DAVID A. SHAW

The ›Apocalyptic‹ Paul

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

616

David A. Shaw

The ‘Apocalyptic’ Paul

An Analysis and Critique with Reference to Romans 1–8

Mohr Siebeck

David A. Shaw, born 1979; 2011 MTh, Oak Hill College; 2019 PhD, University of Cambridge; currently pastor of Woodstock Road Baptist Church, Oxford.

ISBN 978-3-16-161700-3 / eISBN 978-3-16-162015-7
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-162015-7

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind über *http://dnb.dnb.de* abrufbar.

The book was typeset by SatzWeise in Bad Wünnenberg using Minion typeface, printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For Jo; we're wonderful one times one

Preface

This monograph is a lightly revised version of my PhD dissertation. Acknowledgment and thanks are therefore due to my supervisor Simon Gathercole, who cheerfully and patiently guided the thesis over the years. I'm deeply grateful for his enthusiastic support, his generosity with time, and his meticulous attention to texts, argument, and detail. I'm also thankful for my examiners, Prof Eddie Adams and Dr Jonathan Linebaugh whose comments, critiques, and encouragement made for a more enjoyable viva than I could have hoped for and have shaped this work for the better.

Throughout an overlong gestation period, past and present colleagues at Oak Hill cheered me on and bore numerous burdens with remarkable grace, not least Brad Bitner, Matthew Sleeman, Dan Strange, and the much-missed Mike Ovey. If they ever doubted I'd get this finished, they were too kind to show it.

Tyndale House in Cambridge was a remarkably happy and helpful place to work in 2011–14, and I'm grateful to all the staff and my fellow readers there. I'm glad to acknowledge the generous financial support from the Gospel Partners Trust, the Sola Trust, and the Hirst-Player Scholarship.

Finally, I'm grateful to the team at Mohr Siebeck. Every interaction has been supremely helpful and I'd like to express my gratitude to Jörg Frey and the associate editors for accepting this work in the WUNT II series.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

All abbreviations used are taken from Patrick H. Alexander, et al. (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), with the following exceptions, which are not included in the *Handbook*:

BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
EC	Early Christianity
IJST	International Journal of Systematic Theology
JRPC	Journal of Religion and Popular Culture
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
MSB	Monographic series of "Benedictina"
RRT	Reviews in Religion and Theology
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World

Introduction

Like the portraits of Shakespeare that have come down to us, accounts of the apocalyptic Paul are somewhat varied. That said, several common features can be discerned in the following sketches:

> Paul's view of wrong and right is thoroughly apocalyptic, in the sense that on the landscape of wrong and right there are, in addition to God and human beings, powerful actors that stand opposed to God and that enslave human beings. Setting right what is wrong proves then, to be a drama that involves not only human beings and God, but also those enslaving powers. And since humans are fundamentally slaves, the drama in which wrong is set right does not begin with action on their part. It begins with God's militant action against all the powers that hold human beings in bondage.[1]
>
> Paul's apocalyptic theology has to do with the conviction that in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, God has invaded the world as it is, thereby revealing the world's utter distortion and foolishness, reclaiming the world, and inaugurating a battle that will doubtless culminate in the triumph of God over all God's enemies (including the captors Sin and Death).[2]
>
> The unconditional, revelatory, transformational, and liberational aspects of this event mean that it is appropriately described as 'apocalyptic.'[3]

The vision is undeniably engaging: powerful actors, more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in many philosophies, and a tragic captivity overturned by the dramatic entrance of an invading and all-conquering liberator. All is well ended.

It is not hard, therefore, to understand current enthusiasm for the apocalyptic Paul. To take one example, Fleming Rutledge recently suggested that "a powerful argument can be made that the most important movement in twentieth century New Testament theology was what Klaus Koch called 'the recovery of apocalyptic.' This rediscovery of apocalyptic theology in our time is in the process of reshaping our understanding of the cross."[4] In a similar vein, J. Louis Martyn predicted that a 2012 conference entitled 'Apocalyptic Paul' "will surely

---

[1] J. Louis Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 87.

