

Patterns of New Testament Eschatology

BY STEPHEN SMALLEY

“TO survey history,” says the Master of Peterhouse, “requires great elasticity of mind.” This, he maintains, is because generations and individuals who exist “for the glory of God” are involved, which causes the goal of history to lie both in every part of itself and beyond itself. Here is an approach to history, and indeed to historiography, which is truly eschatological, which sees history as shot through with an eternity that gives it point at every point, which conceives with a Johannine clarity the relation between “flesh” and “spirit”.

Thus to begin with the problem of history, and indeed with the Fourth Evangelist himself, is none too wide of the mark which concerns us, the eschatology of the New Testament. What that writer did, the New Testament writers were all doing in their way—wrestling with the most exquisitely painful of all paradoxes, the conjunction of the physical and the metaphysical, and struggling to understand the relation between the “is now” and the “not yet” of Christian eschatology in its severely practical as well as its purely doctrinal applications. For Oscar Cullmann is surely right to equate the mid-point in the eschatological perspective of the primitive Church with the ministry of Christ, and to see time as “divided anew” in Him.³ This means that the New Testament view of history will be presented in the conviction that its centre has been reached, while its end is “still to come” (*ibid.*). The decisive battle has been fought and won, but the war is still on.

I hope to show that what in fact we are given in the New Testament are patterns of eschatology which emerge (I submit) from the teaching of Jesus Himself, and derive their character and content from an ἔσχατον already passed; and which cohere in a doctrinal unity, rather than replacing one another one by one as the imminent expectation of the *parousia* recedes. In this way I hope we shall be able to discover something biblical and relevant for ourselves about the place and significance of the Second Advent.

But first, a little unpacking of terminology. We are probably aware, but may need to be reminded, that the expression “Second Coming” or “Second Advent” is (as such) post-biblical.³ In the New Testament, the term *parousia* is near-technical, though it is not, in fact, used very frequently of the coming of Christ; a more regular way of describing this expectation was by using the verb ἔρχομαι (Mk. 13: 26; Acts 1: 11, *al.*)⁴ Two other main categories are those of ἀποκάλυψις (1 Pet. 1: 7) and ἐπιφάνεια (1 Tim. 6: 14, and elsewhere in the Pastorals); and associated with both a complex of eschatological notions such as the day of the Lord (Phil. 1: 6), judgment (Heb. 9: 27f., where the appearing

of Christ, ὁφθήσεται, is for once designated ἐκ δευτέρου), the gathering in of the elect (Mk. 13: 27) and the τέλος (Mk. 13: 7; 1 Cor. 15: 23f.).

* * * *

1. The origin of the "Parousia" doctrine

We must begin with a consideration of the arguments that have been produced for and against the authenticity and originality of the teaching of Jesus on the subject of the ἔσχατον. I take it that none of us regards the *parousia* of Christ as the only eschatological event recognized in the New Testament; but where it is mentioned it seems to be regarded as a focus, a climactic recapitulation consonant with the winding up of history (1 Cor. 15: 23ff., for example; and, if we are allowed to use the passage as evidence, 1 Thess. 4: 15ff.). Our problem is to discover whether the *parousia* as involving a *second* coming of Jesus ever formed part of His own understanding and teaching, and (obviously integral to the discussion) whether Jesus Himself anticipated any space between the resurrection and the *parousia*, or whether the delay in the *parousia* itself caused the primitive Church to insert intervals in their line of eschatological development, and then to read back the result into the teaching of Jesus.

The views of the Bishop of Woolwich on this subject will be well known. In his important book *Jesus and His Coming* (1957), Dr. J. A. T. Robinson refuses to make the assumption that it is possible to build on "the New Testament teaching about the Second Coming more or less as it stands" (p. 11), and he strongly criticizes those who do. Instead, he is anxious to go behind the eschatology of the early Church, and to discover how the expectation of a second coming arose, and in what form, if any, it owes its origin to Jesus (p. 13).

