

## Disjunction in Paul: Apocalyptic or Christomorphic? Comparing the *Apocalypse of Weeks* with Galatians

LOGAN WILLIAMS

*Department of Theology and Religion, Durham University, Abbey House, Palace Green, Durham DH1 3RS, United Kingdom. Email: [Logan.a.williams@durham.ac.uk](mailto:Logan.a.williams@durham.ac.uk)*

This article compares the *Apocalypse of Weeks* with Galatians to examine whether the motif of *creatio e contrario* is apocalyptic. While reviewing the themes of revelation, salvation and eschatology in each text, it argues that *creatio e contrario* is absent from and theologically foreign to the *Apocalypse*; by contrast, this motif permeates Galatians, not because Paul retrieves it from the apocalypses but because for him the divine economy is shaped by the disjunctive, *e contrario* history of the crucified and risen Christ. Thus, *creatio e contrario* should be classified not as apocalyptic but as christomorphic.

**Keywords:** *creatio e contrario*, disjunction, apocalyptic, Paul, Galatians, Enoch, *Apocalypse of Weeks*

‘Almost all the problems of philosophy’, claims Friedrich Nietzsche, ‘pose the same form of question ...: how can something originate in its opposite, for example rationality in irrationality, the sentient in the dead, logic in unlogic ...?’<sup>1</sup> According to a growing tide of interpreters, the apostle Paul retrieved a theological answer to this philosophical question from the depths of apocalyptic Judaism. For these scholars, Paul’s apocalyptic thought surfaces when he declares that God disjunctively creates something out of its opposite (*creatio e contrario*): new creation out of old creation, blessing out of curse, freedom out of slavery, life out of death.<sup>2</sup>

1 F. Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human* (trans. R. J. Hollingdale; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 12. I am indebted to J. A. Linebaugh, *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul’s Letter to the Romans: Texts in Conversation* (NovTSup 152; Leiden: Brill, 2013) 133 for this quote.

2 For instance, Martinus de Boer states that ‘the revelation of Jesus Christ’ in Gal 1.12 ‘was experienced and interpreted by Paul as an “apocalyptic” event whereby God ... put an end to his old way of life in order to give him a new one in its stead’ (M. C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (New Testament Library; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2011) 78–9); Paul envisages salvation as a divine ‘invasion’ which involves ‘God’s apocalyptic

In classifying *creatio e contrario* as apocalyptic, they theologically coordinate the Pauline corpus with the texts commonly recognised as apocalypses<sup>3</sup> – but this coordination must be assessed via direct comparison between the two bodies of literature.<sup>4</sup> Does Paul’s account of such drastic, cataclysmic, *e contrario* reversals in the divine–human drama stem from and bear similarity to the Jewish apocalypses?

To propose a methodological criterion, in order to categorise *creatio e contrario* as apocalyptic, one must demonstrate its *analogic* and *genetic* connection to the Jewish apocalypses, that it is both *common to* and *derived from* this literature.<sup>5</sup> Commencing an investigation on these terms, I will compare the Enochic *Apocalypse of Weeks* (hereafter *Apocalypse*) with Paul’s letter to the Galatians.<sup>6</sup>

---

*action* in sending forth his son into the human world to liberate human beings from suprahuman enslaving powers’ (de Boer, *Galatians*, 34 (emphasis original)); and ‘[t]he word “apocalyptic” properly evokes this idea of God’s own eschatological and sovereign action of putting an end to this world age and replacing it with the new world-age’ (M. C. de Boer, ‘Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology’, *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, vol. 1: *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. J. Collins; London: Continuum, 2000) 345–83, at 354). Though de Boer does not use the phrase *creatio e contrario*, in these examples he labels *e contrario* disjunctive movements as apocalyptic.

- 3 Scholars still debate which texts should be considered apocalypses. See the discussion in C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, ‘Jewish Apocalyptic and Apocalypticism’, *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (ed. S. E. Porter and T. Holmén; Leiden: Brill, 2011) 1569–1607.
- 4 Thus John Collins asserts that ‘[s]ince the adjective “apocalyptic” and the noun “apocalypticism” are derived from “apocalypse,” it is only reasonable to expect that they indicate some analogy with the apocalypses’ (J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016<sup>3</sup>) 16).
- 5 In contrast to this criterion, de Boer identifies ‘two tracks’ within apocalypticism which he calls ‘cosmological apocalyptic eschatology’ and ‘forensic apocalyptic eschatology’, stating that ‘[t]he metaphor of the two “tracks” thus is used to denote two internally consistent or coherent configurations of motifs that, like railway tracks, may be parallel, crisscross, or overlap, even within a single work’ (M. C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (JSNTSup 22; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988), 84–5. De Boer’s admission that these two tracks can be mixed puts into serious question the basic heuristic value which he ascribes to this taxonomy. It appears rather to reflect a conceptual and theological distinction that de Boer sees but many Jewish authors did not, given that they freely mixed these supposed two tracks. Such a taxonomy could obfuscate the internal theological logic and coherence of certain texts. *Pace* de Boer, the term ‘apocalyptic’ should be reserved for aspects common to all apocalypses. See the critique of de Boer’s ‘two tracks’ in J. Frey, ‘Demythologizing Apocalyptic? On N.T. Wright’s Paul, Apocalyptic Interpretation, and the Constraints of Construction’, *God and the Faithfulness of Paul: A Critical Examination of the Pauline Theology of N.T. Wright* (ed. C. Heilig *et al.*; WUNT 11/413; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016) 489–531, at 508–9.
- 6 Galatians has been a central text in the debate concerning Paul and apocalyptic (see e.g. J. A. Dunne, ‘Suffering and Covenantal Hope in Galatians: A Critique of the “Apocalyptic Reading” and its Proponents’, *SJT* 68 (2015) 1–15) since J. Louis Martyn’s influential apocalyptic