[2] Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville: John Knox, 2007), 80.

[3] Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 66.

[4] *The Crucifixion: Understanding the Death of Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 139. "The Recovery of Apocalyptic" was the English title given to Koch's more provocatively titled original, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*.

prove to be one of our period's most significant international events in the study of the apostle Paul."[5]

Whether or not these views prove hyperbolic, it is clear that interpretive energies continue to be expended (at a rate that is hard to keep up with) because of the appeal of apocalyptic as a major lens through which to understand Paul's conception of the world. This merits attention and scrutiny and has received both. Indeed, a number of protests and critiques have already been registered, which might appear to render this work superfluous. However, a brief overview of those critiques will overcome that impression and establish a clear rationale for this study.

One of the most long-running critiques of the apocalyptic reading of Paul is that it has wandered too far from the literary genre whose name it bears. Even if the adjective *apocalyptic* can legitimately be applied to convictions or motifs that find expression outside of the literary genre of apocalypses,[6] many have insisted that a tangible connection to the texts and the historical contexts from which they emerge must still be demonstrated.[7]

Along those lines, Matlock catalogues the diverse theological agendas that have found apocalyptic to be adaptable to their cause and ends with an endorsement of Christopher Rowland's approach which much more narrowly ties the apocalyptic in Paul to the themes and motifs of apocalyptic literature. More recently, N. T. Wright's exasperation bursts through at several points in his survey of apocalyptic readings, insisting that "the only point in invoking the category was that it appeared to offer historical anchorage. If that is denied or ignored, it would be better to find a different term."[8]

---

[5] J. Louis Martyn, "Afterword: The Human Moral Drama," in *Apocalyptic Paul*, ed. Beverly Gaventa (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013), 157.

[6] Perhaps most influentially, Hanson creates some space for talk of apocalyptic beyond apocalypses with the following definitions: *apocalypse* (the dominant literary genre favoured by apocalyptic writers); *apocalyptic eschatology* (a "religious perspective, a way of viewing divine plans in relation to mundane realities"); and *apocalypticism* ("the symbolic universe by which a specific movement codifies its identity and interpretation of reality"). See P. D. Hanson, "Apocalypticism," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*, ed. Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 29–30.

[7] The absence of detailed engagement with Jewish apocalypses has long been criticised. For example, R. H. Charles protested in the preface to the second edition of his *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity* (1913) that "Schweitzer's eschatological studies show no knowledge of original documents and hardly any of first-hand works on the documents." Quoted in T. F. Glasson, "Schweitzer's Influence–Blessing or Bane?," *JTS* 28 (1977): 296.

[8] *Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (London: SPCK, 2015), 170. cf. the comments on 138 ("Whatever else the word 'apocalyptic' does in western scholarship, it always appeals implicitly to an historical context within the so-called 'history of religions' of the time") and 143 ("We must remind ourselves again that using the word 'apocalyptic' in New Testament Studies is itself a rhetorical device whose power lies in its implicit appeal to an explanatory history-of-religions map.") Cf. James Barr, "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study," *Bulletin of the*

Within this broad protest there are a number of more specific objections to the way in which the apocalyptic Paul is derived from Jewish apocalypses. First, it is lamented that a number of presuppositions which have been claimed as the preserve of apocalyptically-minded writers are little more than basic Jewish convictions. N. T. Wright has discussed the celebrated 'two-age scheme' in this light,[9] and we might also mention the commonplace conviction that God intervenes in human history.[10]

Second, several other supposedly apocalyptic emphases have been challenged on the basis that *no* Jew would plausibly have held such ideas. For example, the notion that God's intervention in human history at the incarnation can be characterised as a *punctiliar* invasion. At the very least, the apocalyptic reading of Paul has created the impression of a "tacitly deist framework" in which a "normally absent god [sic] … occasionally intervenes and acts in discontinuity with th[e] space time continuum."[11]