Dr. Robinson steadily resists, however, any suggestion that the New Testament leaves us with an eschatology already completely realized, and emptied therefore of hope. Futurity there is, he decides, and a futurity which denotes consummation and not finality (p. 23). But if we seek the origin of the primitive Christian expectation that Christ would return "from heaven to earth in manifest and final glory" (p. 24), we are not able to find it in the *verba Christi*. And even the New Testament documents apart from the Gospels do not claim this; they presuppose the belief, but never trace it. As it happens, Dr. Robinson summarily dismisses what I take to be an important witness in this debate, the λόγος Κυρίου of 1 Thess. 4: 15. What is the "word of the Lord" to which Paul refers when he speaks of the relation of living and dead Christians to Christ at the *parousia*? The Bishop of Woolwich suggests that it is either in the apocalypse of verses 16 and 17, or the assurance of the resurrection cited in verse 14, which is possibly paralleled in Jn. 14: 3, "I will come again and will take you to myself." In the second case, this would support his suspicion (and mine) that the discourses of Jn. 14-16 contain after all authentic, traditional material (p. 25, note 1). But Dr. Poul Nepper-Christensen, of the University of Aarhus, has proposed (to Professor C. F. D. Moule's New Testament seminar in Cambridge) a connection between 1 Thess. 4: 15—which reads, after all, very much like the appeal to a dominical

logion—and the 'Εγώ εἰμι saying of Jn. 11: 25f., " I am the resurrection and the life." In *this* case, the question of the originality of the " I am " sayings of Jesus remains an open one, and we are not compelled to dismiss what must in any case be an early piece of teaching on the *parousia* as secondary.

To support his claim that the eschatology of the early Church did not take its rise from the teaching of Jesus, the author of *Jesus and His Coming* claims that Jesus' own expectation involved the twin notions of visitation and vindication, but that these referred respectively to the immediate vindication to God of Christ (His person and cause) and His own; and to the already inaugurated visitation in judgment implied in the events and consequences of His earthly ministry (chapters 2 and 3). The critical climax of what Dr. Robinson calls the " messianic act " is reached, but not exhausted, in the death and resurrection of Christ (p. 81). His conclusion, therefore, is that the " double expectation " of Christ simply arose from the inevitable desire of the early Christians in the face of what happened, or rather did *not* happen, to break down what in fact remains a unity; to provide a second focus for what was already contained in the διδασχῆ of Jesus and the κήρυγμα of the primitive Church; not to add, but to define.

I have surveyed Dr. Robinson's thesis at this length because it is indicative of the trend of at least one contemporary school of eschatological thought, and because, if it is accepted, it is likely to have far-reaching effects on Christian proclamation as well as Christian instruction. Not that all those effects will be adverse, or that we must begin by assuming that the author has merely been " muddling his brains—and ours—with divinity ". And as thus dispassionately we investigate the issues forced upon us, we shall find ourselves compelled to study more closely the apocalyptic (need I say?) of Mk. 13, particularly the Son of Man saying in verse 26 of that chapter, and the assertion of Mt. 10: 23. We shall then be in a position to unravel some of the threads of the developing eschatology of the New Testament, notably from the apostolic preaching, Paul and John, before drawing together some conclusions.

* * * *

(a) *Mark 13*. What then of the eschatological discourse of Mk. 13? Four verses of crucial and monumental difficulty are embedded in the heart of this apocalyptic: verses 24-27. Dr. Robinson has no hesitation in dismissing these as secondary, on a number of counts.⁵ The style of the paragraph is that of an untypical working together of Old Testament allusions; the second person of the verses either side drops inexplicably to the third; and if these four verses are removed, they cease to " interrupt the sequence of the argument " (p. 120). In fact, the Bishop wishes to take just verses 5-20 as standing together and forming a consistent reply to the disciples' query, " when will this be? " (verse 4), involving not apocalyptic teaching about the *parousia* at all, but purely historical warnings (p. 121). The different form of the initial question in the Matthaean parallel (24: 3), which takes account of the larger issue, is on this showing to be regarded as the correction of a " discrepancy " (*ibid.*).

We are still left, however, with what Dr. Robinson calls a series of "isolated sayings and parables" paralleled elsewhere (verses 28-37), which he virtually excises (pp. 120f.). Surely there is a connection between verses 5-23, 24-27 and 28-37, which is made less difficult if we take note of the telling contrast between (for instance) the ταῦτα of verse 29, and the ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις of verse 24. Here is a "double perspective" which naturally arises from a consideration of the eschatological nature (in fact) of more immediate events; the fall of Jerusalem is proleptic of the End. And in that wider and more universal light, the use of a more general third person plural (ὄψονται, verse 26) is not altogether out of place.* But in any case, if, as Dr. Beasley-Murray contends,⁷ the authenticity of the tradition itself is the main point at issue here, and not the actual form of its preservation, we cannot lay too great a stress on inherent connections of style and content, or indeed be surprised if a piece of allusive summarizing is introduced.⁸