The structure of this article is twofold. I first analyse three major topics in the *Apocalypse* – revelation, salvation, and eschatology – and then compare these with parallel topics in Galatians. Within this structure my thesis is deconstructive and then reconstructive: *creatio e contrario* is absent from and theologically foreign to the *Apocalypse*; by contrast this motif is pervasive in Galatians, not because Paul retrieves it from apocalyptic Judaism but because for him the economy of salvation is shaped by the disjunctive, *e contrario* event of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. *Creatio e contrario* is therefore neither analogically nor genetically related to the apocalypses, and thus the term ‘apocalyptic’ not only inappropriately classifies this motif but also obscures its origin and contour; here Paul’s theology is irreducibly christomorphic, not apocalyptic.<sup>7</sup>

### 1. Enhancing the Righteous: The *Apocalypse of Weeks*

‘More will be given to the one who has’ (Matt 13.12). Has *what*? If we could allow the author of the *Apocalypse* to answer, he might say that ‘more will be given to the one who has *righteousness*’. In the *Apocalypse* the divine–human relation in its past, present and future follows a consistent pattern: God enhances the antecedently righteous. This pattern comes to expression in *Apocalypse* in three sections: (1) the portrayal of Enoch as the recipient and revealer of divine knowledge (1 *Enoch* 93.1–3), (2) the revelation of wisdom to the author’s community (93.8–10; 91.11–13), and (3) the arrival of the ‘new heaven’ (91.13–16).<sup>8</sup>

#### 1.1 *Enoch, the Righteous Revealer of Divine Knowledge* (1 *Enoch* 93.1–3)

Texts, if they are to be trusted, need trustworthy origins. This is what the author of the *Apocalypse* assumes when he portrays the ancient figure of Enoch as its original writer in order to establish the content of this text as divine revelation.<sup>9</sup> So the *Apocalypse* begins:

---

interpretation of Galatians (*Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33A; New Haven: Doubleday, 1997)).

7 This is not to suggest that the *Apocalypse* is somehow representative of every apocalypse. It is simply used as an example to show that *creatio e contrario* is not common to the apocalypses, and, thus, according to my methodological criterion, there is nothing uniquely or distinctively apocalyptic about it.

8 For the purposes of this article the Aramaic fragments, Coptic manuscript and various Ethiopic manuscripts of the *Apocalypse* will be treated as a heterogeneous yet coherent unity.

9 On how pseudepigraphy establishes authority, see A. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011) 41–3; cf. H. Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 40.

After this Enoch took up his discourse, saying, 'Concerning the sons of righteousness, and concerning the chosen of eternity, and concerning the plant of truth, these things I say to you, and I make known to you, my sons, I myself, Enoch. The vision of heaven was shown to me, and from the words of the watchers and holy ones I have learned everything, and in the heavenly tablets I read everything and I understood.' (1 *Enoch* 93.1–2)<sup>10</sup>

Enoch advocates for the divine origin of his words by indicating three means of mediation: the 'heavenly tablets', which signify the divine ordination of Enoch's prophecy,<sup>11</sup> the 'watchers and holy ones', who mediate between God and creation,<sup>12</sup> and the 'vision of heaven', which indicates the divine source of his revelation.<sup>13</sup> When Enoch speaks the revelatory formula 'I make known to you' (93.2) his readers should thus recognise the 'heavenly etiology' of his prophecy.<sup>14</sup> These words have come from God.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to indicating the means by which God gives Enoch this heavenly knowledge, the author indicates why: Enoch received revelation because he was righteous. In the Ethiopic text, Enoch was 'born (in) the seventh (part) in the first week, until when justice and righteousness lasted' (93.3), and, more pointedly, in the Coptic and the Aramaic texts Enoch asserts that righteousness

10 Translation from G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).

11 In *1 Enoch* and the surrounding traditions Enoch's scribal activity invests the text with authority. See J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) 150–3; A. A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 36–7, 50–9; L. T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007) 83–6; cf. W. G. Lambert, 'Enmeduranki and Related Matters', *JCS* 21 (1967) 126–38.

12 Enoch is often associated with angels in *1 Enoch* and the surrounding traditions. See M. J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992). Enoch's association with angels may be derived from an interpretation of אֱלֹהִים in Gen 5.22, on which see Vanderkam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 30–1.

13 On the genitive phrase 'vision of heaven', see Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 81.

14 The phrase 'heavenly etiology' is taken from A. Y. Reed, 'Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent, and the Transmission of Knowledge in *1 Enoch* 6–16', *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions* (ed. R. S. Boustan and A. Reed; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 47–66, at 49; cf. M. E. Stone, 'Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered', *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 9 (2006) 1–15.