Third, some have highlighted themes characteristic of the Jewish apocalypses, which are present in Paul, but neglected by apocalyptic readings of him, and which might better warrant discussing Paul under that rubric. For example, Dunne's article on Galatians just cited argues that the negotiation of suffering connects Paul's letter to Jewish apocalyptic.[12] Additionally, Rowland's emphasis on the revelation of heavenly mysteries as a central feature of apocalyptic texts, means that 2 Cor 12 receives the most attention by far in his study.[13]

John Rylands University Library Manchester (1975): 30; and Matlock: "The abstraction apocalyptic … must, if terminology is to signify anything other than confusion, be made on the basis of the apocalypses," *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 261.

[9] "The existence of a two-age scheme of thought–we can hardly emphasise this enough in the present context–*has no automatic connection to anything that can meaningfully be called 'apocalyptic.'* A two-age scheme is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for giving a text, or the ideas expressed in it, that label. The two-age scheme is simply a widespread feature of Jewish thought throughout the second-Temple period and on into the rabbinic period," Wright, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, 158, emph. orig., cf. his comments on 140.

[10] For example, this from Joshua Jipp: "One of the defining features of apocalyptic thought, that God intervenes decisively in human history, is present in Paul's thought." "Paul: The Apocalyptic Theologian," in *Apocalypses in Context: Apocalyptic Currents through History*, ed. Kelly J. Murphy and Justin Jeffcoat Schedtler (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 132.

[11] N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1992), 298. Cf. the updated critique along similar lines in John Anthony Dunne, "Suffering and Covenantal Hope in Galatians: A Critique of the 'Apocalyptic Reading' and its Proponents," *SJT* 68 (2015): 1–15. For a constructive proposal on this point, see Grant Macaskill, "History, Providence and the Apocalyptic Paul," *SJT* 70 (2017): 409–26.

[12] N. T. Wright describes Messianism and politics as two other elements characteristic of apocalyptic texts which ought to be restored if 'apocalyptic' is to have a clearer relationship to its literary namesake, in "Paul in Current Anglophone Scholarship," *ExpT* 123 (2012): 367–81.

[13] Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 374–86. A somewhat distant second in his discussion is the use of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις in Gal 1. To Rowland's mind it corroborates his thesis

Fourth, James Davies has critiqued the apocalyptic reading for its attempt to defend what he considers to be a number of false dichotomies in the four areas of epistemology, eschatology, cosmology, and soteriology by finding them to be characteristic of different strands of apocalyptic literature. Davies' distillation of the apocalyptic reading into those four areas is enormously helpful and overlaps with my own.[14] The main burden of Davies' work, however, is to provide "detailed engagement with the Jewish and Christian apocalypses" in order to critique dichotomised readings of those texts and of Paul.[15]

Fifth, Loren Stuckenbruck has repeatedly challenged the notions that Jewish apocalyptic texts "focus myopically on hope for a world yet to come",[16] and that any sense of the overlap of the ages or the proleptic experience of eschatological blessing is a New Testament innovation without parallel in Jewish apocalyptic texts.[17]

In various ways then, the apocalyptic reading of Paul has had its feet held to the fire of the apocalypses. The critiques have challenged the nomenclature on the basis of what can be considered typical of the apocalypses; they have con-

---

that the disclosure of heavenly mysteries is central to apocalyptic. Although those terms might have proved to be a fruitful way of drawing together the apocalypses and the apocalyptic reading of Paul, apocalyptic readers of Paul have argued that these terms denote invasion more than revelation. On this point, see David A. Shaw, "'Then I Proceeded to Where Things Were Chaotic' (1 Enoch 21:1): Mapping the Apocalyptic Landscape," in *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination*, ed. Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 40. For a sample exegesis from an apocalyptic perspective, see Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Louisville: John Knox, 2011), 93.

