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This thesis seeks to discover the center of Galatians, its unique theological statement, by approaching the question from the perspective of the dialogical nature of the letter as a piece of literature, and the theology of the opponents with which it is dialogical.

The context of a piece of literature is essential to its being understood. When a letter is as obviously disputative as is Galatians, a vital part of that context must be the opponents who have called it forth.

The review of literature reveals that the identity of the opponents in Galatia remains "problematic." Two things in particular stand in the
way of an assessment of their theology. Internally there is the question of the way the parts of the letter relate to each other, the way the argument moves, and the portions of the letter from which the intruding theology can be assessed. Externally there is the debate concerning the source or sources of the "heresy," and of the Galatians' behaviour. Suggestions range from "normative Pharisaic Judaism" to "enthusiastic Hellenistic Paganism."

This thesis seeks to approach first the internal question of the nature of Galatians as a piece of literature. This is a methodology which has not yet been fully explored. Because it will indicate something of the relation of the parts of the letter to each other, it will help prevent a subjective or predetermined dissection of the text and will have important conclusions for the opponents and their theology. Genre analysis suggests that Galatians is best analyzed in terms of an "apologetic letter." In this case, other literary examples, and the rhetorical canons which lie behind them, do suggest that there is a particular dialogical structure to Galatians. The examination of the form and function of smaller segments of the letter, itself a part of this genre-analysis, both confirms and fills out this suggested argument-structure. Throughout Galatians on particular causa is constantly reaffirmed—the Galatians' treacherous abandonment of Paul's gospel
and the embracing of another gospel (a religious quest that could be summarized as a beginning in one way and an ending in another way). Galatians is a dialogical response to opponents. But because of their espousal of an offending theology, the Galatians themselves are in an important sense the offending party, and the whole letter is written to them. Further, throughout Galatians Paul's answer to this intruding theology rests on one particular base—the significance of baptism "into Christ," which transports the Christian into the freedom of the Spirit and of the new age.

This analysis of Galatians as a piece of literature therefore allows a tentative hypothesis concerning the theology of the opponents. Its conclusions for the structure of the argument also provide a frame for a "holistic" comparison of Galatians with external literature, both confirming and filling out this tentative hypothesis. It is essential, not only that history-of-religions parallels to the intruding theology be found, but that they be found in a holistic context that is congruous with the conflict as construed from Galatians. Five traditions are examined (traditions of apostle, traditions of Abraham, traditions of Moses and the law, sacramental traditions, and ethical traditions), firstly in terms of the overall argument in Galatians, and secondly, in terms of the "external" literature.

When Galatians is analyzed in these terms, it
becomes apparent that the one intruding theology, and its acceptance by the Galatians, has called forth the entire letter. This theology takes on its particular shape, firstly, because of its roots in certain circles of Judaism. But it takes its shape, secondly, from its understanding of Christianity and the place it assigns to Jesus. Paul's response, the total statement of Galatians, is also seen now to have a particular shape. It is a statement of the lordship of Christ and of the eschatological nature of the deliverance He has effected in His death on the cross. Justification is to be understood in terms of a new life; and the new life is to conform to the eschatological finality of justification.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis seeks to discover the center of Galatians—its unique theological statement—by approaching the question from the perspective of the dialogical nature of the letter as a piece of literature and of the theology of the opponents with which it is dialogical.

The significance of this study lies not only in the possibility of a more precise comprehension of a foundational document of the Christian church. It also offers deeper insight into earliest Christianity, some of the circles of thought from which these Christians came, the theological "baggage" they brought with them, and the influence this "baggage" had on early understandings of Jesus.

Certain recurring issues suggest that some new attempt to grasp the essentials of Galatians is timely. There is much less than unanimity on the place of the letter in Paul's theology. For some, "Paul" is found more clearly here than anywhere else.¹ But if this is the case, then he is the protagonist par excellence in conflict even with the other apostles and the Palestinian

¹For example, F. F. Bruce, "Galatian Problems: 5. Galatians and Christian Origins," BJRL 55 (1973):284. "Galatians is the most 'Pauline' of all Paul's letters."
wing of Christianity. For others, "Paul" is not really found here at all. Galatians is a letter of excesses, perhaps due to the heat of the moment in which it was written, and Paul himself strays dangerously close to Gnosticism. In the extreme form in which the doctrine of righteousness by faith here appears, it is said, he lays the basis for later problems in Corinth. However, in his other letters he has learned his lesson; he never again proclaims Christian freedom so boldly. Others even conclude that this "extreme" letter is the result of a later addition to and alteration of "Paul."


