CHAPTER FOUR

REALISED ESCHATOLOGY

From the view that Jesus erred in expecting a Parousia, we turn to the view that the early church erred in its hope. Realised Eschatology has found considerable support, especially in the Anglo Saxon world.[1] Its foremost exponent, Professor C. H. Dodd[2] maintains that in Jesus' ministry 'the kingdom of God has finally come . . . In the ministry of Jesus Christ the divine power is released in effective conflict with evil.' This is the fixed point of his exegesis, provided, as he claims, by the 'clear and unambiguous' passages[3] and supported by a particular interpretation of the parables. Dodd holds that Jesus' expectation for the future was three-fold:

a. His own coming death.[4]
b. Impending disaster for the Jews.[5]
c. Survival of death, and the triumph of God's cause in his own person.[6]

The earliest Christian preaching, which Dodd reconstructs from Acts 1-11[7] remained true (according to Dodd) to this teaching. However, within a few years—'once the tremendous crisis in which they felt themselves to be living'[8]—had passed, that which had originally been understood as one whole process was broken up into

[1] Cf. Bibliography in Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 2, n. 3, though this is not exhaustive: R. Otto and E. von Dobschütz are not included (cf. Barrett, in *S.J.T.* VI, 1953, p. 153) and the important work of J. A. T. Robinson (*Coming*) has since appeared.

[2] Cf. especially *Parables*, 1935: *Apostolic Preaching*, 1936. *History*, 1938: *Coming of Christ*, 1951: *Fourth Gospel*, 1953: *Studies* 1954. For a complete bibliography cf. *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. Davies and Daube, 1956.

[3] I.e. Mtt. 12, 28 = Lk. 11, 20. Mk. 1, 14-15. Lk. 10, 23-24 = Mtt. 13, 16-17. Lk. 11, 32 = Mtt. 12, 41-42. Mtt. 11, 1-11 = Lk. 7, 18-30. Mtt. 11, 12 = Lk. 16, 16.

[4] Cf. Mk. 10, 31-45. Lk. 9, 51-62. 13, 22f. 14, 25-33. Mk. 8, 34. Mtt. 16, 24. Lk. 9, 23. Mtt. 10, 38 = Lk. 14, 27.

[5] Cf. Mk. 14, 58. Jn. 2, 19. Mk. 13, 2. Mtt. 23, 37-38 = Lk. 13, 34-35. Lk. 19, 43-44. 21, 20. Mk. 13, 14-20. Lk. 13, 1-5.

[6] Cf. Mtt. 11, 23f. = Lk. 10, 13-14. Mtt. 10, 13 = Lk. 10, 12. Mtt. 12, 41-42 = Lk. 11, 31-32. Cf. *Parables*, chapter 3 (pp. 81ff.).

[7] Dodd maintains their authenticity: *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 30off.

[8] *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 72.

death-resurrection-exaltation on the one hand, and Parousia on the other.[1] The Parousia, that is to say, came to be understood as the last event in a chronological series [2] and the early church fell back into apocalypticism.[3]

Dodd's understanding of Paul's thought is greatly influenced by his conviction that Paul underwent considerable spiritual and psychological development [4] involving the 'transcending of a certain harsh dualism . . . very deeply rooted in the apocalyptic eschatology which moulded the *Weltanschauung* with which Paul began . . .' [5] Thus, initially Paul's faith was fitted into an apocalyptic framework (cf I Thess.1, 9 -10. II Thess. 2).[6] This persists in I Corinthians though there is a slight change of emphasis, for 'whereas in I Thessalonians it is distinctly exceptional for a Christian to die before the Advent, in I Corinthians he has to assure his readers that not all Christians will die. He himself, with others, will survive to the Advent (I Cor. 15, 51-52).[7] Thereafter 'the thought of the imminence of the Advent retires into the background'.[8] At the same time there is a 'growing emphasis on eternal life here and now in communion with Christ',[9] and in place of the early world denial (cf I Cor. 7) comes a positive evaluation of the world, of political institutions (Rom. 13, 1-10), of the instinctive goodness of the natural man (Rom. 2, 14-15) and of the family and marriage ties (Col. 3, 18f. Eph. 5, 21-33).

In the Fourth Gospel, Dodd finds the ultimate stage of the development traced in Paul, namely the re-interpretation, or transmutation of popular eschatology,[10] and thereby the return to the true intention of Jesus' teaching.[11]

[1] *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 64ff.
[2] Whereas, according to Dodd, the true, original hope is in 'the impending verification of the Church's faith that the finished work of Christ has in itself absolute value'. *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 92.
[3] *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 80ff.
[4] Cf. *Studies*, pp. 80ff. 108ff.
[5] Cf. *Studies*, p. 126.
[6] Cf. *Studies*, p. 109.
[7] Cf. *Studies*, p. 110.
[8] Cf. *Studies*, p. 111.
[9] Cf. *Studies*, p. 113.
[10] Cf. Dodd's comments on Jn. 14, 1-24 (*Fourth Gospel*, pp. 390ff.). Here (he argues) it is made clear that 'the true Parousia is to be found in the interchange of divine ἀγάπη, made possible through Christ's death and resurrection' (*op. cit.* p. 395).
[11] Cf. *Fourth Gospel*, p. 406.

Dodd maintains that apocalyptic language was used by Jesus only as a form in which to express eternal truths.[1] The myths concerning the 'beginning' and 'end' of history serve to give absoluteness to particular concepts: ('the myth of the last Judgement is a symbolic statement of the final resolution of the great conflict'[2]).