15 On the scriptural status of *1 Enoch*, see G. W. E. Nickelsburg, 'Scripture in *1 Enoch* and *1 Enoch* as Scripture', *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts, Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman* (ed. T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995) 333–54; cf. A. Y. Reed, 'Pseudepigraphy and/as Prophecy: Continuity and Transformation in the Formation and Reception of Early Enochic Writings', *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity* (ed. P. Townsend and M. Vidas; TSAJ 146; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 25–42.

remained 'until me'.<sup>16</sup> After Enoch, another era of righteousness does not appear until the seventh week (91.12).<sup>17</sup> This is not merely stylistic flourish; the characterisation of Enoch as righteous integrally establishes and supports the author's authority-conferring strategy.<sup>18</sup> As Lars Hartman explains,

[s]uch an access to divine secrets cannot be accorded to anyone without qualifications, and so Enoch is explicitly called 'righteous', and probably this righteousness, in the eyes of our author as in those of other Jews, made Enoch capable of a unique closeness to the Holy One in heaven. When a man of such qualities stands behind a blessing of this kind, the truth and trustworthiness of the oracle are ascertained in two ways ...: on the one hand, he is trustworthy as a stalwart witness to the divine secrets which God has revealed to him; on the other, the 'blessing' of such a powerful personality is so loaded that it, so to speak, shapes the future.<sup>19</sup>

Revelation comes as a fitting gift for the righteous.<sup>20</sup> This is the fundamental parameter within which the author supports the authority of the *Apocalypse* and the implicit logical premise which surfaces in the descriptions of Enoch in 93.1–3. Insofar as Enoch's prior righteousness is etiologically linked to God's revelation, the more Enoch is righteous, the more the *Apocalypse* is likely to have a divine origin. If Enoch was unrighteous, then, his unfit status would fatally undermine the theological bedrock of the author's authority-conferring strategy. An unrighteous mediator of revelation, if not to our author a terminological contradiction,

16 Translation from Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 86–7. For an overview of the possible temporal values of סבוע ('week'), see F. Dexinger, *Henochs Zehnwochenapokalypse und offene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung* (Studia Post-Biblica 29; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 118–20. I interpret סבוע as a seven-generation period, following R. Bauckham, *The Jewish World around the New Testament: Collected Essays 1* (WUNT 1/233; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 155–8. Pace Klaus Koch, who interprets each week as a 490-year period ('Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte: Die Zehn-Wochen-Apokalypse (1 Hen 93:1–10; 91:11–17) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum', *ZAW* 95 (1983) 403–30).

17 The Genesis tradition portrays him similarly. In the genealogy of Gen 5.3–31 every individual dies (מות), but Enoch 'walked with האללים' and, instead of dying, he was 'absent, for God took him' (ואינו כי לקח אתו אללים, Gen 5.24). This may imply that his righteousness occasioned his avoidance of death (VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 30).

18 The phrase 'authority-conferring strategy' is taken from H. Najman, 'Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and its Authority Conferring Strategies', *eadem, Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation, and the Question for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity* (JSJSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 39–71.

19 L. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 12; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979) 126.

20 So George Nickelsburg, commenting on the Book of the Watchers, writes, 'Enoch's righteousness is relevant here because by virtue of it he was permitted to enter the divine presence' (G. W. E Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 270); cf. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire*, 303–4; Reed, 'Heavenly Ascent', 48, 64, 66.

would cast serious doubt on his fittingness and therefore plausibility to receive revelation. Enoch's experience of revelation cannot drastically or disjunctively reverse his status before God because the text's internal theological structure demands a *correspondence* between Enoch's prior righteousness and his reception of revelation.

### 1.2 *The Righteous Saved by Revelation* (1 Enoch 93.8–10; 91.11–13)

'Knowledge is power', so goes the proverb; but in the *Apocalypse* knowledge moreover constitutes *eschatological* power. Expressing the etiological link between righteousness and revelation shown in 1 *Enoch* 93.1–3, 93.8–10 and 91.11–13 describe how those who are righteous receive divine revelation which empowers them to enact their eschatological military victory over the unrighteous.

The author recounts the demise of Israel as they become 'blind' and their hearts 'stray from wisdom', resulting in exile and the destruction of the temple (93.8). To continue this tragedy, 'in the seventh week, a wicked generation will arise, and its deeds will be many, and all its deeds will be wicked' (93.9).<sup>21</sup> But here God decisively intervenes: Enoch predicts that 'the chosen righteous ones will be chosen from the eternal plant of righteousness'.<sup>22</sup> Yet who are 'the chosen righteous' and what is the 'plant of righteousness'? E. P. Sanders suggests that

[i]n the 'Apocalypse of Weeks' (93.1–10; 91.12–17), the 'children of righteousness' are apparently the same as 'the elect' and 'the plant of uprightness [righteousness]' (93.1). The seventh 'week' is that of 'an apostate generation', which will be succeeded, in the eighth week, by the election of 'the elect righteous of the eternal plant of righteousness' (93.9f). It thus appears that in this section, as in others, the righteous and the elect are identical, and are the opposite of the apostates (or, as elsewhere, foreign oppressors).<sup>23</sup>

Sanders' intent to unearth covenantal nomism here forces him to collapse 'the chosen righteous' (*ḥeruyān šādeqān*) into 'the plant of righteousness' (*takla šedq*). Two elements in the text, however, indicate that these labels refer to distinct

21 Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 *Enoch*.

22 Translation adapted from Stuckenbruck, 1 *Enoch*, 118. I interpret the passive verbs (e.g. 'will be chosen') in the *Apocalypse* as divine passives. Klaus Koch's proposal, that the *Apocalypse* depicts a narrative of the clash between cosmic powers (between קשטא and anything associated with חמטא or שקרא), lacks substantial evidence (K. Koch, 'History as a Battlefield of Two Antagonistic Powers in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in the Rule of the Community', *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 185–99). His argument depends on reading קשטא as a hypostasised noun, but קשטא is unanimously used to modify other nouns, save one instance where it is depicted as 'enduring' (93.3), but this sentence does not constitute enough evidence for his interpretation.