[14] See Shaw, "Then I Proceeded to Where Things Were Chaotic," where, independently of Davies, I highlighted the same four areas. Our discussions of epistemology and soteriology are closely related, whereas our discussions of eschatology and cosmology reflect different, though complementary interests. Davies' discussion of eschatology asks how disruptive is the eschatological work of God and how discontinuous is the age to come from the present age; my discussion centres on the relative weight of inaugurated and future eschatology in apocalyptic accounts of Paul. Under the heading of cosmology, Davies discusses the relation of heaven to earth, whereas I focus on the prominence of anti-God powers which populate the apocalyptic cosmos.

[15] James P. Davies, *Paul Among the Apocalypses? An Evaluation of the 'Apocalyptic Paul' in the Context of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Literature* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 1. Thus, whereas Davies helpfully canvasses a number of apocalyptic antitheses (in relation to epistemology, eschatology, cosmology and soteriology) and holds them up against Jewish apocalypses and the book of Revelation, this thesis will focus on the text to which contemporary apocalyptic interpreters most frequently appeal: Romans.

[16] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "How Much Evil Does the Christ Event Solve? Jesus and Paul in Relation to Jewish 'Apocalyptic' Thought," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, WUNT 2.417 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 167.

[17] See his "How Much Evil Does the Christ Event Solve?"; "Overlapping Ages at Qumran and 'Apocalyptic' in Pauline Theology," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 309–26; "Posturing 'Apocalyptic' in Pauline Theology: How Much Contrast to Jewish Tradition?," in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 2.335 (Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 240–56.

tested a dichotomised reading of Jewish apocalypses to substantiate a parallel set of dichotomies in Paul; and they have occasionally suggested other avenues and texts (arising from more direct engagement with the apocalypses) by which to interpret Paul as an apocalyptic theologian.

All of these protests have significant merit, and yet it is intriguing that they have not succeeded in curbing enthusiasm for an apocalyptic Paul.[18] There are a number of likely reasons. In part, as we shall see, de Boer has attempted to ground his account of Paul in the context of Jewish eschatology and, at least in the eyes of some, he has succeeded in legitimising the use of apocalyptic in reference to Paul.[19] Additionally, the staying power of the apocalyptic reading is due to its very great appeal; it has substantial exegetical warrant for several of its main tenets; it is unafraid of drawing robust theological conclusions, inviting the integration of theological disciplines; and, compared to the New Perspective, the apocalyptic reading of Paul has more immediately apparent cultural relevance and relies less upon a reconstruction of the historical and social realities of Second Temple Judaism.

More significantly for this thesis, however, are two further factors. First, apocalyptic readers of Paul often express disinterest in those literary and historical questions. When pressed as to why they label their reading apocalyptic, they most often express a desire to locate themselves within a stream of modern scholarship, rather than an historical or literary context. Many would be happy to use a different term, were it not that *apocalyptic* functions as convenient shorthand for an interpretive approach to Paul. The terminological critique is thereby defused to their satisfaction.

Second, the apocalyptic reading of Paul has continued apace because its engaging theological account of Paul's letters has largely escaped challenge at the exegetical level. This has not gone unnoticed by apocalyptic readers of Paul either. Campbell, for example, speaks of the approach that

> often goes by the contentious name of 'apocalyptic'. But while the critics of this approach have been congratulating themselves on the cogency of their terminological critique, the theological model itself remains largely unscathed by all this, while its powerful internal coherence, illuminated with the help of certain theologians, is just beginning to emerge.[20]

---

[18] The periodical calls for a moratorium on the use of the term have most certainly fallen on deaf ears. See e. g. T. F. Glasson, "What Is Apocalyptic?," *NTS* 27 (1980): 98–105; Graham Stanton, "Review of Galatians by J. Louis Martyn," *JTS* 51 (2000): 264–70. Stanton is echoed by Kwon, for whom apocalyptic is a term "fraught with ambiguity" rendering "the value of the term questionable." Yon Gyong Kwon, *Eschatology in Galatians*, WUNT 2.183 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 8n37.