T. F. Glasson [3] has endeavoured to trace more fully the transition from Jesus' view to that of the early church. Briefly, his thesis is that the Parousia idea 'is certainly absent from the Old Testament, the most important source for the teaching of Jesus',[4] nor is it found in apocryphal literature,[5] and, in apocalyptic writings 'we find in most of them the Old Testament conception of an earthly king'.[6] The idea of a Parousia in Jesus' teaching would be out of place (he says) since Jesus regarded his own death as the gateway to a new epoch.[7] Even in the earliest days of the church there was no idea of Parousia.[8] But by the time of Paul, the idea had developed, through the influence of the Old Testament and apparently unfulfilled prophecies,[9] through the identification of Jesus with 'the Lord' which facilitated the transference of theophanic imagery to him,[10] and through the Anti-Christ legend, imported into Christianity and serving to give imminence to the expectation.[11]

[1] Cf. *Parables*, pp. 195ff.
[2] *History*, p. 170. N.B. In Dodd's later work, *Coming of Christ*, he links the final resolution with a real conclusion of human history, thus providing a not insignificant modification of his former views: see esp. pp. 26f.
[3] *The Second Advent*, 1945 (revised 1947).
[4] *Advent*, p. 13 ('Daniel being no exception', p. 14).
[5] *Advent*, p. 19.
[6] *Advent*, p. 20. Glasson find that 'the bulk of this literature is either silent' about, or denies, the idea of a descent of the Messiah in visible glory from heaven (p. 23). The exception, the similitudes of Enoch are 'unique in Jewish writings' and 'present marked differences from the eschatology of the N.T.' (p. 33). He thinks Charles and Otto mistaken in maintaining the dependence of N.T. writers on Enoch (pp. 41ff.): that the Similitudes depend on Daniel for Son of Man imagery and that Jesus most likely went to the same source: that the Similitudes should (with Bousset's support) be dated mid 1st century A.D.
[7] Cf. *Advent*, pp. 63ff.
[8] Cf. 'The Kerygma: is our version correct', in *H.J.* LI, 1952-3, where Glasson reconstructs the original five main points of the primitive kerygma, from which the Parousia is absent.
[9] Cf. *Advent*, pp. 159ff.
[10] Cf. *Advent*, pp. 162ff.
[11] Cf. *Advent*, pp. 180ff. Glasson maintains that alongside this false development, leading to Millenarianism and the Book of Revelation, we find the true understanding (i.e. true to Jesus' intention) developed in Paul's

Glasson finds confirmation that the Parousia is an early church idea in the absence of the theme in Jewish writings of the Christian era.[1]

J. A. T. Robinson [2] has also sought to probe the foundations of the Parousia hope since (he argues) it is lacking in traditional Jewish expectation [3] and in early Christian preaching and confessions.[4] His conclusion is that into the traditional Jewish eschatological pattern, Jesus brought the message that God was *now* performing a decisive act 'whose climax he described in such terms as the coming in power, whether of the Kingdom of God or of the Son of Man'.[5] This climax involved two interrelated themes, vindication and visitation. Concerning the former, he affirms that 'as far as Jesus' own words are concerned, there is nothing to suggest that he shared the expectation of a return in glory which the Church entertained and ascribed to him'.[6] Visitation [7], Robinson maintains, has three aspects [8] none of which refers to the Parousia. The themes of vindication and visitation 'meet in a point where the crisis brought by his ministry comes to its head . . .' [9]

In the early days of the church's life, certain aspects of the crisis spoken of by Jesus were given a chronological setting and thus received a temporal instead of a moral connotation.[10] The reason behind such a transition was, according to Robinson, the confusion of two divergent Christologies.[11] The earliest held that 'the Christ

later work (especially in Ephesians) and, supremely, in the Johannine literature, the Gospels and Epistles.

[1] What instances there are, he concludes (following Bousset) to be due to contact with Christian thought or to interpolation: cf. *Advent*, pp. 231f.

[2] Cf. *In the End, God . . .*, 1950: 'The Most Primitive Gospel of All?' in *J.T.S.* VII, 1956, pp. 177ff. *Jesus and His Coming*, 1957.

[3] Cf. *Coming*, p. 22.

[4] Cf. *Coming*, pp. 28ff.

[5] Cf. *Coming*, p. 39.

[6] *Coming*, p. 57.

[7] A theme familiar (says Robinson) to the Jews through the conviction that God would 'visit' his people: cf. *Coming*, pp. 59ff.

[8] Jesus speaks of a 'coming' which has already come and of a consequent crisis facing all whom he addresses: also of an immediately impending crisis for the Jewish nation: and of a coming to the disciples. cf. *Coming*, pp. 66ff.

[9] *Coming*, p. 77.

[10] This shift of emphasis, Robinson says, is comparable to the transition from prophetic (cf. Jesus) to apocalyptic (cf. the church) eschatology. Cf. *Coming*, pp. 94ff.

[11] Cf. *Coming*, pp. 140ff. 'The Most Primitive Gospel of All?' in *J.T.S.* VII, 1956, pp. 177ff.

will come (he has not yet!), and will be Jesus' (cf Acts 3): the later Christology affirmed that 'Christ has come' (cf Acts 2). The latter properly represents Jesus' thought as he contemplated his passion and exaltation in advance. The two Christologies were never really reconciled in the church, with the result that the twin affirmations Christ *has come*, and Christ *will come*, were held. It is in the Fourth Gospel, according to Robinson, that the necessary synthesis is achieved and the Parousia is given its proper meaning as 'the mutual indwelling of Jesus and the disciples in love, which is the essence of the Parousia.'[1]

In an earlier work,[2] Robinson had already shown how, in his view, the myth of the Parousia was to be re-interpreted. He wrote, 'the idea of the Second Advent in the New Testament stands for the conviction that if the events of the Incarnation have the eschatological character asserted of them, then history MUST come to a close . . . . . It also represents the inescapable conviction that the end of God's purpose, however clearly embodied in the Incarnation, has NOT YET come in the most final sense possible'.[3] 'And yet the purpose of the eschatological myth is not simply or primarily to draw out the implications of what WILL BE. It is first of all a description of what IS . . . . .' [4]

In our criticism of Realised Eschatology we shall endeavour to discuss separately the four main areas of concern, the Synoptic evidence, the earliest Christian preaching, Paul's epistles and the Fourth Gospel.

In the Synoptic gospels there are two main areas where Dodd differentiates between Jesus' teaching and the embellishment of the early church. The first concerns the Parables. These have an individual stamp which (Dodd says) 'encourages us to believe that they belong to the most original and authentic part of the tradition'.[5]

[1] *Coming*, p. 178.

