondence.

Of greatest importance is the testimony of Acts 24:15: " . . . having a hope in God which these themselves accept, that there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust." These are the reported words of Paul. If Paul actually said this, it would be a concept which has no parallel in his letters.

There is no question that Schweitzer is correct in pointing out the presence of a dual resurrection in New Testament thought. But he has not demonstrated its presence in Paul's thought for there is no evidence on this point.3

Schweitzer's analysis of Ezra and Baruch has been noted above.4 His synthesis of these two eschatological chronologies is a valuable discovery and sheds light on the New Testament eschatology. Yet one cannot dismiss the competence of R. H. Charles, who has thoroughly surveyed the same materials. At this point should be noted Charles' appraisal of Schweitzer in his preface to the Second Edition:

4. See above, Chap. IV, Section 6, "The Background of Pauline Eschatology," p. 58.
Since Schweitzer's eschatological studies show no knowledge of original documents and hardly any of first-hand works on the documents, and since further, they make no fresh contribution to the subject, no notice is taken of him in this edition.¹

These are strong words coming from a foremost authority of apocryphal and apocalyptic writings. The criticism was applied to Schweitzer's first book, Paul and His Interpreters, which was admittedly an introduction. Charles died shortly after the publication of The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. The fact remains that however brilliant Schweitzer's thesis may be in regard to the New Testament as a whole, its application to Pauline thought is not demonstrated.

Despite the absence of evidence on a second general resurrection, there is good reason to believe that a Messianic Kingdom is strongly indicated from the testimony of I Corinthians.² Although this is a singular proof, supported inferentially by Colossians, Charles' arguments to dismiss the whole idea are not convincing.³ Schweitzer here is on much firmer ground.⁴ He rightly notes that a description of this kingdom is not found in Paul nor is there any hint of the duration of the kingdom. However, Schweitzer again falls back on evidence from the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra as a possible suggestion of Paul's position.⁵

We may now summarize the various issues raised in the study of Pauline chronology.

² I Cor. 15:22-24.
³ Ibid., p. 448. See above, p. 18, 71ff.
⁴ Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 66.
⁵ Ibid., p. 67.
Both Charles and Schweitzer have made accurate deductions from the evidence but both have over-stated their positions. There is no evidence for a dual resurrection. In addition, there is no evidence for a general resurrection in the letters of Paul. Charles appears to be correct on these points. On the other hand, the evidence for a Messianic Kingdom is not displaced by Charles' arguments and Schweitzer appears to be correct. In both instances, the disagreements have been brought about by an overstepping of Pauline evidence. Schweitzer reads into Paul the other New Testament evidence and the testimony of the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch. Charles skips over the Messianic Kingdom by an unwarranted interpolation of the events of I Corinthians 15:22-24. The arguments from Ezra and Baruch are interesting and have been duly noted by Charles, but cannot be applied to Paul without further evidence.

5. Immediate Resurrection

The evidence for the concept of immediate resurrection upon death of the believer both supports and contradicts Charles' position. Charles builds his case on I and II Corinthians, but the evidence will not support this interpretation. It would seem that Charles' position is thus refuted. But evidence for immediate resurrection appears in Colossians and is very strong in Philippians. Charles uses neither of these sources to buttress his position. It is hard to say why this is so. Perhaps he

1. See above, p. 18, 71ff.
2. See above, p. 19ff.
felt it unnecessary to add further proof to what he considered already demonstrated. Or perhaps he was reluctant to draw support from another stage of development from Paul's thought.

Schweitzer believes that the immediate resurrection passages of Philippians are applied to Paul alone in some special way in the manner of Enoch, Elijah, Ezra and Baruch. Paul does not re-interpret his eschatology to produce an immediate resurrection for all men; he only does this for himself. It is an attractive solution. The language of Philippians 1:19-26, is very personal and lends credibility to Schweitzer's theory. Paul goes so far in his personal resurrection that he can conceive of himself as a sacrifice offered for his churches in the event of his martyrdom.

To summarize, Charles' arguments on immediate resurrection are not well taken, but the principle is demonstrated in Colossians and Philippians. Schweitzer would not hold for any general change of eschatological hope but only a re-interpretation on an intensely personal level. Thus there is the novel conclusion that Charles rejects the evidence and admits the principle, while Schweitzer rejects the principle and admits the evidence.

In view of the evidence of Colossians, it seems probable to admit the evidence with Schweitzer and the principle with Charles. Thus Paul moves in Philippians to a re-statement of the resurrection in personal and immediate terms.

6. Developmental Thought

Although it is not the purpose of the author to assay Paul's complete thought on the matter of development, a tentative conclusion may be drawn from the evidence at hand.