23 E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977) 359, cf. 361.

groups. First, the phrase ‘a wicked generation’ (*tewled ‘elut*) – Moses’ label for later Israel in Deut 32.5, 20 – suggests that a portion, if not the majority, of Israel will turn away in the seventh week (93.9). The author here distinguishes not between Israel and the Gentiles, but between faithful Israel and unfaithful Israel. Second, and more crucially, Enoch states that ‘the chosen righteous’ are chosen *from* (*‘em/מן*) ‘the eternal plant of righteousness’. Sanders’s uses R. H. Charles’s misleading and ambiguous translation, ‘the elect righteous *of* the eternal plant of uprightness’, but both the Ethiopic and Aramaic texts use a passive transitive verb (*yetharrāyu/תבהרוך*) with an ablative preposition (*‘em/מן*, denoting source) and thus distinguish between Israel (the main body, the eternal plant of righteousness) and the chosen righteous (a sub-group of that body).<sup>24</sup> In other words, ‘the chosen righteous ones’ do not constitute all of Israel.<sup>25</sup> As Loren Stuckenbruck recognises, ‘while Israel is and remains God’s special people, the fact that they descend from Abraham has not provided any guarantee that they would not be punished for their sins. Election must be confirmed through a further event of choosing.’<sup>26</sup>

But this begs a perennial question. What is the relationship here between election and righteousness? Sanders assumes that, if the group is identified as both ‘chosen’ and ‘righteous’, election precedes and determines righteousness. So he asserts that ‘we still find that salvation depends on election and that what is necessary to *maintain* the elect state – to be righteous – is to maintain loyalty and obedience to God and his covenant’.<sup>27</sup> Yet the variant Ethiopic traditions of 93.10 may suggest a different relationship between righteousness and election. Instead of *ḥaraya* (‘to choose’), seven manuscripts use a form of *‘asaya* (‘to reward’): ‘the chosen righteous from the eternal plant of righteousness will be rewarded’ (*yet’assayu ḥeruyān ṣādeqān ‘em-takla ṣedq*).<sup>28</sup> As Stuckenbruck puts it, in 93.10 ‘[e]lection ... depend[s] on the righteousness of the individuals or

24 See R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: Translated from the Editor’s Ethiopic Text* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912<sup>2</sup>) 231; Sanders claims to have used this translation in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 563. He interprets this phrase as an apposition (i.e. the chosen righteous *are* the eternal plant of unrighteousness), but both the Aramaic and Ethiopic texts have ablative prepositions (*‘em/מן*) rather than genitive constructions.

25 So G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 108. Unlike 4QInstruction (4Q418) 81, 13, the agricultural language refers to all of Israel, not the author’s own community, following its usage in *1 Enoch* 10.3, 16 and 84.6. See L. T. Stuckenbruck, ‘The Plant Metaphor in its Inner-Enochic and Early Jewish Context’, *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 210–12; cf. P. Tiller, ‘The “Eternal Planting” in the Dead Sea Scrolls’, *DSD* 4 (1997) 312–35.

26 Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 118.

27 Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 362 (emphasis original).

28 Bodl 5, BM Add. 24990, BM 499, Vatican 71, Munich 30, Garrett Ms. and Westenholz ms. attest this reading. Curzon 55 has the singular *yet’assay*. This list is taken from Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 119.



people at any given time.<sup>29</sup> If Stuckenbruck is correct, then in the *Apocalypse* it is not the chosen *qua* the chosen who are righteous; it is the righteous *qua* the righteous who are chosen.<sup>30</sup>

The righteous are thus set on the path to eschatological salvation. In contrast to the rest of Israel who ‘fell away from wisdom’ in the sixth week (93.8), God endows the righteous with ‘sevenfold instruction with respect to the whole of his creation’ (93.10), or, as in the Aramaic text, ‘sevenfold wisdom and knowledge’ (שבועה פ[עמי]ן חכמה ומדע).<sup>31</sup> Wisdom here functions teleologically to empower the righteous to purge evil from the cosmos by obliterating the wicked and consequently enacting their salvation.<sup>32</sup>

... the roots of oppression shall be cut off, and sinners shall be destroyed by the sword; from every place the blasphemers will be cut off, and those who plan oppression and those who commit blasphemy will be destroyed by the knife. And after this there shall be another, an eighth week, which is (of) righteousness, and to it shall be given a sword, so that judgement and righteousness will be executed on those who oppress, and sinners will be delivered into their hands. At its end, they shall obtain possessions through their righteousness ... (91.11–13)<sup>33</sup>

The Aramaic text clarifies that the elect judge sinners through their God-given military skill: ‘a sword will be given to all the righteous ones *in order to* exact a righteous judgement (למעבד דין קשות) from all the wicked ones’.<sup>34</sup> As fitting

29 Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 118.

30 See also Bauckham, *Jewish World*, 279–80.

31 Translation from Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 118, 121. Nickelsburg notes the etiological relationship between righteousness and the reception of wisdom (G. W. E. Nickelsburg, ‘Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity’, *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, ‘Others’ in Late Antiquity* (ed. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs; Scholars Press Studies in the Humanities; Chico: Scholars, 1985) 73–91, at 74–7). Collins suggests this is present also in *1 Enoch* 1–36 (J. J. Collins, ‘The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers’, *CBO* 44 (1982) 91–111, at 96).

32 The soteriological value of wisdom in the *Apocalypse* is noted by G. Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (JSJSup 115; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 41–5; and S. B. Reid, ‘The Structure of the Ten Week Apocalypse and the Book of Dream Visions’, *JSJ* 16 (1985) 189–201, at 195. Nickelsburg also identifies this connection in the *Epistle of Enoch* (G. W. E. Nickelsburg, ‘The Nature and Function of Revelation in *1 Enoch*, Jubilees, and Some Qumranic Documents’, *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. G. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 91–119, at 94).