[2] *In the End, God . . .*, 1950.

[3] Cf. *In the End, God . . .*, p. 58.

[4] Cf. *In the End, God . . .*, p. 64. There is an interesting convergence in this matter of Protestant and Roman Catholic theology; cf. further below, p. 64.

[5] *History*, p. 89. Cf. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 10. The *a priori* in Dodd's methodology is here apparent. Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, p. 88 writes, 'Er setzt hier offenbar voraus, dass im Menschen eine apriorische Urteilskraft vorhanden ist, die ihm die Möglichkeit gibt, innerhalb der evangelischen Tradition zwischen mehr oder weniger charakteristischen und echten Bestandteilen zu unterscheiden.'

Dodd, accepting that they were not intended as allegories [1] affirms that they 'called to decision' by 'presenting one comparison clearly'.[2] Mk. 4, 11-12 is, therefore, understood as the embarrassment solution of the early church [3] following the loss of the original *Sitz im Leben* and of their original meaning. Dodd, however, appears to be tied too closely to the term 'parable', whereas the background meaning of παραβολή, as has been shown,[4] suggests that the required decision could be evoked through the presentation of a problem, riddle or mystery—here, the 'mystery of the Kingdom of God'.[5] In this way, the parables can be seen to share in the equivocal character of the entire ministry and teaching of Jesus,[6] and, precisely because of their non-transparent quality, to have been especially suited to become Jesus' teaching method, inviting and allowing a free response to himself.[7]

Dodd claims to rediscover the original *Sitz im Leben* and to use this as the key in determining the parables' true meaning.[8] He does this in two ways. First, he finds the main theme of Jesus' teaching from 'clear and unambiguous passages'—but these (which we must discuss in a moment) are, actually, amongst the most difficult and disputed in the New Testament. Secondly, he determines the meaning of the parables in the light of these 'clear' passages

[1] Jülicher's thesis, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 1899. His exclusiveness, however, has been modified by many; cf. Cadoux, *Parables*, pp. 50ff. Oesterley, *Parables*, pp. 12ff. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 16. Black, 'The Parables as Allegory', in *B.J.R.L.* XLII, 1960. As A. H. M.'Neile said, 'The principal object in the foreground of a picture is not the only object visible' (quoted by A. Walls, in the *T.S.F.* Bulletin XXXII, 1962, p. 12).

[2] *Parables*, p. 22.

[3] Similarly Cadoux, *Parables*, p. 15. Smith, *Parables*, p. 28. Guy, *Last Things*, pp. 24f. Boobyer, in *E.T.* LXII, 1950, pp. 131ff. Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 11f. concludes that the saying, though authentic, is wrongly applied to the parables.

[4] Cf. Cranfield, 'Mark iv; 1-34' in *S.J.T.* IV, 1951, pp. 398ff. and V, 1952, pp. 49ff. (with bibliography).

[5] Cf. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 16.

[6] 'ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται', Mk. 4, 11.

[7] Cf. Torrance, in *Essays in Christology*, pp. 13ff. Cranfield, *Mark*, pp. 152ff. Torrance, 'A Study in N.T. communication', in *S.J.T.* III, 1950, pp. 298ff. (Here, following Wallace in *S.J.T.* II, 1949, pp. 13ff., Torrance writes, 'Jesus deliberately concealed the Word in the parable lest men against their will should be forced to acknowledge the Kingdom, and yet He allowed them enough light to convict them and to convince them.').

[8] Cf. *Parables*, pp. 26ff.

and *then* posits what their *Sitz im Leben* must have been [1]—but this is, of course, a circular method and the reverse of the procedure proposed! [2] Had the parables been so dependent upon their context for their true meaning as Dodd suggests, one might ask whether it is likely that this setting would quickly or lightly be forgotten. It is at least possible that their key is to be found not in any particular context but in their general relationship to the person and work of Christ.[3]

The second area of concern in the Synoptic material is apocalyptic. Some deny the presence of apocalyptic language and ideas in Jesus' message.[4] Others argue that Jesus used apocalyptic only as the *form* of his message.[5] The former contention can hardly be sustained except with the aid of *a priori* distinctions between a non-apocalyptic Jesus and an apocalyptic early church.[6] The other argument is also difficult; the use of the title Son of Man, for instance, suggests that not only is the term taken from apocalyptic [7] but also that it is being understood in terms of its meaning in apocalyptic tradition.[8] Besides, if Jesus used apocalyptic only as the form of his teaching, he clearly (on Dodd's thesis) failed to make this apparent to his hearers amongst whom the impression was created that this teaching actually embraced some of the ideas of apocalyptic.

[1] Cf. *Parables*, ch. 2 for the meaning: chs. 3-6 for the *Sitz im Leben*.

[2] Jeremias' method is ostensibly opposite: first 'Return to Jesus from the Primitive Church' (*Parables*, pp. 20-88), then, 'Message of the Parables' (*Parables*, pp. 89ff). Yet, in fact, here too the message of the parables is the guiding principle in the first section.

[3] Cf. Morgenthaler, 'Formgeschichte und Gleichnisauslegung', in *T.Z.* VI, 1950, pp. 1ff. contrast Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 20f.

[4] Cf. Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 63ff. Bowman, *Intention*, pp. 51ff. Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 83f. Goguel, *Birth*, pp. 271ff.

[5] Cf. Dodd, *History*, p. 135. Guy, *Last Things*, pp. 63ff. Holmes-Gore 'The Ascension and the Apocalyptic Hope', in *Theology*, XXXII, 1936, pp. 356ff. ('even the most apocalyptic of Christ's sayings should be interpreted in a spiritual sense', he writes). It is interesting to note that Bultmann, who follows Wrede in his scepticism, follows Schweitzer in interpreting Jesus as strongly influenced by apocalypticism, whereas Dodd, who follows Schweitzer in his non-scepticism, follows Wrede in interpreting Jesus as not influenced by apocalypticism: cf. Bowman, 'From Schweitzer to Bultman', in *T.T.* XI, 1954, pp. 160ff.

[6] The same sort of distinction pressed by Schweitzer, but now in the opposite direction.