[19] For engagement with his reading of Jewish apocalyptic literature, see chapter 5 below; also: David A. Shaw, "Apocalyptic and Covenant: Perspectives on Paul or Antinomies at War?," *JSNT* 36 (2013): 155–71; Davies, *Paul Among the Apocalypses?*, chapter 5.

[20] *The Quest for Paul's Gospel: A Suggested Strategy* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 27.

Although a few studies have begun to examine the apocalyptic reading from a theological or exegetical perspective,[21] Campbell is right that critiques of the apocalyptic Paul have not focussed their attention upon its exegetical foundations, and this is one of the major burdens of this thesis. This lack of exegetical critique has also left unexplored the extent to which contemporary apocalyptic readings of Paul differ in substance and argumentation. Under the same banner, several conflicting accounts of Paul are being advanced.

In light of these lacunae, therefore, and in a sentence, the aim of this thesis is to examine carefully the *different* ways in which Paul's theology has been expounded under the banner of apocalyptic, drawing together a *more accurate* sketch of the contemporary apocalyptic Paul, and then evaluating him *exegetically* beside the texts of the apostle Paul.[22]

Before I outline how that aim will be accomplished, three points require attention. First, I want to develop the claim that apocalyptic functions as shorthand, claiming allegiance to an interpretive history. Several assumptions are at work here that justify spending as much time as I will on considering the distinctive features of eight individuals who are regularly associated with apocalyptic readings of Paul.[23] More briefly, it is also necessary to defend two other methodological decisions: the choice of these eight scholars, and the choice of these eight chapters of Romans as the text with which to critique the apocalyptic reading.

First, then, the use of apocalyptic as a nod to an interpretive history. For Douglas Campbell, it is a matter of expediency:

---

[21] Simon Gathercole questions the emphasis on *Sin* as opposed to *sins* in *Defending Substitution: An Essay on Atonement in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 47–53. The second issue of *JSPL* (2012) was devoted to engagement with the apocalyptic readings of Galatians. The 2016 edited volume *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination* demonstrates how imaginatively the adjective *apocalyptic* can be applied to Paul in support of different theological projects, but see Jason Maston's chapter 'Plight and Solution in Paul's Apocalyptic Perspective' for some perceptive exegetical engagement via 2 Cor 5:18–21. From a more theological perspective see Edwin Chr. van Driel, "Climax of the Covenant vs Apocalyptic Invasion: A Theological Analysis of a Contemporary Debate in Pauline Exegesis" *IJST* 17 (2015): 6–25.

[22] Two aspects here distinguish the current project from Matlock's *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*. First, whereas his survey finished with Martyn, my focus increasingly falls on the generation that succeeded him and their appropriation of the scholars in the period Matlock surveyed. Second, whereas Matlock's thesis provided a kind of hermeneutical exposé of past interpreters and the diverse agendas that prompted their enthusiasm for apocalyptic terminology, my aim is to develop an exegetical critique of contemporary apocalyptic scholarship.

[23] A number of the critiques that focus on the connection to apocalyptic literature have helpful sketches of the individual apocalyptic interpreters, although they lack the space to set them out fully. See e. g. Stuckenbruck, "How Much Evil Does the Christ Event Solve?" which surveys Käsemann, J. Christiaan Beker, J. Louis Martyn, and James D. G. Dunn (a name not usually associated with the rest, but discussed because of his engagement with the two-age schema Stuckenbruck is discussing).