(b) *Mark 13: 26.* Which brings us to the content of these four verses, 24-27, and in particular to the saying concerning the "coming" of the Son of Man (verse 26). It is interesting that Dr. C. H. Dodd (not so much the Dodd of *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 1936, but the more modified Dodd of, for example, *The Coming of Christ*, 1951), while rejecting an historical *Sitz im Leben* for the reference to the Son of Man coming in (ἐν; 14: 62, μετὰ) the clouds, as it is given in Mk. 13: 26, is prepared to admit that such a saying certainly formed part of the earliest tradition of dominical *logia*.⁹ Further, although Dr. Dodd does not regard Mk. 13 as an "apocalypse" at all, but rather as a composite *Mahnrede*, he allows for the genuineness of such a piece of prediction as 13: 9-13 by insisting that there is every reason to believe that Jesus "contemplated a further period of history after His departure".¹⁰ Are we right, then, to regard an interval between the resurrection and the *parousia* as a part of our Lord's own eschatological expectation, and if so, was the vision He communicated that of a second return in glory to earth?

The contention of Dr. Beasley-Murray in the course of his scholarly and detailed examination of this discourse, both in his book *Jesus and the Future* (1954), and in its companion volume, *A Commentary on Mark 13* (1957), has yet to be satisfactorily answered. It is that Christ seems to be preparing His disciples here for a period to come which will involve "a necessity to share the sufferings of Christ and the advancement of the Gospel amidst persecution".¹¹ In other words, mission and opposition belong together—which is precisely the situation we so often discover in *Acts* as the context of evangelism (*Acts 4 and 5*, Peter and John; *Acts 7*, Stephen; *Acts 22 onwards*, Paul). As in Mk. 13. 10f., therefore, so in the *Q logion* of Mt. 10: 19f. and Lk. 12: 11f., the Holy Spirit's aid is promised for proclamation within a specifically juridical setting. And it is at the end of *that* period, probably conceived by Jesus Himself with "prophetic foreshortening" as imminent, that the Son of Man is to return for judgment and vindication and glory.

Dr. Robinson, however, queries the place of Mk. 13: 26 in this discussion, on the grounds that since (as with its variant in 14: 62) the content

of the title "Son of Man" as applied to Jesus is derived chiefly from its setting and use in Dan. 7: 13ff. (though 1 Enoch 14: 8 is a clear parallel), Jesus is speaking here of vindication to God, and not of final visitation at all; of ascent, and not descent.¹³ In this interpretation the Bishop is not, of course, alone, since it is also to be traced in Colani,¹³ Glasson,¹⁴ and many others. Dr. Beasley-Murray rejects the position, however, as "improbable", because no change of scene from earth to heaven is suggested in Dan. 7; because the divine "vehicle" (verse 9) parallels that described by Ezekiel as serving for God's appearances on earth (cf. Ezek. 1: 15ff.); and because the Ancient of Days visits, and the Son of Man comes to receive the kingdom, on earth. "Our Lord," he concludes, "would have had no other thought in view than a parousia for the humanity of earth."¹⁵ Dr. Robinson is sceptical about these objections, none the less, and rightly reminds us that in an apocalyptic vision the *locus* is (literally) "neither here nor there".¹⁶ The predominant category is clearly that of vindication, and I am not too clear that we are intended to regard a return of Christ to earth as mandatory for our understanding of His *parousia*. On the other hand, *parousia* there certainly is, and a "coming" which was apparently taught and understood as forming the climax to a post-resurrection period of history.

Similarly with the *parousia* reference in Mk. 8: 38. Dr. Robinson rejects the last member of this verse, "when He comes in the glory of His Father with the holy angels," as a transmissory addition; and does so on the grounds that it does not appear in the Q tradition Mt. 10: 32f. = Lk. 12: 8f.¹⁷ But we are on dangerous ground indeed if any prediction of Jesus which cannot be substantiated in Q must be dismissed; for then we must eliminate, for example, much of the teaching of Jesus about His death. The phrase in the Matthaean straight parallel, 16: 27, ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ, does not appear in the other Synoptists, but it is interesting to note how often elsewhere the concepts of *parousia* and *krisis* belong together (Mk. 13: 27, cf. 13: 35f.; Lk. 17: 22ff., 21: 25-27, cf. 21: 36).