[7] Whether from Daniel or Enoch is for the moment immaterial.

[8] Cf. Cullmann, *Christology*, pp. 155f. Taylor, *Names*, pp. 25ff.

The demythologizing involved in realised eschatology is here to the fore.[1] Of course, the problem of recognising what is only picture language has long been felt,[2] and it is questionable whether every item in apocalyptic was ever taken literally.[3] But the distinction between imagery and literal truth is, surely, abandoned where (as in Realised Eschatology) all futurist eschatology is regarded as myth. This demythologizing, distinct from Bultmann's, is in danger of becoming Docetic: as Morgenthaler[4] writes, 'All die Argumente, die er (Dodd) gegen die futurische Eschatologie ins Feld führt, müssen sich schliesslich gegen seine realisierte Eschatologie wenden.'

Behind Realised Eschatology is an apologetic motif. Schweitzer maintained that Jesus was simply mistaken in his expectation of an imminent Parousia. Dodd accepts that the New Testament reflects such an imminent expectation and mistake, but transfers the onus of error onto the early church and safeguards Jesus from becoming an apocalyptic *Schwärmer*. His thesis, therefore, presupposes a cleavage between the early church and Jesus as great as that affirmed on Schweitzer's view, yet the antithesis may be no more necessary or correct than in Schweitzer's case.[5]

Fundamental in Dodd's thesis is his exegesis of the so-called 'clear and unambiguous' passages. A brief review of these will suffice to show how little they support Dodd's view:

i. Mtt. 12, 28 = Lk. 11, 20[6]. Anticipating later discussion[7], we suggest that φθάνειν points to a real *yet proleptic* presence of the Kingdom in Jesus' exorcisms.[1] Werner[2] rightly maintains that the saying is difficult and must be interpreted by 'non-ambiguous' passages.

ii. Mk. 1, 14-15.[3] Again anticipating,[4] we suggest that ἤγγικεν here, parallel to πεπλήρωται, points to a real but proleptic presence of the Kingdom in the person and work of Christ.

iii. Lk. 10, 23-24 = Mtt. 13, 16-17.[5] The 'things' (ἅ) in question are Jesus' words and works. The Kingdom *is* present[6] but in this ambiguous, and therefore not final, manner.

iv. Lk. 11, 31-32 = Mtt. 12, 41-42.[7] Whilst the presence of the eschatological expectation in the person of Jesus is affirmed here, the possibility of further future fulfilment is not excluded. Indeed the future judgement is referred to in the future tense ἀναστήσονται and ἐγερθήσεται. Glasson[8] tries to evade the significance of these futures, but Kümmel[9] points out that a translation without a future reference would contradict the usage of κρίσις in the phrase ἡμέρα κρίσεως, and Klostermann[10] notes that 'will rise up' is NOT a Semitism for 'rising up in accusation' but definitely refers to the resurrection of the last day. The passage, far from denying a future final judgement, rather affirms it.[11]

v. Mtt. 11, 1-11 = Lk. 7, 18-30.[12] Whilst the presence of the Kingdom is here affirmed, it is directly related to Jesus' words and works (Mtt. 11, 5) and its presence is apparently ambiguous:[13] it remains, therefore, a prolepsis of a final, unambiguous manifestation.

---

[1] Demythologizing is intentional: cf. Dodd, *History*, p. 170, Glasson, *Advent*, p. 236. Robinson, *In the End, God . . .*, pp. 33ff.

[2] Cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, pp. 19f. Wilder, 'Eschatological imagery and earthly circumstance', in *N.T.S.* V, 1958, pp. 229ff.

[3] Leckie, *World to Come*, pp. 17ff. goes too far, cf. Cadoux, *Historic Mission*, pp. 340ff. Fritsch, in *T.T.* X, 1953, pp. 357ff.

[4] *Kommendes Reich*, p. 91.

[5] Bowman, in *T.T.* XI, 1954, pp. 160ff. accepts McCown's remarks (concerning Schweitzer, in *The Search for the Real Jesus*, p. 252) 'Progress toward the truth is not made by the conflict between two (often confusedly opposed) alternatives, such as supernatural or rational, mythical or historical, eschatological or non-eschatological. His whole argument is based upon the "either/or" fallacy, the "fallacy of antithesis" or "abstraction" or "misplaced concreteness" (p. 169). The same could, surely, be said of Dodd.

[6] Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 43ff. *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 32. *History* p. 96. Glasson, *Advent*, p. 107. Robinson (*Coming*) has no mention.

[7] Cf. below, p. 167.

[1] Cf. Michaelis, *Matthäus, ad loc.* Flückiger, *Ursprung*, p. 95. Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, p. 44. Manson, in *Eschatology*, p. 10.

[2] *Formation*, p. 50.

[3] Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 44.

[4] Cf. below, pp. 166ff.

[5] Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 46. Glasson, *Advent*, p. 115. Robinson, *Coming*, p. 64.

[6] Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, pp. 46f. denies a reference here to the Kingdom: contrast, rightly, Dodd, *Parables*, p. 46.

[7] Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 47. Glasson, *Advent*, p. 108.

[8] Cf. *Advent*, p. 128 (following Wellhausen, McNeile and others). Contrast Robinson, *Coming*, p. 37, n. 1 who admits Glasson's failure here.

[9] *Promise*, p. 44, n. 84 (cf. also pp. 36ff.)

[10] *Matthäus, ad loc.*

[11] Cf. Kümmel. *Promise*, p. 44. Michaelis, *Matthäus, ad loc.* Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, p. 47.

[12] Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 47.

[13] Cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 111. Schniewind, *Matthäus, ad loc.*

vi. Mtt. 11, 12 = Lk. 16, 16.[1] The verb βιάζεται is difficult. Most probably it should be translated with a passive sense [2] and *in malam partem*.[3] The meaning then must be that in some sense the Kingdom of God is present (as it was *not* before Jesus' ministry), yet present in a way which allows it to be attacked. The ἕως ἄρτι sets a limit to this and contrasts the presence of the kingdom *now* with a presence yet to be realised ἐν δυνάμει.[4]

We find, therefore, in these passages a 'realised eschatology' which is a) directly related to the person and work of Christ and not affirmed in any abstract or universal sense: and b) hidden and ambiguous, pointing forward to a yet future fulfilment of the old expectation of a manifest, universal, unequivocal presence. These passages can hardly stand as the foundation of Realised Eschatology.