The only use I can see for such a phrase [sc. apocalyptic] is to communicate 'in-house' information within Pauline debates quickly – where one stands roughly in interpretive terms, and who one reads (and the use of the word 'apocalyptic' usually denotes a strong link with either Käsemann or Martyn).[24]

For Beverly Gaventa, it is a matter of integrity:

Among the interpreters of Paul whose works most influence my own readings are Ernst Käsemann, J. Christiaan Beker, and J. Louis Martyn, all of whom explicitly adopt the terminology of apocalyptic. To withhold acknowledgment of their influence on my work by attempting to cloak my own views under other terminology strikes me as lacking in maturity and even gratitude.[25]

Several issues lurk here which govern the shape of this book. First, it is implied by such statements that Käsemann is the progenitor of this movement,[26] but this is to confuse terminology with content. True, Käsemann popularises the use of the term *apocalyptic* but his account of Pauline theology differs quite markedly from those who take up his terms and seek to identify themselves as his heirs in some sense. As I will argue, it is more illuminating to explore the connections with Schweitzer and Wrede.[27]

Relatedly, the critique of the use of the term *apocalyptic* has also largely left unaddressed the extent to which the apocalyptic reading is not a singularity. Rather divergent understandings of Paul's theology often go unnoticed because apocalyptic interpreters of Paul operate under the same banner and make com-

---

[24] Campbell, *The Quest for Paul's Gospel*, 57n3. In making these comments, Campbell addresses the terminological and historical critique levelled against the apocalyptic reading, arguing that: (1) recent apocalyptic interpreters of Paul are not claiming that Paul is dependent on the categories of Jewish apocalypses [Campbell makes no mention of de Boer's attempt here]; (2) that apocalyptic literature cannot be reduced to a single motif; (3) that the vexed question of the relationship between the apocalypses and the apocalyptic worldview "does not have to be settled by Paulinists." He therefore sees it as an interesting question, but his intent merely to signal his position vis-à-vis Martyn and Käsemann means that fixation on terminology is misguided.

[25] *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 82.

[26] e. g. "In this relatively new view, spawned originally and centrally by the work of Ernst Käsemann, Paul is perceived to have been a thoroughly apocalyptic theologian," J. Louis Martyn, "Afterword: The Human Moral Drama," in *Apocalyptic Paul*, ed. Beverly Gaventa (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013), 161; "Ernst Käsemann launched a new movement in the world of biblical theology with this much-quoted announcement: 'Apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology,'" Rutledge, *The Crucifixion*, 139; "The 'apocalyptic' reading of Paul is generally traced, in modern scholarship, back to Ernst Käsemann," Macaskill, "History, Providence and the Apocalyptic Paul," 411; "Contemporary Christian apocalyptic includes a rich array of biblical and theological scholars, beginning in the 20th century with Ernst Käsemann," Nancy J. Duff, "Christian Apocalyptic," *ThTo* 75 (2018): 5–8.

[27] Matlock begins his survey with Schweitzer and ends it with Martyn. The subsequent development of the apocalyptic reading beyond Martyn, in the work of de Boer, Gaventa and Campbell, makes clear the need to include Wrede, and, once again, to carefully map out areas of confluence and contrast.

mon cause against traditional or alternative readings. Thus one can read that "continuing the thesis developed by Käsemann … and J. Christiaan Beker … Martyn affirms that Paul's theology is thoroughly apocalyptic."[28] Fleming Rutledge writes of "biblical theologians in the line of Ernst Käsemann (J. Louis Martyn, Beverly Gaventa, Douglas Campbell, Susan Eastman, and many others)."[29]

Even where Schweitzer's influence is acknowledged, the impression endures of broad uniformity, as, for example, in Douglas Harink's comment that "the understanding of Paul as an apocalyptic theologian goes back as far as the work on Paul by Albert Schweitzer. It has been given vigorous revival by Ernst Käsemann, J. Christiaan Beker and J. Louis Martyn."[30] Likewise, de Boer states that "my work builds on the contributions of other interpreters of Paul, most notably, Albert Schweitzer, Käsemann, J. Louis Martyn and Beker."[31]

Of course, none of these authors are suggesting that there is complete agreement within the apocalyptic camp, but, as I will demonstrate, the differences between Schweitzer, Käsemann, Beker and Martyn are pronounced, such that contemporary claims to their mantle require significant clarification. Likewise, it will be become clear that the present day apocalyptic readings of Paul have their own internecine tensions, embracing different aspects of those older readings and taking their leave of others.