(c) *Matthew* 10: 23. We cannot leave the Synoptic Gospels without some attention being given to yet one more crux, Mt. 10: 23. There are difficulties about this verse, however it is taken. As it stands, the thought of "flight" seems to contradict the action recommended in verse 14 ("shake off the dust from your feet"), and violent persecution is not necessarily likely to follow from the simple proclamation of the evangel, Ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (verse 7). Further, verses 17-22 are descriptions of "signs before the End" which have parallels, as we have noted, in Mk. 13 and Mt. 24; so that there may possibly be a closer connection than now appears between verses 16 and 23.

But what is meant by the verb ἔλθῃ in verse 23? It seems to me that one telling reason for asserting the genuineness of this *logion* is the fact that in the sense in which the early Church would have understood the verb ἔρχομαι of the Son of Man in such a context as this, the prediction remained unfulfilled prophecy. As such, I would want to take verse 23 as the conclusion to advice given in a mission-persecution setting, and to regard ἔλθῃ as a reference to the *parousia*, given for the

encouragement of the disciples and their successors, and not a reference to the resurrection or Pentecost. But at the same time, the context is also immediate: εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν in verse 23a could easily anticipate Pella, and there always remains the possibility of a further deliberate ambiguity. The twelve even now will not have completely evangelized (τελέσητε) the more than 200 cities of Galilee before they encounter the Son of Man again. Dr. Filson's proposal, that this is a reference to the manifestation of Christ as the Kingdom of God is proclaimed and accepted, seems less likely in a graphic and eschatological setting of this kind, especially since there is no parallel use of such a phrase with this meaning.¹⁸

* * * *

2. The Apostolic Preaching and beyond

So far, we have been concerned to establish what grounds exist in the Synoptic Gospels for associating with Jesus the didactic expectation of His *parousia* at the end of a post-resurrection interval, and to this extent we have been "futurist" in our eschatological exploration. But I suggested at the outset that there is a sense in which the ἔσχατον has already taken place, and this must now be substantiated.

We do not go far in the Pauline *corpus* before we discover a conviction that the Christian hope is not only future but also present, and that it is possible already to share a guaranteed spiritual inheritance (Eph. 1: 14), to possess the love of God (Rom. 5: 5), enjoy the privileges of sonship (Gal. 4: 6) and produce the harvest of the Spirit (5: 22f.). In other words, the traditionally linear view of Jewish eschatology, whereby Israel remained on tiptoe with expectation for a future eschatological irruption, has been shattered. In the New Testament, the final act of God is upon us, and meets us everywhere; already we are saved. This is not at all to say, of course, that Paul does not conceive of a "consummated" as well as a "realized hope". Certainly the new age has already been inaugurated; but it also awaits the reaching of what Teilhard de Chardin would call the "omega point". This point will be synonymous with the winding up of history, the *parousia* of Christ (an expectation the imminence of which recedes and, as in *Ephesians*,¹⁹ becomes spiritualized, but never really disappears) and final resurrection and judgment (Eph. 1: 10; Phil. 3: 20; 1 Cor. 15: 22f. and 4: 5). Meanwhile *marana tha* remains the watchword of the whole *ecclesia*.

In his essay on *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul*, Neill Hamilton attempts to relate the work of the Spirit primarily to the future, both in the individual believer and in the Church as a whole; but indicates as well the decisive way in which He is at work in the present *continuum*.²⁰ It is certainly true that for the Christian whose life is lived *κατὰ πνεῦμα* the trinity of virtues, faith (Gal. 5: 5), hope (Rom. 15: 13) and love (Phil. 2: 1), is infected with a persistent and sometimes even painful tension between the "now" and the "then" (pp. 32ff.). But this is also true of the outworking of these gifts, in terms of the application of the Christian ethic. We are familiar with the dictum that New Testament ethics and eschatology belong together,

yet what do we mean by it? Do we simply mean that our ethical actions all carry an eternal reference? That is true, but it is not all. Paul's ethical teaching (which is less "systematic", than tied to and arising from particular circumstances) works from a growing point already behind, as well as towards a culminating point entirely in the future. Rom. 13 illustrates this exactly: at the conclusion of a list of exhortations to civil obedience, in line with the common New Testament catachetical principle of *subjecti estote*, Paul gives his readers the key, "put on the Lord Jesus Christ" (verse 14), and the perspective, "the day is at hand" (verse 12).