The second main area of concern is the earliest Christian preaching. Dodd reconstructs the kerygma from Acts 1-11, counting the Parousia among the five major components. But he interprets this from the standpoint of Mk. 1, 14f. and dismisses its character as a future historical event. However, the ultimate nature of the Parousia as a future event cannot, consistently, be demythologized without also bringing into question the nature and historicity of the past events on which the speeches of Acts lay great weight.[5]

Glasson [6] omits the Parousia from his reconstruction of the primitive kerygma, excising the two references in Acts on the basis of numerical inferiority. This methodology, however, is open to

[1] Dodd, *Parables*, p. 48. Glasson, *Advent*, p. 141. Robinson, *Coming* p. 41. Dodd, in the forward to his 3rd edition of *Parables* admits that the passage is not specially satisfactory for his thesis.

[2] Cf. Schrenk, in *T.W.N.T.* I, pp. 611f. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 122, n. 67.

[3] Cf. Schrenk, in *T.W.N.T.* I, pp. 611f. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 122. Cullmann, *State*, p. 20. *Early Church*, p. 197. Michaelis, *Matthäus*, I, *ad loc.* Schlatter, *Matthäus*, *ad loc.* Torrance, *When Christ comes*, pp. 117f. thinks that both active and passive can stand, and Klostermann, *Matthäus*, *ad loc.*, that both good and bad senses can.

[4] Cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 124. Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, pp. 46ff. Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 180f. holds that this forward look is present in Matthew but removed by Luke.

[5] Cf. Cadbury, in *Background of the N.T.* pp. 300ff. Kümmel, in *N.T.S.* V, 1959, pp. 113ff. Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, pp. 91ff.

[6] *Advent*, pp. 154ff. and in *H.J.* LI, 1952-3, pp. 129ff.

serious criticism.[1] According to Glasson [2] the Parousia hope arose through the application to Jesus of certain Old Testament imagery referring to JHWH, on the basis of the conviction that 'Jesus is Lord'. But even Robinson (who accepts Glasson's thesis in so many particulars) cannot find here a suitable explanation, since the Gospels speak of a Parousia of the Son of Man, rather than of the Lord.[3] Besides, there is a qualitative distinction between recognising that the early church increasingly applied Old Testament passages to the risen Lord and supposing that, by the application of certain passages to him, the church created for itself a hope foreign to Jesus' teaching.

Robinson finds both Acts 3, 20 and 10, 42 unconvincing.[4] In Acts 10, 42 it is said that Jesus is ὡρισμένος, and Robinson says 'there is no suggestion that he will judge only at some second coming, no mention of which in fact is made'.[5] However, whilst the Old Testament knows of interim judgements in history,[6] one of its firm expectations was that God would ultimately exercise his judgement (either directly or through a mediator) at the great and final assize.[7] The reference to Jesus as judge-appointed of the living and the dead was, surely, intended to convey this idea of a final epiphany in judgement.[8] Acts 3, 20, Robinson argues,[9] does not contain a reference to Jesus' Parousia but to his status as Messiah-elect. Here we meet Robinson's answer to the question 'how did the Parousia hope arise?': he says it was through the confusion of the primitive Christology of Acts 3, 12-26 with the later Christology

[1] Glasson, by analysis (*Advent*, pp. 154ff.) finds 5 points which occur in every speech: but whether these 5 alone formed the original kerygma cannot be determined by his analysis alone (Cadbury, in *Background of the N.T.* p. 317 points out that the speeches are not necessarily typical or comprehensive . . .) Besides, the analysis says nothing about the historicity of articles which do not feature in every speech. The exaltation of Christ (Acts 2, 33. 3, 13. 5, 31) and the call to repentance (Acts 2, 38. 3, 19. 5, 31) are each only mentioned 3 times, but Glasson does not question their place.

[2] *Advent*, pp. 157ff.

[3] *Coming*, p. 41.

[4] Cf. *Coming*, pp. 28ff.

[5] *Coming*, p. 28.

[6] Cf. above, chapter 2. Peake, *Problem of Suffering in the O.T.* pp. 1ff. Bentzen, *Introduction to the O.T.* pp. 162f.

[7] Cf. above, chapter 2.

[8] Cf. Dibelius, *Studies*, p. 56. Jackson and Lake, *Acts*, *ad loc.* cf. also I Peter 4, 5. II Tim. 4, 1. Barnabas 7, 2. II Clem. 1, 1. etc.

[9] Cf. *Coming*, pp. 153f. and in *J.T.S.* VII, 1956, pp. 177ff.

of Acts 2. But we make here two criticisms of this. First, Acts 3, 12-20 does *not* contain a Messiah-elect Christology. During the narrative (3, 13-15) it is said that the Servant, the Holy and Righteous One, the Prince of Life *has* come, *has* died and risen and now works (v. 16). Verse 18 might contain, as Robinson holds[1] a Lukan formulation, but the idea it expresses is present already in vv. 13ff. Robinson supports his dismissal of v. 18 on the grounds that 'if we are to accept the words . . . as an integral part of the original speech then it is difficult on any reconstruction to find in it a consistent theology'.[2] This is no justification for excising the verse and appears, anyway, to be unfounded—on the basis of the events of Christ's life, death etc. (summed up in v. 18) comes the call to repentance (vv. 22-26). Secondly, the relation of Acts 2 to Acts 3 must be questioned. Both contain an emphasis on fulfilled events (2, 3ff. 3, 18), on the present as the time of repentance (2, 37-40.3, 21-26), and the future aspect of salvation-history (though not explicit in Acts 2—(contrast 3, 20-21)—it is implicit in the call of vv. 39-40).[3] It would indeed be surprising if this supposed primitive Christology should so completely drop out of the tradition and yet be responsible for such far reaching and erroneous an understanding of the future.