Turning now to those other methodological considerations, we ask: why these eight scholars? I trust that in many ways the above discussion justifies the scholars I have chosen to survey. Albert Schweitzer, Ernst Käsemann, J. Christiaan Beker, and J. Louis Martyn are surely uncontroversial. Wrede is certainly not the only figure prior to Schweitzer we might have discussed,[32] but the endearing brevity of his *Paulus* proves winsome to many, and both his

---

[28] Kuo-Yu Tsui, "Reconsidering Pauline Juxtaposition of Indicative and Imperative in Light of Pauline Apocalyptic in the Context of Rom 6:1–14," *CBQ* 75 (2013): 309n62.

[29] *The Crucifixion*, 36n62. See also Brittany Wilson who aligns herself with "Ernst Käsemann, J. Louis Martyn, and other proponents of an apocalyptic Paul" in that she uses "the term 'apocalyptic' to reference the radical disclosure of God's salvific righteousness in Jesus Christ" and as exemplars she references works by de Boer and Gaventa. "Rereading Romans 1–3 Apocalyptically: A Response to Douglas Campbell's 'Rereading Romans 1–3,'" in *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul: Reflections on the Work of Douglas Campbell*, ed. Chris Tilling (Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade Books, 2014), 182n2.

[30] *Paul Among the Postliberals: Pauline Theology Beyond Christendom and Modernity* (Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 16.

[31] *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 7, cf. 23.

[32] Sturm describes earlier arguments for interpreting Paul in light of apocalyptic eschatology from Johannes Weiss, Wilhelm Bousset and Richard Kabisch (all of whom published studies in 1892–3). See Richard E. Sturm, "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic': A Problem for Biblical Criticism," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989), 26–27. Adolf Deissmann's studies of 'in Christ' mysticism in light of eschatology should certainly be in-

influence on Schweitzer and their disagreements will prove significant and enduring.[33] Of the contemporary advocates, Martinus de Boer, Beverly Gaventa, and Douglas Campbell have all published or edited significant works promoting an apocalyptic reading of Paul.[34] A wider group of scholars are connected in various ways: some writing under the apocalyptic banner (e. g. Susan Eastman), others reflecting or exerting some degree of influence (Gustaf Aulén, John Barclay, Karl Barth, Charles Cousar, Leander Keck, Paul C. Meyer, Chris Tilling, Alan J. Torrance), and still others attempting to develop the theological and ecclesiological implications of the apocalyptic reading, especially as expressed by Käsemann and Martyn (David Congdon, Douglas Harink, Philip Ziegler among others). Where appropriate, these figures will feature in the analysis of the apocalyptic Paul, but our aim within the scope of this present work cannot be a comprehensive cartography of the apocalyptic landscape.[35] The more modest aim of tracing the individual positions of the leading proponents and their mutual interactions is more than sufficient unto the day.

Lastly, a word about the focus on Rom 1–8. Historically, Galatians has an understandable reputation as the mighty fortress of the apocalyptic Paul, given the commentaries by Martyn and de Boer and its more antithetical and punctiliar themes.[36] And yet before and after that phase, the first eight chapters of

---

cluded here also. See his *Die Neutestamentliche Formel 'In Christo Jesu'* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1892); *Paulus: Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911).

[33] It is a strength of Campbell's *The Deliverance of God* that Wrede's significance is highlighted. De Boer and Matlock begin their surveys with Schweitzer but mention Wrede as a precursor: Martinus C. de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989), 168n1; Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul:* 32n23, and Matlock repeatedly refers to a "new phase" of Pauline interpretation inaugurated by Wrede and Schweitzer together (1996, 33n23, 34, 56n62, 61).