2 So, Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, trans. Frank Clarke (Atlanta: John Knox, 1977), p. 56. Because Galatians is one of the "controversial" texts, this is not the place to begin to assess Paul's theology.


4 Drane, " Tradition," p. 177.

5 J. C. O'Neill, The Recovery of Paul's Letter to Galatians (London: SPCK, 1972), p. 9, etc., following the earlier theories of van Manen and others. See below, p. 16. O'Neill asserts that "if Paul was a coherent, argumentative, pertinent writer, Galatians as it now stands cannot have been written by Paul, for it is full
Closely allied to this issue is the question of the "Judaism" of the Galatian opponents. Hans Joachim Schoeps is rather typical in his assumption that it is an "orthodox" or Pharisaic Judaism; but he concludes that, if this is so, Paul basically misunderstands Judaism. Others see behind Galatians an error closely related to the one behind Colossians—and therefore not of Rabbinic type, but associated more with sectarian and apocalyptic Judaism. Precision in this respect becomes even more difficult in the face of the apparent breakdown of obscurities, contradictions, improbable remarks, and nonsequiturs; but, if Galatians was not written by Paul, it is too obscure and disjointed, and at the same time too urgent and compelling, to have been written by a compiler. Nobody could have written Galatians but Paul; yet the Galatians we possess is not entirely Paul's." A crucial assumption behind O'Neill's failure to hold Galatians together is that it was written against "orthodox" Judaism. So he would modify passages on law and Judaism, completely omit the στοιχεῖα-passage (4:1-3, 8-10), and emend references to apostleship.


of traditional categories of intertestamental literature.¹

A third and vital issue is the place and meaning of the doctrine of "righteousness by faith" in Galatians. As it has a central place in only two of Paul's books, is it really a "Pauline" doctrine? Is it that an opponent has led him to use an "un-Pauline" argument?² Or, if it is Pauline, is it a doctrine which speaks only to Pharisaic Judaism, therefore being totally irrelevant in the Galatian situation? Is Paul using an argument against opponents who could not possibly be answered in this way?³

In the face of such issues, this thesis suggests that it is in Paul's opponents that explanations will be found for the form of the theology in this letter, and the particular way in which the argument holds together.⁴

---

¹See below, pp. 196-99.

²Helmut Koester, "Paul and Hellenism," in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. Philip J. Hyatt (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 192, notes, "... scholars are looking for a particular polemical situation in which Paul, prompted by opponents, was enticed to discuss theories so alien to his thought as those proposed in the epistle to the Romans."

³Gunther, Opponents, p. 61; see also below, pp. 21-23, on Schmithals and Marxsen.

And yet, as the review of literature will demonstrate, there is anything but consensus concerning the identity of these opponents. Is the letter written against Jewish intruders? Then why does it refer to them only in terms of their methods, and not of their theology? Why is the theology directed to the Galatians themselves? And why is it that some practices in Galatia seem very "un-Jewish" in traditional terms (4:8-9, 5:19-21, 6:13)? Is it written, then, to Gentile Galatians? Then why does the argument suggest a direct assault from a form of Judaism? Are there two groups of addressees (legalist intruders, libertine Galatians; or legalist intruders and Galatians, and a party of libertine Galatians)? Then why are there strong suggestions of the same concerns in all sections of the epistle (3:1-5, 5:13-24, 6:1, 2, 7-8)? Why are the Galatians always referred to as a homogeneous group (1:6-10, 3:1-5, 5:13-15)? If it is the Galatians who are the libertines, how are they in danger of accepting a legalist heresy?

In all the attempts at approaching Galatians from the perspective of the opponents, the most crucial and recurring question is that of the unity of the letter.

(1972-73):229-54; and further literature below, pp. 15-59. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 334, citing the example of Luther as an illustration of this principle, noted, "Luther renouncing the Pope for idolatry and Luther rebuking Carlstadt for iconoclasm writes like two different persons. He bIDS the timid and gentle Melanchthon 'sin and sin boldly;' he would have cut off his right hand sooner than pen such words to the antinomian rioters of Münster."
Which parts address the Galatians? From which parts is the intruding theology to be assessed? No clear answer is possible without a careful examination of the structure of the letter, its literary nature, and the unity of its argument.

This thesis therefore seeks to approach the question of the opponents from a particular direction, an analysis first of the dialogical nature of Galatians as a piece of literature. As will be noted below in the review of methodology, this approach has not yet been fully explored. Moreover, it may provide some form of control over the way the parts of the epistle are related to each other, suggesting to what extent, and with whom, the letter is dialogical.