Even if these two passages are allowed to stand as references to the Parousia[4] it remains true that early preaching, in general, 'was concerned with events which had already happened and of which the Apostles were witnesses'.[5] This, however, does not mean that the Parousia hope did not form an integral part of the earliest Christian faith. As 'conversion preaching'[6] these speeches would not be the context in which to find teaching concerning the Parousia. The conviction that the Parousia is to come is itself the mainspring of mission and lies *behind* the conversion preaching of Acts.

[1] Cf. in *J.T.S.* VII, 1956, p. 183. This is accepted by Jackson and Lake, *Acts*, p. 37. Contrast Bruce, *Acts*, *ad loc* 2, 23.

[2] *J.T.S.* VII, 1956, p. 183.

[3] The imagery is similar in some respects: cf. 2, 39 with 3, 24; 26. and 2, 40 with 3, 23.

[4] Cf. Bruce, *Acts*, *ad loc.* Jackson and Lake, *Acts*, *ad loc.* Dibelius, *Studies*, p. 56. All agree, with varying definiteness, that some idea of a Parousia is contained in one or both verses.

[5] Glasson, *Advent*, p. 155.

[6] Cf. B. Reicke, 'A synopsis of Early Christian Preaching', in *The Fruit of the Vine*, ed. Fridrichsen, esp. pp. 136ff.

The third main area of interest is Paul's eschatology. Dodd's hypothesis of a development in Paul's eschatological ideas may be criticised on general grounds. The dating of the Epistles, so important for Dodd's thesis, is open to dispute.[1] The psychological reconstruction of Paul's personality is extremely questionable.[2] The theory of a second conversion, which is said to have accomplished what the first could not, is also doubtful.[3] The idea of such radical development appears inherently improbable.[4]

Anticipating the exegetical discussion which concerns us later, we suggest that beneath the surface of Paul's letters, which changes according to the needs and circumstances being addressed, there is a constant and consistent eschatological framework in which the past, dominated by the Cross and Resurrection, the present, dominated by the Spirit, and the future, dominated by the Parousia, all have their necessary place. Taken alone, Realised Eschatology must give a one-sided and incomplete picture of Paul's thought.[5]

The fourth area of concern is the Fourth Gospel. Here, according to Dodd[6] is found the full return to Jesus' original intention.

[1] This matter is clearly vital for Dodd. He rightly allows 20 pages to argue for a late date for the Captivity Epistles. Yet in the matter of Galations—although recognising that 'the date of Galations is greatly disputed' (*Studies*, p. 85)—he is content to leave the question after a brief mention, concluding (following Burton) that it dates from c. 54-57.

[2] Cf. *Studies*, pp. 67ff. Deissmann, *Paul*, pp. 55ff. does not offer anything like the same picture, counting the remarkable tensions in Paul as his strength and greatness: similarly McNeile, *Paul*, pp. 2ff.

[3] Paul refers to the Damascus road incident (Gal. 1, 15) in a passage where important events bearing on his apostleship are being enumerated, yet does not mention the second 'really significant' experience save in a passing reference, II Cor. 12, 9!

[4] According to Gal. 1, 17-18; 21. 2, 1., Paul spent some 15 or 16 years (cf. Dibelius, *Paul*, p. 58) working in Syria and Cilicia before his missionary journeyings began and before any of his epistles were written. It seems intrinsically unlikely that we should find any radical development in Paul's thought in the letters dating from 'the last fifteen years of his working life' (Dibelius, *Paul*, p. 59). Dibelius concludes, 'Except for changes in the emphasis of certain particular doctrines, all the attempts of scholars to distinguish between a doctrinal system that was as yet undeveloped—in the earliest letters that we have (to Thessalonica)—and that of the four principal letters . . . have broken down' (*Paul*, p. 60). Contrast, with Dodd, Barclay, *Mind*, p. 218. Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 286ff.

[5] Cf. Barrett, in *S.J.T.* VI, 1953, p. 145. Ladd, in *E.T.* XLVIII, 1956, pp. 268ff. Hunter, *Interpreting Paul's Gospel*, pp. 52f.

[6] Cf. *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 155f. *Fourth Gospel*, *passim*. Glasson *Advent*, pp. 210ff. Robinson, *Coming*, p. 178.

The development is similar to that posited by Schweitzer, but this is now understood as a move nearer to Jesus rather than away from him. Exegetical discussion again concerns us later,[1] but here there are certain general matters which must be raised. Many scholars maintain that the historicity of the Fourth Gospel must be taken very seriously [2] and that the old antithesis 'Synoptics or John' is wholly inadequate.[3] The Johannine emphasis on the present is not unique (for it is by no means absent from the Synoptics [4]), nor is it, necessarily, exclusive. It is understandable in terms of the writer's intention.[5] Further, the Parousia is not so easily eliminated from the Fourth Gospel as Dodd suggests.[6] Certainly the Fourth Gospel recognises that with Jesus' past appearance came the End —and with it Judgement,[7] the Resurrection,[8] condemnation and blessing.[9] There are also passages where the present and future aspects of the End almost coincide[10] and where the two tenses must qualify each other: the hour is not wholly future, it is also *now*: but neither is it wholly present, it is *to come*. Again, there are sayings where the future aspects of the End are clearly expressed— the actual final judgement,[11] the actual final resurrection of the dead[12] and the actual Parousia of Jesus at the End.[13] The mystical

[1] Cf. below, pp. 157ff.

[2] Cf. Westcott, *John*, pp. liiiff. Barrett, *John*, p. 117. Lightfoot, *John*, p. 30. Strachan, *Fourth Gospel*, p: 18.

[3] Cf. Howard, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 19ff. 128 f. Riesenfeld, *Gospel Tradition*. Strachan, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 18f.

[4] Cf. Mk. 1, 15. 2, 18-22. 8, 34f. 9, 38f. 10, 42f. 13, 5ff. etc. Moule. 'The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel', in *N.T.* V, 1962, pp. 171ff.