If we now go behind the Pauline eschatology we have considered, as A. M. Hunter does so ably,²¹ we shall discover the extent to which Paul is himself indebted to a pre-Pauline tradition, in fact to an apostolic *paradosis*. The note of inauguration and fulfilment, as well as being everywhere present in the teaching of Jesus Himself, is also the burden of the apostolic *kerygma*. God has acted decisively in Christ (Acts 2: 22, 32 and 36), the Holy Spirit has been given (5: 32) and salvation through faith in Christ is now possible and indeed imperative (2: 38). The Pauline eschatological teaching about resurrection judgment, similarly forms part of the primitive apostolic tradition (*cf.* Acts 10: 42, and the appeal to a *datum* of faith in Rom. 2: 16).

That the primitive expectation of a second *parousia* does not loom large in the preaching of the apostles, and indeed is apparently confined to Peter's speech in Acts 3 (12ff.), causes the Bishop of Woolwich to suppose that Acts 3 shows us simply messianic expectation hesitantly continuing, while in Acts 2 we are presented with that expectation firmly realized; in neither, according to him, is a second coming envisaged.²² Yet even if the speeches in *Acts* are reported in summary form, as seems likely,²³ I find it hard to suppose that this tension remained unresolved in the same mind, or even in the minds of the same group of people, to such an extent that it survived the written record, if, as apparently happened, a resolution which involved a second coming of Christ asserted itself and persisted as a part of the earliest stream of kerygmatic *paradosis*. And in any case, Peter's appeal in Acts 3 has as its ground God's activity in Christ *already* accomplished (*cf.* verses 18 and 26); while the only way to account for the clear statements in this chapter of the *pre*-Resurrection messiahship of Jesus (*cf.* verses 18 and 20), is the questionable one of regarding them as later interpolations.

Before we draw to a conclusion, we must glance at the eschatological pattern of the Fourth Gospel. Alf Corell's book, *Consummatum Est* (1950, E.T. 1958), provides an illuminating commentary on the Fourth Evangelist's view of history, which we know and have seen to be of central importance to *St. John*. It is Corell's contention that here the Church is conceived as "sacred history" (p. 84), continuing the work of Christ from the resurrection to the *parousia*, and demonstrating thus the "inner connection between the varying events of history" (*ibid.*). As a direct outcome of the Easter-event, the Spirit, whose person and ministry are inseparable from the Church itself, is given (*cf.* 7: 39), and the cry of *τετέλεσται* (19: 30) extended, and itself consummated. Meanwhile, the Paraclete abides with the faithful

(14: 16), instructs the Church (16: 13) and inspires evangelism (16: 8 ; pp. 88ff.).

We are, of course, unable to escape the fact that the Johannine eschatology is almost entirely non-apocalyptic, and "realized" (6: 39f. is one exception, which Dr. C. K. Barrett, at least, accepts as an authentic part of the tradition⁴⁴); the *χρόσις* has already invaded time, the *alpha* has been replaced by the *omega*. I am not too ready, as it happens, to agree that the Church (as such) was the "inevitable outcome of Easter" (p. 85); and furthermore, there is a good deal of particularity, as well as corporateness, about the Fourth Gospel. But if this thesis of the link between the Church and eschatology in the Fourth Gospel is accepted, it will throw light on the Johannine eschatological perspective in one further direction. As well as adding significance to what we already know about the Fourth Evangelist's aim (which I take to be an investigation of the real source and meaning of the sacramental), it will remind us of the fulfilment and futurity, as well as the anticipation already present, which are implied in the *parousia* itself (p. 206). John is the least "linear" of the four evangelists, but because he infuses time with eternity, we need not make the mistake of supposing that he eliminates consummation, and even *parousia*, altogether.

* * * *

3. Conclusions

From the New Testament evidence we have surveyed, may I draw three conclusions about its eschatology?

(a) In speaking of "patterns" of New Testament eschatology, I have simply hoped to indicate that there are in the primitive church features which emerge (as I would say, from the teaching of Jesus Himself), and then begin to develop. And basically we may say that the patterns are founded on the announcement of the *ἔσχατον* already passed, but await their consummation in an *ἔσχατον* yet to come. Within these two points—the *Urzeit* of the Incarnation, and the *Endzeit* of the *parousia*—the patterns proliferate with no manifest linear evolution: to apocalyptic, to ethics and to the doctrine of the Spirit and the Church. They proliferate indeed, but they never separate.