33 Translation from Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 118, 131.

34 Translation from Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 133.



recipients of this empowering revelation, then, the righteous strike down the wicked and thus enact their eschatological vindication and salvation.<sup>35</sup>

Thus, the implicit theological premise in 93.1–3 – that revelation corresponds to righteousness – comes to expression in the *Apocalypse's* soteriology in 93.8–10 and 91.11–13. Just as God gave revelation to Enoch because of his prior righteousness, so also God gives soteriological wisdom to those already righteous. Though 93.8–10 and 91.11–13 may describe drastic changes within the world order (e.g. the vindication of the righteous and the condemnation of the unrighteous), as regards the *divine-human drama* God's revelation does not disjunctively transform the identity of the righteous. What is apocalypsed to them does not, for example, enact an *e contrario* movement from unrighteousness to righteousness or from demonic slavery to liberation; instead, this revelation confirms their identity: the righteous remain righteous, the unrighteous remain unrighteous.<sup>36</sup> This theological correlation between revelation and soteriology in the *Apocalypse* leads us to consider one final element: the eschatological arrival of the new heaven.

### 1.3 *The Arrival of the New Heaven, in the Absence of Sin* (1 Enoch 91.13–16)

In the *Apocalypse* Enoch predicts that world history will gradually develop into a restored state that provides the preconditions for the smooth transition into the 'new heaven':

... the Temple of the Great King shall be built in glory forever. And after this, in the ninth week, the righteous judgement will be revealed to all the world, and all the works of the wicked will depart from the whole earth. And the world will be written down for destruction, and all people will look to the path of uprightness. And after this, in the tenth week, the seventh part in it, there will be eternal judgement. And it will be executed against the watchers of the eternal heaven, a great (judgement) that will be decreed in the midst of the angels. (1 Enoch 91.13–15)<sup>37</sup>

This gradual restoration anticipates and prepares for the eschatological refashioning of heaven itself: 'And the first heaven will pass away in it, and a new heaven will appear, and all the powers of the heavens will shine forever with sevenfold

35 So Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 448. On the effectual relationship between wisdom and judgement, see R. A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment* (Early Judaism and its Literature 8; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 42.

36 One could possibly suggest that God also gives revelation to sinners in 93.4 if it is translated as 'a law will be given to sinners'. This would depend on a translation of *la-hāte'ān* that takes this phrase as the indirect object of *wa-šer'at yetgabbar* ('a law will be made'). However, it is more likely that the law is given for the restraint of sinners, referring to the laws of the Noachic covenant in Gen 9.1–6 (see Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 92, 98–9; contra, Dexinger, *Zehnwochenapokalypse*, 124). The phrase *la-hāte'ān* is therefore referential and does not function as the indirect object.

37 Translation from Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 131, 139, 145.

(brightness)' (91.16).<sup>38</sup> Here the 'new heaven' replaces the old heaven *after* the reconstruction of the temple, the vindication of the righteous, the destruction of the wicked (both human and angelic) and a universal turn to obedience.<sup>39</sup> This follows the same pattern expressed elsewhere in the *Apocalypse*: just as God provided revelation to the antecedently righteous – both Enoch and the chosen righteous – here the new heaven (and only a 'new heaven', not a 'new earth') appears within a cosmos already purged from sin. God has thus enhanced the antecedently righteous on a cosmological/eschatological scale. Because the new heaven arrives once the world is restored, it does not irrupt out of a wicked age, create a historical disjunction, or invade a demonic sphere. There is no disjunctive eschatology in the *Apocalypse* and no eschatological or cosmological event of *creatio e contrario*.<sup>40</sup> Only *after* being restored from within, the cosmos gradually develops into and climaxes in the arrival of the 'new heaven'. Thus, a strict dualistic separation between 'this age' and 'the age to come' is not necessarily present in or characteristic of apocalypses. As Crispin Fletcher-Louis recognises, '[t]here is no intrinsic connection between an apocalypse and so-called "apocalyptic eschatology"'.<sup>41</sup>

In the *Apocalypse* God consistently enhances the antecedently righteous, and thus the divine-human drama contains no instances of *creatio e contrario*. Enoch receives revelation for his righteousness, the righteous obtain salvific wisdom as a fitting gift, and the new heaven appears within a world already restored. Revelation, salvation and eschatology are not characterised by disjunction: there is no disruptive apocalypse given to Enoch, no salvific invasion that liberates the community from the demonic captivity, and no cataclysmic end to an evil age immediately replaced by a new age. *Creatio e contrario* is not only absent from but also radically foreign to the theology of the *Apocalypse*. But this is not the case for Paul in his letter to the Galatians.

## 2. Raising the Dead: Disjunction in Galatians

Like the *Apocalypse*, Paul speaks of divine revelation (Gal 1.11–16), the salvation of a community (3.10–14), and 'new creation' (6.14–15). This topical

38 Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 *Enoch*.

39 After the arrival of the 'new heaven', time no longer follows the week-structure. So Dexinger: 'die endzeitliche Existenz nicht mehr periodisiert wird. Es gibt zwar noch "Wochen", aber sie sind ohne Zahl' (Dexinger, *Zehnwochenapokalypse*, 144).

40 Pace Martyn, who asserts that the motif of invasion is distinctively apocalyptic (Martyn, *Galatians*, 99). Fletcher-Louis perceives that 'there remain swathes of revelatory material in the apocalypses which have nothing to do with ... an obviously "transcendent" [or dualistic] kind of eschatology. This suggests that a "transcendent eschatology" [or dualistic eschatology] is really only incidental to the genre and need not be present in every case' (Fletcher-Louis, 'Jewish Apocalyptic and Apocalypticism', 1578–9).