[5] Dodd and others (including Barrett, *John*, p. 115) conclude that the gospel was in part prompted by the Parousia delay and its consequences. But the reason given in 20, 30-31 is surely adequate—'to encourage the readers to hold fast their belief' (Tasker, *John*, p. 28). If the gospel had in mind certain false ideas, and especially gnosticism (cf. Barrett, *John*, pp. 31ff. 114f.) then its emphases are understandable: in combatting gnosticism, the writer does not eliminate futurist eschatology, but he emphasises present faith union with Christ—faith as union rather than gnosis, effectual through the Spirit (cf. Weber, *Eschatologie und Mystik*, pp. 168ff. and Howard, *Christianity*, p. 120).

[6] *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 151. *Fourth Gospel*, esp. pp. 390ff.

[7] Cf. Jn. 3, 18. 9, 39. 12, 47. 5, 22. 12, 28.

[8] Cf. Jn. 5, 24. 6, 47. 11, 25.

[9] Cf. Jn. 5, 24. 6, 11; 40; 51. 3, 36. 12, 31. 16, 11.

[10] Cf. Jn. 4, 23. 5, 25. where the 'clash and paradox of tense characteristic of the N.T.' (Barrett, *John*, p. 56) is to be seen.

[11] Cf. Jn. 12, 48. 5, 29.

[12] Cf. Jn. 5, 29. 6, 40. 11, 24.

[13] Cf. Jn. 14, 2-3. 17, 24. chapter 21.

present aspect of salvation is but 'die Vorausnahme der Zukunft Gottes'.[1] The present mystical appropriation of the present reality of salvation is set forth in the Fourth Gospel within the framework of eschatology, and the clearly ambiguous usage of e.g. ἀνίστημι, ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζῶης, τετέλεσται, serves to emphasise this.[2] 'Christ as a figure of history belongs to the past and to the present. He came forth from God, sent by him. He has gone back to the Father. The Johannine view of revelation demands that he should have a future if the historical revelation is to be fulfilled. That is why St. John has not given up his expectation of a consummation.' [3]

Realised Eschatology rightly recognises that the New Testament emphatically declares that the Kingdom of God has come and is not 'wholly futurist'.[4] However, this 'realisation' is connected in the New Testament directly with the person and work of Christ and therefore with the lowliness and hiddenness characteristic of his ministry. It therefore carries the promise of future fulfilment, indeed demands future fulfilment. The pre-Christian hope centered upon an awaited universal, unambiguous manifestation of God's rule, and the coming of God's kingdom in Jesus' incarnate life does not exclude such a future, unambiguous coming, but rather confirms it as an object of hope.[5] The present is evaluated falsely if it is seen only in the light of the past event (Incarnation) and not also in the light of the future End. Realised Eschatology can 'speak no word of teleological hope to those now grappling with the historical dilemmas of our time.'[6] The future for which Realised Eschatology looks [7] misses entirely the historical particularity of

[1] Weber, *Eschatologie und Mystik*, p. 196.

[2] Cf. Cullmann, in *T.Z.* IV, 1948, pp. 360ff.

[3] Howard, *Christianity*, p. 212. Cf. also Ladd, in *E.T.* LXVIII, 1956-7, pp. 270ff. Kümmel, in *T.B.* XV, 1936, pp. 225ff. Meinertz, *Theologie*, II, pp. 280ff. Körner, in *Ev. T.* 1954, pp. 171ff. Stählin, in *Z.N.W.* XXXIII, 1944, pp. 225ff. Strachan, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 13f. Barrett, *John*, pp. 56ff. Wood, *Jesus*, p. 185.

[4] Cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, pp. 105ff. Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, pp. 58ff. Cullmann, *Early Church*, p. 115. Rust, in *T.T.* X, 1953, pp. 327ff. Bruce, in *L.Q.H.R.* 1958, pp. 99ff.

[5] Cf. Cranfield, in *Essays in Christology*, p. 87.

[6] Fison, *Hope*, p. 65.

[7] Dodd, *Coming*, p. 26 says, 'When in due course history ends, and the human race perishes from this planet, it will encounter God . . . This is how I understand the mysterious language of the Gospels about the final coming of the Son of Man.' Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 232f. thinks man may even 'look for a world-wide triumph of the Gospel' and suggests that 'man may ulti-

the Parousia in the New Testament, a particularity which is strictly parallel to that attaching to the Incarnation.[1] The difference between the two 'comings' is not that the first involved a coming onto the plane of history whilst the second does not, nor that the first involved the coming of the Son of Man whilst the second does not, but rather that whereas the first involved the coming of Jesus Son of Man in hiddenness, the second will consist of his coming in glory. It appears impossible to remove this particularity without misinterpreting the New Testament hope.[2] With the abandonment of such a hope comes the inevitable over-evaluation of the institutions of the present which is specially marked in Roman-Catholicism[3] but is not the prerogative of that church.[4] Realised Eschatology represents the swing of the pendulum from Schweitzer's extreme view, but it is doubtful whether the New Testament can be interpreted adequately at this extreme any more than it was at the opposite.

An appended note on Dodd's interpretation of the parables (cf. above pp. 53ff.) Dodd differentiates into two main blocks: parables of crisis (*Parables*, pp. 154ff) and parables of growth (*Parables*, pp. 175ff.). Concerning these we make the following brief comments:

1. Mtt. 24, 45-51 (= Lk. 12, 42-46). Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 158: Jeremias *Parables*, pp. 45f. Both see the original as a warning to the religious leaders of the time which has been re-interpreted (particularly by Luke) in terms of the Apostles and the Parousia hope. But, though 'servants' is a familiar designation (through the O.T.) of Israel's leaders, it appears from Mk. 10, 44 (cf. Mtt. 10, 24. Jn. 15, 15) that Jesus could refer to his disciples as δοῦλοι. Further, the picture of the return of the 'lord' is certainly painted in terms

mately be able to renew and wind up the universe . . .' (In *Appearing*, p. 191, he is willing to allow the possibility of a consummation of history 'by some supreme manifestation of the presence and power of Christ.')

[1] Acts 1, 11 is a good example of this particularity: 'this same Jesus' stresses the Christological particularity: 'shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven' emphasises the particularity of the context.

[2] Cf. e.g. Vidler, *Essays in Liberality*, p. 35.