(b) If eschatological consummation is acknowledged to be, even in the teaching of Jesus, a *future* event in some sense (as it is, for example, by Dr. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 and 58), why must it be regarded as so unlikely that Jesus thought of a second *parousia*, as opposed simply to an "appearance before God", inaugurated through His death? In any case, are we not here still begging the question of the meaning, manner and timing of that *τέλος*?

(c) Lest any should think that my criticisms of Dr. Robinson's position have scarcely warranted my earlier description of his book as "important", it must be said that he has given us a constructive as well as provocative study, relevant in two major directions. He has forced us to demythologize our traditional and often hazy language and thought about this subject; and he has also reminded us of the importance of recognizing the present as well as the future coming of Christ

to us. And *this* kind of eschatological perspective, surely, if we take it seriously, and follow its widest implications fully, will enrich and inform not only our worship and devotion to our Lord who comes in even as we wait for Him, but also our evangelism. In the words of Oscar Cullmann, "The missionary work of the Church is the eschatological foretaste of the Kingdom of God, and the Biblical hope of the 'end' constitutes the keenest incentive to action."²⁵

¹ H. Butterfield, *Christianity and History*, 1949, p. 67.

² O. Cullmann, *Christus und die Zeit*, ET 1951, p. 84.

³ Vide J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming*, 1957, pp. 17f. A distinction between the "first" and "second" comings of Christ is first made by Justin Martyr (cf. *Apology I*, 52. 3). He uses the term *parousia* of both.

⁴ Καταβαίνω is used only once of the return of Christ (1 Thess. 4: 16; cp. Jn. 3: 13).

⁵ J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 56f. and pp. 118ff.

⁶ Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 1959, *ad loc.*, p. 406.

⁷ G. R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 1957, p. 11 note 1.

⁸ The same objections would apply to the view (a modified version of which appears, for example, in Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 1952, pp. 636ff.) that verses 7-8, 14-20, 24-27 and 30-31 can be extracted and linked together as a regular but secondary piece of apocalyptic.

⁹ Vide G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, 1954, p. 100, where Dodd's position is cited from a private communication.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*; vide C. H. Dodd, *The Coming of Christ*, 2nd edn. 1954, p. 17; and also *The Parables of the Kingdom*, revised edn. 1936, pp. 59f.

¹¹ G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, p. 192.

¹² J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 45, and p. 50 note 3. Dr. Robinson regards Mk. 13: 26 as referring to *inaugurated* visitation, however, and suggests that this concept was then given (with the whole of the discourse in Mark 13) a future eschatological "twist" by the early church (p. 127). In line with this, it is interesting to see that Professor J. Jeremias (in *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, ET 1954, pp. 38ff.) regards the content of five *parousia* parables as having been reapplied to the new situation of the early church, in view of the delay (p. 52).

¹³ T. Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps*, 2nd edn. 1864, p. 20.

¹⁴ T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent*, 1945, pp. 63ff.

¹⁵ G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, p. 259.

¹⁶ J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 45 note 2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 53ff.

¹⁸ F. V. Filson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 1960, *ad loc.*, pp. 131f. If the phrase in its manifestly eschatological setting (Mt. 24: 27; Lk. 12: 40, *al.*) be so taken, why should we not give the same meaning to Lk. 18: 8b? But if we do, it makes nonsense of it.

¹⁹ Vide my article, "The Eschatology of Ephesians", in *The Evangelical Quarterly* XXVIII. 3 (July, 1956), pp. 153ff. For a consideration of this shift of emphasis with reference to Paul's reappraisal of the natural order, vide C. H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies*, 1953, pp. 109ff. (in the course of an essay on "The Mind of Paul").

²⁰ N. Q. Hamilton, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul*, *Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers* No. 6, pp. 17ff. The same tension is evident if we compare Rom. 13 (and 2: 5-10) with Rom. 8.

²¹ A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, 2nd edn. 1961, pp. 98ff.

²² J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 142ff.

²³ Vide for example, H. N. Ridderbos, *The Speeches of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1962, p. 11.

²⁴ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 1955, *ad loc.*, p. 244.

²⁵ O. Cullmann, "Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament", in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, 1956, p. 409.