1

INTRODUCTION: THE POLITICS OF INHERITANCE?

In the immediate aftermath of World War II, Colin McCahon, one of Aotearoa New Zealand's foremost artists, produced a painting called *I Paul, to you at Ngatimote*. In this painting McCahon, who is increasingly ranked as one of the masters of mid-twentieth-century modern art, did what Pauline interpreters have often attempted but have consistently struggled to do – to situate the apostle Paul within a particular landscape in order to tease out the significance of his message for a specific locale. McCahon does not offer many clues to the content of the scroll which Paul holds in his hand for the people of Ngatimote, New Zealand, but several aspects of the painting are revealing and unintentionally crystallize issues which have frequently been a concern of Pauline scholars, especially over the last century. The painting explores war and its devastating consequences. Flying above the figure of Paul is what appears to be a military aeroplane and behind Paul (as well as a self-portrait of McCahon) is barbed wire. In other words, for McCahon both the context of Paul's message and the content of his letters are of *this world.* In the midst of a landscape of war and violence Paul is to be found on the earth, with the people, presumably because he has a message which, despite the reality of the struggles of this world, may offer hope and solidarity to the community of which he is a part. In contrast to this, Paul's scholarly interpreters have often portrayed the apostle as hovering above the earth, detached from the social and political realities of the first century.

To juxtapose McCahon with Paul's interpreters is *not* to suggest that students of the apostle have failed to identify any aspects of hope in his writings. Often Paul's eschatological language is acknowledged as a source of expectation for his audience. One of the enduring insights of twentieth-century biblical scholarship is a recognition of the extent to which an eschatological milieu shapes and governs the NT writings in general and the Pauline corpus in particular. A seminal figure in this regard is Albert Schweitzer. His emphasis on the primacy of Paul's Jewish

heritage and on the significance of the apostle's eschatological perspective are often described as Schweitzer's greatest contribution to Pauline studies.[1] It would not be an overstatement to refer to the twentieth-century as "the age of Schweitzer, that is, the age of eschatology."[2] Ernst Käsemann, a biblical scholar of equally far-reaching influence, walked a similar interpretive path to that of Schweitzer.[3] Although these two leading figures did not approach Pauline theology in identical fashion, there is much likeness in the terrain they traversed. Believing that "apocalyptic was the mother of all theology," Käsemann saw as one of his main purposes to renew the challenge emerging from the "rediscovery of primitive Christian apocalyptic," which Schweitzer and others had begun and which Käsemann argued had been "more or less industriously eliminated or pushed away to the outer fringes of our awareness."[4] Subsequent scholarship has given much reflection to Käsemann's challenge, but the interpreter who has given this the most sustained attention is J. Christiaan Beker.[5] Even if not all interpreters accept Beker's proposal that eschatology constitutes the "coherent center" of Paul's thought, many do now acknowledge that the apostle's eschatology could be identified as the starting point and one of the governing features of his writings.[6]

It is in light of the landscape sketched and shaded by Schweitzer, Käsemann and Beker in particular that an awareness has developed of the ways in which eschatology provides the background and foundation for many other strands of Paul's thinking, such as, for example, christology, pneumatology, ecclesiology and soteriology. In other words, it is possible to see eschatological concerns threaded through almost every letter within the Pauline corpus.

[1] See particularly A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: Black, 1931).

[2] B. Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism* (Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 24.

[3] It is also the case that Käsemann's teacher, Rudolph Bultmann, has had a considerable influence on how Paul's eschatological language has been understood. See particularly R. Bultmann, "History and Eschatology in the New Testament," *NTS* 1 (1954): 5–16; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1956); R. Bultmann, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York: Scribner's, 1958), *passim*.

[4] E. Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM Press, 1965), 109 n. 2.

[5] J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980). There has been much debate over what exactly Käsemann meant by the term "apocalyptic." As Barry Matlock suggests, there is a sense in which the term functions as theological shorthand for whatever Käsemann wants it to mean. See Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 235. Similarly N. T. Wright, "A New Tübingen School? Ernst Käsemann and His Commentary on Romans," *Themelios* 7 (1982).

[6] For Beker's proposal see particularly Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, *passim*.