41 Fletcher-Louis, 'Jewish Apocalyptic and Apocalypticism', 1589.

similarity, however, only unveils the fundamental disparity between these authors. In contrast to the *Apocalypse*, in which God consistently enhances the righteous, in Galatians disjunctive events of *creatio e contrario* are pervasive in the divine economy: revelation brings new life out of Paul's dead self, redemption creates blessing out of curse, and the new creation irrupts within and out of the present evil age. While contrasting Paul with the *Apocalypse*, this section will show that the *e contrario* shape of revelation, redemption and eschatology in Galatians derives from Paul's theological application of the significance and centrality of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As such this, motif is not apocalyptic but *christomorphic*.

### 2.1 Paul's Biography of Resurrection (Gal 1.11–16)

Γνωρίζω ... ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί (Gal 1.11). Though Paul's introduction to his mediation of divine revelation bears striking similarity to Enoch's 'I make known to you, my sons' (1 *Enoch* 93.2), Paul's authority-conferring strategy fundamentally differs from and even inverts the strategy of the *Apocalypse*: instead of signifying that he was worthy or fit to receive revelation, Paul exploits his prior *unrighteousness* to prove that he has received divine revelation.

Galatians opens with an axiomatic binary antithesis between divine and human origination: Paul's apostleship is 'not from man ... but through Jesus Christ and God' (1.1). His gospel derives from no human source (1.12). According to Paul's deductive reasoning, since no human generated his gospel, God himself must have revealed it. Paul here argues by way of negation: since there are two and *only* two potential sources of this revelation, he substantiates the divine, revelatory source of his gospel by stating (1.11–12), and then supporting (1.13–16), that no human produced his message.<sup>42</sup>

Paul's story begins with his life ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, but, notwithstanding his identification as Ἰουδαῖος later (2.15), he no longer identifies with or bears allegiance to such a movement.<sup>43</sup> Two clauses in apposition to his 'former conduct' (ἀνοστροπή ποτε) elucidate his past life. First, by pointing out that he persecuted the assembly of God, he identifies the negative worth that he had possessed in relation to God; second, by referring to his zealous character, he signifies the

42 The γάρ in 1.13 indicates that this story primarily substantiates the divine origin of his gospel rather than responds to counter-narratives transmitted by the agitators. See B. Lategan, 'Is Paul Defending his Apostleship in Galatians? The Function of Galatians 1.11–12 and 2.19–20 in the Development of Paul's Argument', *NTS* 34 (1988) 411–30; cf. J. H. Schutz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority* (SNTSMS 26; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 114–58, esp. 134; B. Gaventa, 'Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as Paradigm', *NovT* 28 (1986) 309–26; J. M. G. Barclay, 'Paul's Story', *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment* (ed. B. W. Longenecker; London: Westminster John Knox, 2002) 133–56.

43 For the meaning of Ἰουδαϊσμός, see M. Novenson, 'Paul's Former Occupation in *Ioudaismos*', *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter* (ed. M. W. Elliot et al.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014) 24–39.

positive worth that he accrued before his peers.<sup>44</sup> But these elements of his former life, including both his merits and demerits, his righteousness and unrighteousness, are only dramatically identified to point out, rather ironically, their complete irrelevance: God set him apart from birth, and thus nothing in Paul's prior life either occasioned or inhibited God's revelation to him.<sup>45</sup> To expand on a phrase from Karl Barth, the conversion of Paul speaks not only a great 'yet' and 'nevertheless' to his unrighteousness, but also a 'regardless' to the positive social value he obtained amongst his kinsmen.<sup>46</sup> Accordingly, Paul, considering his past life to be a functional state of non-existence without worth or proper direction, states that God 'called me by his grace', signifying the creative power of God which miraculously calls his new life into being. God's interruptive intervention does not provide Paul with some sort of enhancement, empowerment or even new information per se. The revelation of Jesus Christ occasions his entire deconstruction and reconstruction (2.19–20); Paul is called into existence *ex nihilo*.<sup>47</sup>

This conversion transforms the entirety of his existence, not least his actions and even his physical body, into a crucimorphic pattern (cf. 6.17).<sup>48</sup> Paul is 'co-crucified' with the messiah, who then indwells and enables his actions: 'It is not I who live, but Christ who lives in me' (2.20). By saying that the son of God was revealed 'in' him, Paul interprets his own conversion and calling as the moment when he becomes a re-presentation and continuation of God's eschatological revelation of Jesus Christ to the world.<sup>49</sup> Paul himself becomes an apocalypse.

For Paul his conversion account provides sufficient evidence to prove that his gospel did not come from man. The *e contrario* transition from his former life as a persecutor to an apocalypse of the crucified messiah precludes the possibility that any human, either himself or his peers, caused this transformation.<sup>50</sup> God is the only option. Whereas the *Apocalypse* establishes the 'heavenly etiology' of the text by highlighting Enoch's *righteousness*, Paul supports the divine origin of his gospel by exploiting his *unrighteousness* to prove that no human could have

44 Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015) 358.

45 Martyn translates ἀποκαλύψαι in 1.16 as 'apocalyptically reveal' because he thinks it indicates an apocalyptic 'invasion' (Martyn, *Galatians*, 99, 158). But there is nothing apocalyptic about the notion of invasion or a cataclysmic end of history. The apocalypses, not least the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, often describe revelation as non-invasive.

46 K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. IV/1: *The Doctrine of Reconciliation* (ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance; trans. G. W. Bromiley; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956) 11.

47 Barclay, 'Paul's Story', 142.

48 Barclay, 'Paul's Story', 141; M. Gorman, 'The Apocalyptic New Covenant and the Shape of Life in the Spirit according to Galatians', *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination* (ed. B. C. Blackwell et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016) 317–37, at 322–4.