[3] The Vatican Council of 29th July, 1944, decided to remove the dogma of a physical return of Christ into the world from that which can with certainty be taught: cf. the report by Werner, in *S.T.U.* 1944, pp. 117f.

[4] Cf. Robinson, *Coming*, p. 15. Fison, *Hope*, p. 65 speaking of 'catholically minded incarnationists' writes that 'their thinking centres round a community conceived of as organised on an organic rather than a dialectical pattern. This leads at times to a virtual deification of the church and to a transubstantiation of its earthly realities into realities of grace. For such an outlook lip-service to a traditional future eschatology may be genuine in so far as individual hopes of immortality are concerned, but it can hardly have any meaning in the biblical sense for any corporate hope either for the world or for the church.'

of a final judgement, resulting in rewards and punishments: Jesus could hardly have expected that such a picture would be understood only as framework.

2. Mk. 13, 33-37 (= Lk. 12, 35-38). Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 160f. Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 43f. Both maintain that it is a parable of crisis which may conceal a Messianic utterance of Jesus but has been variously interpreted by the early church in terms of the Parousia. Again, however, the imagery is of one who first goes away and then returns, and this is integral to the call to watchfulness. Had the crisis not been the impending Parousia, it is difficult to see why this particular 'framework' has been utilised (the prophets have, for example, other imagery in their crisis preaching: cf. Amos 3, 1ff.).

3. Mtt. 24, 43-44 (= Lk. 12, 39-40). Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 167f.: Glasson, *Advent*, p. 95: Robinson, *Coming*, p. 113: Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 93f. Jeremias says 'the proclamation of the coming catastrophe became a direction concerning conduct in view of the delayed Parousia' (*op. cit.* p. 41). Only Jeremias offers support for this conclusion (which is accepted by Robinson, *Coming*, p. 113 n. 2) (Glasson quotes a suggestion of Harnack, but appears to reject it). Jeremias objects that 'thief' in every other N.T. usage (I Thess. 5, 2; 4. II Pet. 3, 10. Rev. 3, 3. 16, 15) is a picture of imminent catastrophe: so the parable, he argues, must have been addressed to the crowd concerning the crisis of Jesus' presence. But the parable is equally suited, even where 'thief' is given Jeremias' meaning (which it does not necessarily have to bear!), to the disciples. The charge is to watchfulness in order that no thief will appear at all: though the Son of Man come, it would not be as a thief if they watch (Rev. 3, 3 supports this understanding).

4. Mtt. 25, 1-12. Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 172: Glasson, *Advent*, p. 93: Robinson, *Coming*, p. 69: Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 41f. Jeremias says that the clue is in v. 5 χρονίζοντος δὲ τοῦ νυμφίου which was originally unstressed. However, the delay *remains* unstressed! He also argues that the 'allegorical representation of the Messiah as a bridegroom is completely foreign to the whole of the O.T.', and he finds only one late Rabbinic example. However, as Meinertz (in *Synoptischen Studien für A. Wikenhauser*, pp. 94ff.) rightly notes, the O.T. often sees the relation of JHWH to Israel as that of groom to bride (cf. Ezek. 16, 7. Hos. 1-3. Is. 65, 2. Ps. 45, 3), and it would not be surprising therefore to find Jesus using such a picture of the Parousia of the Son of Man.

These are the parables of crisis. The parables of growth are seen in a similar light and originally (it is said) represented Jesus' ministry as 'the climax of a long process which prepared the way for it' (Dodd, *Parables*, p. 180).

1. Mk. 4, 26-29. Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 175f.: Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 91f. But the parable is not about growth! It is a comparison of the secret beginning with the certain, glorious harvest (cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, pp. 128f. Cranfield, *Mark*, pp. 169f. Schniewind, *Markus*, p. 47).

2. Mk. 4, 2-8 (cf. Mtt. 13, 3-9=Lk. 8, 5-8). cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 180f. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 92. For Jeremias, this is an assurance that 'out of nothing, in spite of apparent neglect, undeterred by failure, God is bringing in His Kingdom'. But it may well be (with Hunter, *Mark, ad loc*: Cranfield, *Mark, ad loc*: Klostermann, *Mark, ad loc*) that the emphasis is on 'hearing' and not at all on growth.

3. Mtt. 13, 24-30. Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 183f. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 155. Whereas Dodd suggests that the parable originally answered the disciples' question about the Baptist's coming, Jeremias rightly regards it as a parable

of the consummation (similarly Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 134). Clearly appropriate to the early church's life, it may well be that the disciples expressed doubts about their fellows (cf. Schlatter, *Mark, ad loc*) (cf. Lk. 9, 49) and the parable answers by contrasting present ambiguity with future unveiling and disclosure.

4. Mtt. 13, 47-50. Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 187f. Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 155f. Dodd (cf., too, Robinson, *Coming*, p. 37, n. 2) sees Matthew's interpretation, vv. 49-50, as secondary, the original being a reference to the mission and men's self-judgement according to their reaction to Jesus. But Matthew's 'interpretation' is more likely to be correct: on Dodd's view the fish should be described as themselves jumping back into the sea or into the vessels! The points of contact with the metaphor of Mk. 1, 17 are actually very slight.

5. Mk. 4, 30-32 (Mtt. 13, 31-32 = Lk. 13, 18-19). Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 189f. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 90. Many (e.g. Kümmel, *Promise*, pp. 129f. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 169) refute Dodd's view that Luke's form or Matthew's apparent conflation overrule the emphasis in Mark—which clearly stresses the littleness of the mustard seed. The point is surely, the contrast rather than the process of growth.

6. Mtt. 13, 33 (= Lk. 13, 20-21). Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 191: Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 90. Dodd argues that the stress is on the influence of the leaven—a picture of Jesus' obscure work. Kümmel (*Promise*, p. 132 and cf. n. 99 for other authorities) argues that there are two events, one small and insignificant, the other manifest and large, and that the emphasis is on contrast (similarly Jeremias).

Neither the parables of crisis, nor the so-called parables of growth, necessarily exclude the Parousia theme: much rather do they point to the Parousia, in a number of cases.