This is *not* to say that there has always been agreement amongst Paul's interpreters on how to understand and define this increasingly slippery term, with one interpreter asking whether it has now been devalued beyond recovery.[7] The word was formed from the Greek adjective *eschatos* and has traditionally been used to refer to that section of systematic theology which is concerned with "last things": Christian beliefs concerning the individual's death, judgment, the afterlife and resurrection. The term is now used more broadly than this. It often refers to the language, beliefs and concepts which relate to the end of history and which point to a new quality of existence, a world which is qualitatively different from the present.[8] In what follows, the focus will be on *describing* Paul's eschatology as it emerges in his writings rather than attempting to further *define* it. However, two observations are worth making at this stage: first, that a distinction will be assumed between the various expressions of Jewish apocalyptic phenomena and Paul's eschatology;[9] second, that Paul's eschatology encompasses how he understands the goal and destiny of history – both the *future* event of God's final intervention and the *quality* of that event.

Amidst the abundance of eschatological language and concepts which the apostle Paul employs, one word which has received relatively little attention within Pauline studies is that of "inheritance." What does Paul mean, for example, when he writes to the Christians in the capital of the Roman Empire insisting that they will one day "inherit the world" (Rom. 4:13)? How would such a grand claim to worldly dominion have sounded within the context of first-century imperial Rome? To ask this question is to enquire how one aspect of his eschatological thought (inheritance) might have been viewed against the backdrop of a particular landscape (first-century imperial Rome) and what it might have meant for a specific group of people (the Christians at Rome).

In Paul Hammer's 1960 article "A Comparison of *Klēronomia* in Paul and Ephesians," he identifies several characteristics of Paul's inheritance

[7] George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980), 256.

[8] D. E Aune, "Eschatology (Early Jewish)," in *ABD* II (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 594.

[9] Following P. D. Hanson ("Apocalypse, Genre," in *IDBSup* 29 [Nashville: Abingdon, 1976], 27–34), there is a general consensus to divide the field of Jewish apocalyptic into three categories: apocalyptic (a literary genre), apocalyptic eschatology (a religious perspective not confined to apocalypses) and apocalypticism (a socio-religious movement or community that has recourse to apocalyptic eschatology as a way of dealing with social or political alienation). M. C. de Boer, "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, ed. J. J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 1998), vol. I, 348.

language which set it apart from how *klēronomia* is used in Ephesians.[10] One of Hammer's conclusions is that inheritance in the undisputed Pauline letters (as opposed to its meaning in Ephesians, a disputed letter) refers both to Jesus Christ and to believers, and that both believers and Christ become "the means to and *the content* of the inheritance."[11] Hammer argues that "[a]lthough Paul does not say so directly, his argument leads us to assert that for him there is what approaches an identification between the heir and the inheritance. Christ is the *heir* of Abraham and the *content* of the promise to Abraham. He is both the historical *means* and the historical *end*."[12] In other words (although this is never stated explicitly by Hammer) what was typically understood in biblical and post-biblical Jewish tradition to refer to the land of Israel and to the inheritors of this land is now transmuted by Paul into a reference to individual Christians and their relationship to Christ.[13] Accordingly, the socio-political significance which the concept of inheritance carried in Jewish tradition, which will be discussed in due course, is no longer apparent when Paul uses the word.

In 1968, in his work *Paul's Concept of Inheritance*, James Hester engaged in an extensive study of inheritance and its cognates in Paul's letters.[14] In the decades since Hester's discussion there have been various forays into the territory of Pauline inheritance but there has been no other study which has examined the concept in such length.[15] Hester identifies a number of important themes conveyed by Paul's language of inheritance. At points he also identifies several problems with Hammer's treatment. Perhaps one of Hester's most significant findings is the conclusion (against Hammer) that when Paul uses inheritance language he maintains the focus on "land" which is so central to the Old Testament's use of the word. What Hester shows, however, is that for Paul "inheritance" includes the whole world, rather than referring to the specific land of Canaan. As Hester puts it, "The geographical reality of the Land

[10] P. L. Hammer, "A Comparison of *Klēronomia* in Paul and Ephesians," *JBL* 79.3 (1960).
[11] Ibid., 272; emphasis added. [12] Ibid., 271; emphasis original. [13] Ibid., 272.
[14] J. D. Hester, *Paul's Concept of Inheritance* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1968). See also J. D. Hester, "The 'Heir' and Heilsgeschichte: A Study of Gal 4:1ff," in *Oikonomia, Festschrift für Oscar Cullmann* (Hamburg-Bergstedt: Reich, 1967), 118–25.
[15] As Denton observes, Hester's monograph is "the most detailed study of inheritance in Paul"; D. R. Denton, "Inheritance in Paul and Ephesians," *EQ* 53.3 (1982): 158. For other discussions of the word, see, for example, F. Lyall, "Legal Metaphors in the Epistles," *TynBul* 32 (1981); J. Eichler, "Inheritance, Lot, Portion," in *NIDNTT* II (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–85), 295–304; J. H. Friedrich, "κληρονομία," in *EDNT* II (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 298–99.