The advancing of the time of the coming of the Lord relative to other eschatological events might be one indication of developmental thought.1 The coming of the Lord tends to move toward the beginning of the eschatological chronology. Because the events are so proximate to one another, it is unwise to press this evidence too far, but a coherent picture is presented.

A more substantial proof for development is the evidence for the immediate resurrection summarized above. There is no question that Paul introduces a new understanding of the resurrection in the imprisonment letters. This is tacitly admitted by Schweitzer in his opinion on the transformation process going on in Colossians.2

On the other hand, consistent eschatology argues against developmental thought. This foundation position is absolutely clear from the evidence and supports Schweitzer's position with great force.

The evidence on this issue may be summarized by concluding that Paul's thought is both consistent and developing. On the basic eschatological issue of the hope of the Parousia, Paul is consistent; on other matters his thought shifts.

1. See above, Chap. IX, p. 155.
2. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 42.
7. Developmental Chronology

The question is further raised about the time spans involved in the writing of the letters. Are these sufficient to allow for the changes which appear?

Paul's letters may be grouped into three categories chronologically. These periods coincide with those of Charles except I Corinthians is combined with II Corinthians and Romans. These three letters are all written within about nine months. This dating would argue against any sharp separation between Charles' second and third period. Charles characterizes Paul's changes in the third view as a changing of the time of resurrection and "enlarged conceptions as to the universal spread and comprehensiveness of Christ's kingdom on earth." In view of the close relationship of I and II Corinthians, such changes or development as Charles observes more probably are due to different foci in Paul's letters. To this may be added the possibility of a multiple source theory of the Corinthian correspondence which makes the differentiation of Charles' second and third stage more difficult.

A general appraisal of the sufficiency of time between the three stages to allow for developing thought is more difficult. In three years there should be ample opportunity for any person to shift his position, particularly under the turbulent conditions which Paul faced. Yet it

1. See above, Chap. VIII, p. 112.
should not be forgotten that seventeen years elapsed between Paul's conversion and the writing of I Thessalonians. This would argue for consistency and stability. Any conclusions here would be conjectural.

8. Tabulation

It will be convenient to tabulate the results of this evaluation so that the arguments may be concluded.

Conclusion reached:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Result on the position of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. II Thessalonians accepted</td>
<td>Schweitzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Colossians accepted</td>
<td>Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ephesians rejected</td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Philippians accepted</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consistent imminent eschatology</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Resurrection of righteous only</td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Two resurrections rejected</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Messianic Kingdom accepted with reservations</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. General resurrection rejected</td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Immediate resurrection of righteous</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Immediate resurrection of Paul alone</td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing Thought

12. Updating Lord's coming                  | support                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Chronology</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Three periods of composition</td>
<td>no effect</td>
<td>mixed support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Seventeen years</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Three year gaps</td>
<td>no effect</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER XII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Some conclusions pertaining to the issues raised in the Introduction¹ and the preliminary questions of Chapter V,² may now be drawn:

1. Paul stands outside the process of Hellenization. The consistent imminent hope for the Parousia throughout Paul's letters supports Schweitzer's general principle of thorough-going eschatology and contradicts the Tübingen School, R. H. Charles, and modern developmentalists.

2. Paul revises his concept of the time of the resurrection in the Imprisonment Letters. Though his hope in the imminent Parousia is uniform, the possibility of his own death prior to that event opens the way for the doctrine of the immediate resurrection upon death. This new approach to the resurrection could possibly reflect a growing disillusionment about the Parousia. In addition, Paul's revision could provide a convenient point of departure for future Hellenists.

3. Paul may have held a belief in a temporary Messianic Kingdom. The evidence is limited to a few verses in Corinthians.

4. Paul believes in a single resurrection for the righteous only. Schweitzer's elaborate reconstruction of eschatological chronology based on a synthesis of Enoch and Baruch-Ezra does not find support in the

---

¹ See p. 3.
² See p. 79-81.
Pauline correspondence. There is no evidence for a general resurrection.

In addition to the above major conclusions, the following observations may be added.

1. There is a tendency to advance the date of the Lord's coming relative to other events of the eschatological chronology. The outcome of this tendency conceivably could be the immediate resurrection and facing of the Lord upon the death of the individual as suggested in the Imprisonment Letters.

2. Schweitzer's rejection of the genuineness of II Thessalonians and Colossians appears to be more from doctrinal than literary grounds.

3. Both Charles and Schweitzer have failed to consider all of the evidence of the Pauline letters on eschatology. Charles' most glaring oversight is his failure to admit the evidence of Philippians. Schweitzer's eschatological chronology of two resurrections can be applied only to certain non-Pauline portions of the New Testament.

4. Charles' division of Paul's eschatological thought into four periods is not altogether satisfactory in view of the close timing of the major letters and the composite character of Corinthians and other letters.