[34] The surveys by Davies and Wright devote attention to these same three plus Martyn (although Wright gives less space to Gaventa). See Davies, *Paul Among the Apocalypses?*, 15–21; Wright, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, 155–218. Elsewhere, with a focus on soteriological matters, Davies summarises the contributions of Martyn, de Boer, and Campbell in "Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, WUNT 2.417 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 142–68.

[35] Beyond the scope of this work, but of note are the ways in which apocalyptic readings of Paul interact with or have affinities to engagements with Paul by modern European philosophers and political theorists such as Giorgio Agamben, Alain Badiou, and Slavoj Žižek. For discussion of their readings of Paul and their relation to apocalyptic readings see especially Douglas Harink, ed., *Paul, Philosophy, and the Theopolitical Vision: Critical Engagements with Agamben, Badiou, Žižek and Others* (Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade Books, 2010), and John M. G. Barclay, "Paul and the Philosophers: Alain Badiou and the Event," *New Blackfriars* 91.1032 (2010): 171–84.

[36] See J. Louis Martyn, "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 31 (1985): 410–24; J. Louis Martyn, "Events in Galatia: Modified Covenant Nomism Versus God's Invasion of the Cosmos in the Singular Gospel: A Response to J. D. G. Dunn and B. R. Gaventa," in *Pauline Theology Vol. 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, and Philemon*, ed. Jouette M. Bassler (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 160–79; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "The Singular-

Romans have been at least as significant. As we shall see, Schweitzer describes Rom 1–8 as a puzzle, and a great deal of contemporary apocalyptic effort has been spent trying to solve it. De Boer's *Defeat of Death*, Campbell's *The Deliverance of God*, and the vast majority of Beverly Gaventa's many stimulating articles on Romans all have the goal of planting the apocalyptic flag in that section of Paul's longest letter.[37] These multiple and diverse efforts also provide a window onto some of the key differences between them and their apocalyptic forebears. Rom 1–8, then, is where the battle rages, and it is where the faithfulness of the apocalyptic Paul to the letters of Paul can best be tested.

This study has three parts. Part 1 surveys the eight scholars mentioned above, distilling their works into a statement of how they individually conceive of the Pauline plight and solution. In no way does this imply that Paul himself thought from plight to solution (a notion several of our subjects will strongly reject). Rather, this is a heuristic tool, enabling the comparison of one scholar with another and facilitating the kind of judgments we seek to make about compatibility across the generations and within the contemporary apocalyptic account of Paul. Part 2 will analyse these findings, focussing upon the contemporary apocalyptic reading of Paul and its distinctive view of the Pauline plight and solution, but also highlighting several significant moves away from past accounts. This analysis makes its own contribution, in the absence of other substantial studies of the contemporary apocalyptic reading of Paul, it's soteriology, and its relation to the interpretive history with which it seeks to align itself. That said, this analysis also facilitates an accurate and focussed critical engagement in Part 3. As will become clear, contemporary apocalyptic readings largely hold their theological convictions in common but deploy a number of different exegetical strategies in their defence. Part 3 is therefore composed of several chapters addressing the breadth and assessing the strength of those arguments. The study will then conclude, summarising the critique of the apocalyptic reading of Paul, and charting a course by which the debate might progress.

---

ity of the Gospel: A Reading of Galatians," in *Pauline Theology Vol. 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, and Philemon*, ed. Jouette M. Bassler (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 147–59.

[37] Despite seeing Romans as a strategic tempering of apocalyptic themes (in light of a negative reception of Galatians), Martyn latterly also joined this effort: See e. g. "Nomos Plus Genitive Noun in Paul: The History of God's Law," in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Michael L. White. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 575–87; "World Without End or Twice-Invaded World?," in *Shaking Heaven and Earth: Essays in Honor of Walter Brueggemann and Charles B. Cousar*, ed. Christine Roy Yoder et al. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 117–32.

Index of References

Old Testament

Jewish Literature

Qumran Literature

New Testament

Index of Modern Authors

Index of Subjects