never ceases to play an important part in Paul's concept of inheritance. He simply makes the Land the eschatological world."[16] Given Hester's emphasis on the earthly and physical nature of inheritance, it is surprising that the socio-political direction of his study has not been taken further in subsequent scholarship. As Walter Brueggemann points out, the promise of land within the biblical narrative is a pledge to secure socio-economic well-being for the people of God and such a guarantee carries with it inevitable socio-political implications: "The linkage of God and land makes the biblical tradition endlessly revolutionary in its social function. Every attempt to reduce the Bible to an otherworldly subject fails precisely on this accent on land."[17] If it is the case, therefore, that Paul is still referring to physical land, albeit extended to include the whole world, when he uses the word inheritance (as Hester argues), the question arises as to what degree such language is "endlessly revolutionary" for himself and his hearers in the context of first-century imperial Rome. At first glance Hester's reading of inheritance would seem to fit well within McCahon's painting since the word has the appearance of conveying a decidedly socio-political claim – like McCahon, Hester has painted Paul in earthy tones.

Not all interpreters, however, have understood Paul's language in this way. Many have concurred with Hammer's judgment that, although inheritance in the Hebrew scriptures refers primarily to physical land and the possession of this land, Paul's use of the word is entirely devoid of any such concrete reference. Particularly influential has been W. D. Davies' examination of "land" in the New Testament.[18] In Davies' study there is no mention of the phrase "inherit the world" as it occurs in Rom. 4:13 (τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου) – a statement which has so much potential for an understanding of "land" in the New Testament – and neither is there any thought given to the use of "heir" in the context of Romans 8, a text which yields considerable insights into the future redemption of this world.[19] Davies acknowledges that "the notion of 'inheritance' is important and inseparable from our theme [of 'land']" [20] and yet he fails to give any attention to the *content* of the inheritance. What makes

[16] Hester, *Paul's Concept of Inheritance*, 82.
[17] W. Brueggemann, "Land," in *Reverberations of Faith. A Theological Handbook of Old Testament Themes* (Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 123.
[18] W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land* (London: University of California Press, 1974).
[19] So E. Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), 170.
[20] Davies, *The Gospel and the Land*, 20 n. 12.

this omission particularly significant is that his work is arguably the most detailed treatment of the concept of "land" in the New Testament and it is certainly one of the most influential proponents of an apolitical and "spiritualized" reading of "land" in Paul.[21]

There are two interrelated aspects of Davies' study which have had a particularly significant influence on an understanding of inheritance in Paul. First there is Davies' observation that whereas in the Old Testament, inheritance and land are primarily focused on the territory of Canaan, for Paul, because of Christ, there is no longer any importance given to a particular territory. "To the contrary, fulfillment of the promise 'in Christ' demanded the deterritorializing of the promise."[22] Davies rightly points out that one of Paul's main purposes (especially in Galatians and Romans) is to argue *against* those who would continue to define the community of God in terms of ethnic traditions and observances. As Davies puts it, although Paul never makes explicit his perspective on the land, "In the Christological logic of Paul, the land, like the law, particular and provisional, had become irrelevant."[23]

There is one sense in which Davies' observation is accurate – there is little question that Paul, in the light of Christ, is insistent on the relativizing of the law. The implication of this would be that the land of Canaan no longer has any primary importance in the apostle's thinking. But the problematic nature of Davies' argument (and that of subsequent scholarship) is the deduction that since Paul's inheritance is non-territorial, inasmuch as it is not tied to one specific tract of terrain, it is therefore also necessarily non-material or spiritual in reference. For example, it is common for interpreters to suggest that because inheritance no longer refers to a particular territory then it is best understood as being, for Paul, a *symbol* of God's blessing – it is a word which connotes God's relationship with humanity rather than a concept which involves actual physical turf.[24] In other words, inheritance has little to do with the created order or tangible real estate and it is better conceived as transcending the present state of things on earth. One of the consequences of a non-material inheritance is the belief that, for Paul, the present created order (including the socio-political realm) is nothing but a transient stage on which believers play out the drama of life in preparation for the world which will follow. According to some of Paul's interpreters this is why he often appears to

[21] See Davies, *The Gospel and the Land*. [22] Ibid., 179. [23] Ibid.
[24] See, for example, L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 206; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 116.

encourage the social and political status quo, for to engage at any level in the socio-political realm of the first century would be like "tinkering with the engines of a sinking ship."[25]