5. Schweitzer's belief that Paul identifies the immediate resurrection with himself only is a useful harmonization of the contrary evidence on this matter found in Philippians.
APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ROBERT HENRY CHARLES

Robert Henry Charles was born August 6, 1855, in Country Tyrone, Ireland, the son of D. H. Charles, M.D. He began his education at Belfast Academy and continued at Queens College, Belfast, and Trinity College, Dublin. He received his A.B. degree from Queen University in 1877, with first honors in classics. In 1880, his M.A. followed. Honorary degrees were a D.D. in 1898, from Dublin, and a D. Litt in 1907, from Oxford.

His ecclesiastical career began with ordination in 1883. He was Curate of St. Marks, Whitechapel from 1883-1885; St. Philips, Kensington, 1885-1886; and St. Marks, Kensington, 1886-1889. His academic career began in 1890.

His first published work was in Apocryphal Studies, which soon brought him wide recognition. He was invited to the Hibbert Lectures in 1898, and the Jowett Lectures in 1898-1899, and many lectureships thereafter. From 1898 to 1906, he was Professor of Biblical Greek at Trinity College, Oxford. From 1906-1911, he was the Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint at Oxford, and from 1910-1914, he was the Speaker's Lecturer in Biblical Studies, Oxford. In 1913, he was the Lecturer in Advanced Theology at London University. From 1919, until his death, he was the Warburton Lecturer at Lincoln Inn Chapel. In 1919-1920, he delivered the Schweich Lectures.
Charles' literary production may be divided into three periods. Period one is from 1893-1900, during which time he edited and published his major Apocryphal studies. These were the Book of Enoch translated from the Ethiopic (1893), Book of Jubilees (1894), Apocalypse of Baruch (1896), Assumption of Moses (1897), and the Ascension of Isaiah (1900).

In the second period from 1899 to 1920, Charles' work branched out into varied fields. His major writings from this period are The Doctrine of Future Life, The Jowett Lectures (1899), Greek Version of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (1908), Drew Lectures on Immortality (1912), the Zadokite Fragments (1912), Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments (1914), The Apocalypse, edited with text translations and commentary (1920). In addition, he was the General Editor and contributor to the Oxford Edition of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (1913).

The third and final period of Charles' writing included a new interest in ecclesiastical matters. His major works were the Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce (1921), Adventure Into the Unknown (1923), the Decalogue (1924), Gambling and Betting (1925), Divorce and Nullity (1927), Critical Commentary on Book of Daniel (1929), The Resurrection of Men and Other Sermons (1930), and Courage, Truth, and Purity (1931).

He died at his home, 4 Little Cloisters, Westminster Abbey, London, on January 30, 1931.
APPENDIX B

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER

Albert Schweitzer was born in Kaysersberg, Upper Alsace, on January 14, 1875, son of Louis Schweitzer, pastor at Gunsbach. His early education was at the Realschule at Munster, and the Gymnasium at Mulhouse. He received his Doctorate in Philosophy from the University of Strasbourg in 1899, and immediately afterward became Licentiate of Theology. In 1912, he married Helene Bresslau, who died in 1957. In 1913, he completed his medical studies at Strasbourg and was awarded the M.D.

In 1899, Schweitzer served as the Curate of St. Nicholas. From 1902-1912, he was Privatdozent at Strasbourg. From 1903-1906, he was principal of St. Thomas College at the University of Strasbourg. His varied talents allowed him to be organist of the Paris Bach Society from 1905-1911.

The major service of his life began in 1913, with his first visit to Lambarene where he established a hospital. As a German citizen he was interned by the French during the war and was unable to return to Lambarene for seven years. He resumed his work in 1924, and has continued at the hospital since that time. He has made several visits to Europe and one to America in 1952. He was awarded the Goethe Memorial Prize in 1928 at Frankfurt. He was the Hibbert Lecturer in 1934, at London and
Oxford, and the Gifford Lecturer in 1934-1935. He was elected to the French Academy in 1951. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1952.

His major works include authoritative contributions in three distinct fields: theology, music, and philosophy. In addition to the works noted below, he has written numerous monographs on related topics, African medical problems, and world events.

A partial list of his writings include:

1899 - The Religious Philosophy of Kant
1901 - Mystery of Kingdom of God
1905 - J. S. Bach - Musician and Poet
         From Reimarus to Wrede - The Quest of the Historical Jesus
1911 - Paul and His Interpreters
1913 - A Psychiatric Study of Jesus
1921 - On the Edge of the Primeval Forest
1923 - The Decay and Restoration of Civilization
         Civilization and Ethics
         Memoirs of Childhood and Youth
1930 - The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle
1931 - Out of My Life and Thought
         The Forest Hospital at Lambarene
1935 - Indian Thought and Its Development
1939 - From My African Notebook

1. The dates are those of the original publication in German.
KEY TO APPENDIX C

2 Party - Baur's thesis of Petrine and Pauline groups in tension gradually coalescing into the Second Century Church.

2 Thot. - Greek and Jewish concepts within the mind of Paul in tension. Resolved in various ways.

Devel. - Paul's thought develops in the resolving of two-thought tensions.