49 On calling into being, see de Boer, *Galatians*, 91.

50 Martyn labels this as a 'disjunctive apocalypse' (Martyn, *Galatians*, 99).

produced this revelation which has now newly constituted him as righteous (2.16). Both arguments function within certain presupposed theological parameters: the author of the *Apocalypse* takes for granted that revelation and righteousness must correspond; Paul presupposes a christologically conditioned creator-creature distinction (1.1). Logically speaking, whereas the *Apocalypse* makes an inductive argument, Paul makes a deductive argument: Enoch's righteousness establishes the divine origin of his message; Paul's unrighteousness necessitates it.<sup>51</sup>

Paul's configuration of his conversion does not simply stem from his reflection on experience per se. Instead, he interprets his conversion through the history of the crucified and risen Christ and so expresses God's call in the christomorphic imagery of death and resurrection: 'Through the Torah I *died* to the Torah in order that I might *live* to God' (2.19). In light of this death-to-life imagery, we should call Paul's story not just a 'biography of reversal' but a biography of *resurrection*: God's call brought him to life out of death.<sup>52</sup> Paul's account of his *e contra-rio* reconstitution is therefore not determined by some prior theory about how revelation must work but rather retrospectively derived from his theological application of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. In other words, Paul configures his disjunctive experience of revelation in explicitly christomorphic terms.

### 2.2 *Salvation by Blessing out of Curse (Gal 3.10–14)*

Paul describes a rather pessimistic situation in Gal 3.10: 'those from works of the Torah' fail to obey the Torah and thereby incur the curse. The Torah, though against neither the blessing nor the promise, nevertheless contains an internal weakness and inability to effect the realisation of the eschatological blessing of Abraham. The Torah promised blessing but has only brought curse.

A number of elements in Galatians 3 demonstrate that Paul at least associates the content of this curse with death.<sup>53</sup> Blessing, justification and life are tightly connected so as to be virtually interchangeable. Paul declares that 'nobody is *justified* in the Torah' (3.11) and the *blessing* comes by faith (3.14) because 'the righteous by faith will *live*' (3.11). Furthermore, he interprets the Torah's inability to bring blessing as an inability to 'make *alive*' (ζωοποιῆσαι, 3.21). To invert this, the curse, lack of justification and death are correlated, most prominently when Paul coordinates Jesus' death with his assimilation into the curse (3.13). Thus, the terms 'blessing' and 'curse' describe and accentuate what Paul calls 'life' and 'death'.

51 'Necessitates' here does not imply the superiority of Paul's argument but rather points out the implicit logic of 1.11–16.

52 The phrase 'biography of reversal' is taken from Schutz, *Paul and the Anatomy*, 133.

53 R. J. Morales, *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians* (WUNT 11/282; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) 86–114.

Gal 3.10–11 drives home the absolute certainty and universal scope of the Torah's death-curse.<sup>54</sup> With quantitative terms Paul emphasises that '*as many* who are from works of Torah are accursed ... accursed are *all* who do not remain in *all* of the things written in the book ... *nobody* is justified in the Torah'. But Paul has also referred to a group that has received the blessing along with Abraham (3.6), and thus at first glance in 3.6–11 Paul appears simply to apply the blessing and curse to two distinct communities. On the one hand, there are those of faith who, by virtue of their participation with Jesus through the Spirit, are children of Abraham and receive his blessing. On the other hand, all of 'those from works of the Torah' are cursed because they for one reason or another fail to obey the Torah. A cursory reading of 3.6–11 would not indicate any movement between the two groups: one is cursed, the other is blessed. If, however, those from works of the Torah are to be justified, blessed and made alive, what is needed is a disjunctive movement from curse into blessing. What is needed is a way to bring life out of death.<sup>55</sup>

And indeed Paul discovers just that. Those under the curse of the Torah are 'redeemed' by 'Christ becoming a curse for us' (3.13). Christ's assimilation to those under the curse of death results in both their disjunctive movement *out of* the sphere of curse and *into* the sphere of blessing: 'Christ redeemed us from the curse ... so that the blessing of Abraham might come in Christ Jesus (3.13–14). To borrow a phrase from Barth, God 'does not allow his history to be his and our ours': he does not will for Israel's death to be hers alone, her curse hers alone, or her humanity hers alone.<sup>56</sup> For Paul, God in Jesus Christ willingly participates in Israel's fallen humanity, her curse and her death, in order that he might, by the re-creative power of the resurrection, bring Abraham's blessing out of the curse to all humanity, both Jew and Gentile alike.

Blessing out of curse means life out of death, and so this *e contrario* movement in Gal 3.10–14 theologically parallels the announcement of Christ's death and resurrection (1.1). Paul therefore also configures redemption christomorphically: God creates the blessing of life out of the curse of death through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In light of this christomorphically configured soteriology, Paul describes salvation as a gift distributed not to the worthy, the elite or the antecedently righteous but to the *unworthy* insofar as they are, prior to this event, under the curse for disobedience. In other words, the mismatch between the crucifixion and the resurrection entails a corresponding mismatch between divine gift and human recipient: the christomorphic shape of salvation entails

54 On the universal scope of the curse, see F. Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2004) 431–4. I use 'universal' here to mean universal for the group of those from works of Torah.

55 See Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 404–7 for interpretation along these lines.

56 Barth, *CD* IV/1, 7.

that, to use John Barclay's vocabulary, God's grace is given as an *incongruous* gift.<sup>57</sup> Because God's nature is to bring life out of death, he has mercy on none except sinners.<sup>58</sup>

Whereas in the *Apocalypse* God enhances the antecedently righteous with wisdom which empowers them to actualise their own military victory over the wicked, in Galatians God delivers the unrighteous into a state of blessing through the disjunctive, christomorphic, *e contrario* event of making the dead come to life. This christomorphic pattern also shapes Paul's understanding of the relationship between the 'present evil age' and the 'new creation'.