A second, closely allied deduction made by Davies and subsequent interpreters is the assumption that any elements of nationalistic hope and political expectation which were at the heart of inheritance and land in the Old Testament are entirely absent from Paul's thinking. The logic is that it was primarily the territory of Canaan that gave rise to the associated ideas of Israel's triumph over the surrounding nations. For Paul, Canaan is no longer important, therefore any ideas of worldly sovereignty, possession and ownership must also be missing when Paul uses the word "inheritance." In short, inheritance is non-territorial and therefore depoliticized.[26]

Although Davies' study of "land" has been influential, it is also important to outline the ways in which various other interpretive traditions have contributed to such an understanding. One particularly influential approach has been what is often now referred to as the Reformation or Lutheran reading of Paul. This understanding argues that the heart of his theology and the essence of his gospel revolve around concepts such as individual guilt, condemnation, righteousness and justification. It has been assumed that in using this language (especially in Galatians and Romans) the main theological problem Paul is dealing with is the question of how a sinful person can find acceptance before a righteous God. Paul's answer to this problem, it is argued, is faith: God reckons as righteous (i.e. he justifies) those who by faith accept the offer of forgiveness made possible through the atoning work of Christ. With this doctrine of justification by faith as his foundation, Paul opposes those who would seek to be justified by works, which is the attempt to claim acceptance of one's own meritorious achievement, whether moral or religious.[27] This governing Reformation approach to Paul in turn determines how

[25] J. Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity* (Oxford University Press, 1983), 120. For similar readings of Pauline eschatology in general, and the way in which this influences Paul's "social conservatism," see E. E. Ellis, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 18–23; J. P. Sampley, *Walking between the Times: Paul's Moral Reasoning* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 78, 113; H. Räisänen, "Did Paul Expect an Earthly Kingdom?," in *Paul, Luke and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. O. Christofferson, C. Clausen, J. Frey and B. W. Longenecker, JSNTSup 217 (Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 19.

[26] See, for example, Davies, *The Gospel and the Land*, 164–220.

[27] For this reading of Romans see, for example, J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB 33 (London: Doubleday, 1993), 369; D. J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 94–96; B. Witherington, *Paul's Letter to the Romans. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004), 124.

the language of inheritance is understood: the focus is predominantly on *how* (for example) Abraham received the inheritance and therefore *how* believers receive the inheritance. Or, if any thought *is* given to the content of the inheritance, it is often understood in individualized and spiritualized terms, and there is believed to be no spatial, earthly or this-worldly dimension to the concept.[28]

This reading of Paul has undergone rigorous critique in the last twenty-five years with the result that there has emerged within NT scholarship a so-called "new perspective on Paul." This label was coined by James Dunn in his 1983 Manson Memorial Lecture, "The New Perspective on Paul and the Law,"[29] and it is now used to designate a diversity of revisionist readings of Paul which seek to do more justice to the first-century Jewish context Paul engages with.[30] One of the areas which has received extensive discussion in this new reading has been the law, not only Paul's view of the law and the "works of the law," but also first-century Jewish attitudes to the law. Whereas the traditional perspective understands Paul to be opposing Jews who believed they could be saved by legalistic observance of the law, the newer perspectives suggest that the principal problem with the law, for Paul, is that it is ethnically exclusive. If law remains central in Christian identity, then Gentiles, who do not possess the law, are either excluded from the Jewish community or they are considered to be inferior members of the community. Paul is therefore not opposed to works in general, but more specifically to "works of the law," understood as Jewish identity markers which produce rigid social boundaries between Jew and Gentile. This change in perspective can

[28] Identified by W. Brueggemann, *The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith*, Overtures to Biblical Theology (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 177. For a similar observation in relation to Romans 8 see B. J. Byrne, "Creation Groaning: An Earth Bible Reading of Romans 8:18–22," in *Readings from the Perspective of Earth*, ed. N. C. Habel (Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 194.

[29] J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," in *Jesus, Paul and the Law*, ed. J. D. G. Dunn (London: SCM Press, 1990). Originally published as J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," *BJRL* 65 (1983). Dunn was also the first to demonstrate, in a NT commentary, the implications of the New Perspective. J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, WBC 38A (Dallas: Word Books, 1988); J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, WBC 38B (Dallas: Word Books, 1988).