Damascus - Holsten's unique method to resolve the two-thought problems.

Grk. - The presence of strong Greek influences in the development of Paul's thought.

Loci. - Method of investigating Paul's thought by dividing it into various subjects, the least of which was often eschatology.

non Loci. - Method of trying to investigate Paul's thought from a single perspective.

non Greek - That position which seeks to bring Paul totally into the primitive Jewish community.
THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SCHEME BEFORE JESUS ACCORDING TO SCHWEITZER

**Pre-Exilic**
- Tribulation
  - Sifting out
  - Earthly Kingdom
  - Davidic Messiah
  - (no resurrection)

**Post-Exilic**
- Tribulation
  - King of God
  - (no resurrection)
- Revelation of Glory
  - Among Heathen

**Daniel, Enoch**
- Death Tribulation
  - King of God
  - Supernatural King
  - Satan's Power
  - R of Elect

**Psalms of Solomon**
- Tribulation
  - Davidic Messiah

**Baruch, Ezra**
- Tribulation
  - Messianic King for Elect
  - 400 years - good time
  - J - living only
  - M to Heaven
  - no son of Man King of God
  - M to Heaven
  - J - Final
  - R - General
KEY TO APPENDIX D

M  -  Messiah
S of Man  -  Son of Man
J  -  Judgment
R  -  Resurrection
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ABSTRACT

The primitive Christian hope of the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God was based on the memory of the teachings of Jesus. The fact that that hope remained unfulfilled forced a transformation of the Christian faith which enabled it to survive the failure of the original expectation.

The place of Paul in this transformation has been uncertain. His early letters show a strong expectation of the Parousia, but scholarly opinion on the later letters remains contradictory. R.H. Charles has suggested that in Paul's later letters there is a noticeable decline in eschatological thought and, in effect, a transformation of Paul's original hope for the immediate Parousia. This transformation may be clearly shown by arranging Paul's letters into four stages on the basis of the diminishing emphasis of declining eschatology. Albert Schweitzer has held that Paul maintains a consistent eschatological hope throughout his letters.

The background of Charles' position was rooted in the work of F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School and culminated with H. J. Holtzmann. This background centered about two questions of Pauline doctrine: 1. Its relationship to primitive Christianity, 2. Its relationship to Hellenistic ideas. The Tübingen School explained the decline of eschatology on the hypothesis that Paul introduced Hellenistic thought.
Schweitzer regarded this explanation as unfounded and attempted to demonstrate that there were no clear affinities between the thought of Paul and the Hellenistic world. Paul's thought thus did not develop in any Hellenistic direction but remained consistently Jewish eschatological throughout his literary production.

The purpose of this dissertation is to outline and criticize the Pauline eschatological theory of R. H. Charles in the light of Schweitzer's thorough-going eschatology with particular reference to the Parousia.

The two positions are first compared on the basis of their relationship to critical norms regarding the Pauline corpus. These norms reject the authenticity of Ephesians and the Pastorals and establish the genuineness of nine letters. These genuine letters are chronologically arranged into three groups, each group being separated by a period of three or four years.

The eschatological material in the letters is then isolated and analyzed under three headings: the imminent expectation of the Parousia, the immediate resurrection upon death, and the eschatological chronology. This last heading is subdivided into the problem of the temporary Messianic Kingdom and a dual resurrection. The results of this analysis are applied to an evaluation of the two positions with the following results:

1. There is a consistent imminent hope for the Parousia throughout Paul's letters sustaining Schweitzer's basic position. There is no evidence for a correlation of this hope with the dating of the letters. Charles' failure to acknowledge the eschatological evidence of Philippians is a primary objection to his developmental argument.
2. In the light of the possibility of his own death prior to the Parousia, Paul revises his concept of the time of the resurrection in the Imprisonment Letters, arriving at a new doctrine of immediate resurrection. It is uncertain whether or not Paul wishes to apply this new doctrine only to his own death.

3. Evidence for a Messianic Kingdom is limited to a single passage in I Corinthians which does not adequately support Schweitzer's theory, a theory which is based primarily on non-Pauline materials.

4. Paul believes in a single resurrection for the righteous only. Schweitzer's reconstruction of eschatological chronology, which includes a dual resurrection, is based on non-Pauline materials.

Insofar as the eschatological evidence is concerned, Paul seems to stand apart from the process of Hellenization and, despite the possibility of his introduction of the doctrine of immediate resurrection, he remains within the Jewish eschatological framework.
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