### 2.3 *The Birth of the New Creation, out of the Present Evil Age (Gal 1.4; 6.14–15)*

At the outset of Galatians Paul announces that Jesus 'snatched us from the present evil age' (1.4). The resurrection of Jesus Christ (1.1) transfers Paul's community ('us') out of this age and into a different realm of existence. Paul further elaborates on this in 6.14–15:

May it never be for me to boast – except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the world is crucified to me and I to the world. For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything, but new creation.

This is cosmological deconstruction. The triple crucifixion of Jesus Christ, Paul and the world tears Paul away from the old age which is now in a state of objective, permanent dissolution.<sup>59</sup> The erasure of the old antinomy of circumcision/uncircumcision directly follows the crucifixion of the world, the nullification of the 'present evil age'.<sup>60</sup> Because the old world is crucified, its systems of value and standards of evaluation are non-existent and utterly irrelevant: 'neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of value'. It is not that Paul prefers uncircumcision over circumcision, or vice versa, but rather he evaluates both forms of male status as irrelevant in view of the norm-shattering cosmological deconstruction of Christ's crucifixion. What does count, what is 'something' (τί), is 'the new creation', the creative action of God in the resurrection of Jesus, which generates a

57 Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 72–3.

58 Cf. Martin Luther, *Die sieben Bußpsalmen: Erste Bearbeitung* (1517; WA 1/1) 183–4: 'Gottis natur ist, das er auß nicht etwas macht ... Macht nit lebend, dann die toden ... Macht nit frum, dann die sunder.'

59 So also de Boer, *Galatians*, 401–2. Pace Moyer Hubbard, ὁ κόσμος does not merely have an anthropological referent (M. V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought* (SNTSMS 119; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 188–232; see the critique in T. R. Jackson, *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept* (WUNT 11/272; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) 83–114.

60 On antinomies in Galatians, see J. L. Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians', *NTS* 31 (1985) 410–24.



new aeon out of the evil age. Such profound newness arrives in the Christ-event that it drastically restructures all indexes of quality established prior to or against what must now be regarded as the singular criterion of worth in the new creation: the self-gift of Jesus Christ (2.20).

The *Apocalypse* described a gradual and eventual eschatological development in which the new heaven arrives after the judgement of sinners, the rebuilding of the temple and a universal turn to obedience. For Paul, however, as an event of *creatio e contrario*, the new creation irrupts from within and out of the present evil age when the death of Jesus permanently judges the old age and his resurrection produces the new creation on the other side of death. Paul's configuration of his eschatology as a type of cosmological death and resurrection is purely christomorphic: the disjunction between the present evil age and the new creation derives from the disjunction between the crucified and risen Christ.<sup>61</sup> Thus, the drastic separation between the present evil age and the new creation is not a pre-determined tenet of Jewish apocalypticism but stems from Paul's creative eschatological application of his Christology.

### 3. Disjunction as Christomorphic, Not Apocalyptic

Paul opens his letter with a decisive assertion of the divine identity: God is the one who raised Jesus Christ from the dead (Gal 1.1). God is thus known *through* the history of Jesus Christ *as* a fundamentally christocentric reality, or, in other words, Jesus Christ constitutes both the formal and material principles, the source and content, of Paul's theology. Paul rethinks the identity of God and his interaction with humanity through the disjunctive, *e contrario* history of Christ crucified and risen. God manifests as 'the one who raised him from the dead' (1.1) when he brings Paul's new life out of his dead self (1.11–16), the blessing of life out of the curse of death (3.10–14), and the new creation out of the present evil age (1.4; 6.14–15). Paul configures these elements of the divine economy according to a disjunctive, *e contrario* pattern precisely because the paradigmatic action of the divine identity is the *e contrario* enactment of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

This contrasts starkly with the *Apocalypse of Weeks*. In the *Apocalypse*, God gives revelation to Enoch on account of his prior righteousness, enacts salvation for only the righteous and brings in the new heaven after a universal turn to obedience. Instances of *creatio e contrario* are absent from the *Apocalypse* because the narrative consistently follows a theological pattern of divine relationality in which God enhances the antecedently righteous. This is to suggest neither that *creatio e*

61 Hubbard points out the death-life pattern in 6.14–15, though he views it anthropologically (Hubbard, *New Creation*, 227–9); cf. B. Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007) 68–9.

*contrario* is *nowhere* in the Jewish apocalypses nor that the *Apocalypse* is somehow representative of all the apocalypses or apocalypticism; rather, as this investigation has shown, this motif is just not common to all the apocalypses and therefore should not be classified as a uniquely apocalyptic theme. Attempts to pinpoint the origin of the Pauline *creatio e contrario* somewhere in the Jewish apocalypses will ultimately fail to reveal how the theological pattern of this motif demonstrates Paul's thoroughgoing application of his Christology to his theology.

Paul's explicit christomorphic shaping of *creatio e contrario* is neither analogous to common aspects of the Jewish apocalypses nor directly retrieved from them. Disjunctive aspects of Paul's letters commonly described as apocalyptic are more appropriately identified as *christomorphic* since they are not derived from the apocalypses but shaped by the kerygmatic history of Jesus Christ. Put simply, Paul's theology here is not apocalyptic; it is christomorphic. For Paul, then, the problem of Nietzsche's philosophers – '[H]ow can something originate in its opposite...?' – is not answered by apocalypticism. The answer is Jesus Christ.