[30] It was the work of E. P. Sanders which led to a re-evaluation of how first-century Judaism is understood. See particularly E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1997), 33–428. However, John Barclay rightly notes that there are many before Sanders on whom he has drawn. See J. M. G. Barclay, "Paul and the Law: Observations on Some Recent Debates," *Themelios* 12 (1986): 6. Besides Dunn, the other primary contributor to the New Perspective approach has been N. T. Wright. See, for example, N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991).

therefore be characterized (although this is only one aspect of a wider critique) as a shift from a predominantly soteriological reading of Paul to more of an ecclesiological understanding of his message. In other words, rather than being focused on how an individual is saved, Paul is more concerned with how the new community of God is to be defined. This change in perspective has had some effect on how inheritance is read in Paul's letters. Since Paul's focus is believed to be on the question of *who* are the heirs, there has been a welcome shift from understanding inheritance solely in individualized terms to recognizing that Paul uses the word in the course of discussing the make-up of the community. As James Dunn argues, "The question Paul has in view is 'Who are the heirs of the promise to Abraham?' "[31]

Despite this interpretive shift, however, there has still been comparatively little attention given to the importance of the category of inheritance in Paul's letters in general, and in particular to its possible socio-political significance for himself and his readers located in the context of the Roman Empire. In other words, the potentially suggestive nature of Hester's findings has not been capitalized on. In part this is understandable because it was not Hester's purpose to establish the degree to which Paul's inheritance language would have subverted the dominant imperial discourse of the day. Instead, Hester's primary intent was to describe the elements of salvation history found in certain passages in Paul's letters (primarily Romans 4 and 8; Galatians 3 and 4), using inheritance as a way of providing the focus and limits to this study. Even so, Hester's study includes some valuable insights which might have something to contribute to the growing interest regarding Paul and his socio-political context.

Over the last few decades there have been a number of isolated attempts to demonstrate the socio-ethical significance of Paul's letters. For example, there have been re-examinations of his apparently negative portrayal of women as well as readings of his work from a non-Western perspective. There have also been investigations into the significance of Paul's *principalities* and *powers* language. But what about Paul in relation to his socio-political context more broadly – to what degree does he confront or subvert the socio-political status quo? Pauline studies has, in recent times, begun to identify appropriate questions with regard to the Roman imperial context. Important work in this regard was started by the "Paul and

[31] Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 213–14. See similarly R. B. Hays, "'Have We Found Abraham to Be Our Forefather According to the Flesh?' A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1," *NovT* 27 (1985): 83–84, 90–91, 93.

Politics" group in the Society of Biblical Literature and it is now increasingly adopted by other interpreters.[32] It is this sort of analysis which N. T. Wright considers to be the most exciting in Pauline studies today. He welcomes "the quite fresh attempts that are being made to study the interface, the opposition, the conflict between Paul's gospel . . . and the world in which his entire ministry was conducted, the world in which Caesar not only held sway but exercised power through his divine claim."[33]

In tandem with this increasing awareness of the tension between "Caesar" and Paul there has been a growing recognition of the ways in which material poverty affected Paul's assemblies and the extent to which such economic destitution might therefore have influenced how Paul's letters were understood in their first-century context.[34] Whereas over the last thirty years or so Pauline studies has tended towards a "cultivated detachment" regarding the social location of Paul's Christian audiences, there is now a slow (but growing) alertness to the possibility that "Paul's assemblies mostly comprised urban poor folks who lived near the line between subsistence and crisis" and that this should in turn shape how we interpret Paul's message.[35]

The politics of inheritance?

It is within this stream of Pauline socio-political scholarship that the present study finds its home. My intention in the ensuing discussion is to extend James Hester's research by giving sustained attention to the

[32] For the key contributors to the Paul and Politics group, see the essays in R. A. Horsley, ed., *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 2000). See also N. Elliott, "Strategies of Resistance in the Pauline Communities," in *Hidden Transcripts and the Arts of Resistance. Applying the Work of James C. Scott to Jesus and Paul*, ed. R. A. Horsley (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 97–122; D. Harink, *Paul among the Postliberals. Pauline Theology beyond Christendom and Modernity* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2003).

[33] N. T. Wright, "Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire," in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation*, ed. R. A. Horsley (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 2000), 160.

[34] The first to put this question back on the agenda was J. J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, Studies of the New Testament and Its World (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998). Meggitt's argument has sparked robust debate. For the responses, see further below, Chapter 2.

[35] Quotation from S. J. Friesen, "Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-Called New Consensus," *JSNT* 26.3 (2004): 359. The approach to this issue over at least the last thirty years has been shaped by what has been called a "New Consensus." The primary advocates of this have been W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983); G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982). For a more detailed discussion of these issues see Chapter 2 below.