Once the structure of the argument in Galatians has been clarified, the key traditions at work in the letter are analyzed in terms of external literature. This is not only to safeguard against any "vague combinations and hypotheses" but is also to fill out the picture of the opponents and their theology as suggested by the literary analysis. This last is not here left behind but is used to provide a framework in which the "structural function" of the traditions in Galatians itself can first be determined.¹

The steps in the thesis will now briefly be described. It begins with a review of literature, divided into two chapters, the first of which examines various theories regarding the identity and theology of the opponents. The second critically considers methodologies for locating and characterizing the opponents, concluding with a statement of the method to be used in this thesis.

The following part is devoted to an analysis of Galatians as a piece of literature, and a determination of the literary genre to which the letter belongs. The first chapter examines the genre of letter, or epistle, indicators within Galatians of appropriate genre, and the "apologetic letter" genre, with suggestions of the structure to which it gives rise. The second chapter looks for indications of smaller scale of the structure and unity of the letter, continuing and confirming the genre analysis. Using the conclusions for the pattern of argument, it ends with a sketch of the intruding theology.

The final part of the thesis seeks to confirm and fill out this sketch or hypothesis in terms of Jewish and Christian literature of the period. Beginning from

---

within the movement of the debate in Galatians, it examines five prominent traditions involved in the controversy: the tradition of apostle, the tradition of Abraham, traditions of Moses and the law, sacramental traditions, and ethical traditions.

The conclusion, of course, seeks to draw the whole work together. It sets forth the theology of the opponents, and the essentials of Paul's theological statement in the letter, now that it is understood as a dialogical response to these opponents.

There are naturally some self-imposed limitations to the study, although at times their restrictions are keenly felt. Such matters as the precise destination (North or South Galatia) and date of the letter (especially relative to Acts 15, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans) must be largely left to one side. Five traditions are considered; of course there are more, but space excludes them. For Jewish literature, attention is concentrated on so-called "apocalyptic" texts, the writings of the sectarians (Qumran), Philo, Josephus, and some "apologetic" literature, with briefer attention to other sources. And it has not been possible to trace exhaustively the anti-Pauline or "Judaising" traditions through the rest of the New Testament and early Christianity.

This is an appropriate place for some definitions of terms. By "nomism" will be meant not only a concern
for law but a conviction that compliance with law is essential for the initiation of access to God, or for full acceptance with God. "Enthusiasm" is used to refer to an attention to the inward and personal experience of religious powers, especially the experience of the Spirit, which lifts above the ordinary and confers an advanced standing in that religion. A "literary genre" is a literary type with respect to larger units such as "gospel" or "epistle."¹ "Genre analysis" is used to refer to the identification of literary genres, and determination of the suitability of any one for an evaluation of a particular piece of literature.² The "apologetic letter genre" is a subcategory within the larger category or literary type of "letters" which is at the same time rhetorical or apologetic speech in a literary mode.³ "Rhetoric" refers to the long-developed and


²Doty, Interpretation, p. 56, refers to it as the attempt to "evaluate the significance and influence of the larger units of the materials, the genres." See also Frederick Veltman, "The Defense Speeches of Paul in Acts: Gattungsforschung and Its Limitations" (Th.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1975), pp. 251-52, and further literature below, pp. 65-66.

³See the description and identification of this genre below, pp. 85-93.
studied methods and devices for public speech or oratory. The term "apocalyptic" is used in two typical senses. Firstly, it is used as a commonly-accepted designation for certain Jewish pseudepigraphical literature ("apocalyptic literature"), in particular 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, the Assumption of Moses, and Jubilees.

Secondly, it is used to refer to a realm of ideas, or a form of eschatological thinking, which has its own way of viewing the world, the cosmos, and history—that is, ideas contained in "apocalyptic literature." "Eschatology" refers to an orientation to the movement of history towards its conclusion or perfection, an orientation

1See further description and sources, below, pp. 87-93.

2See the list of apocalyptic literature in David Syme Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (London: SCM Press, 1964), pp. 37-38. Of Jubilees he says, "Jubilees is not, strictly speaking, an apocalyptic book; but it belongs to the same milieu" (p. 54). Because this thesis is more concerned with the ideas in the milieu than with a precise definition of apocalyptic, it seems justifiable to refer to Jubilees as apocalyptic literature. Gene L. Davenport, The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees (Leiden: Brill, 1971), pp. 5-9, after noting the difficulty of distinguishing between apocalyptic and prophetic eschatology, claims that there are both prophetic and apocalyptic elements in Jubilees.

3These two definitions of apocalyptic are found, for instance, in Philip Vielhauer, NTA, 2:582, and Doty, Interpretation, p. 165. The concern of the dissertation is not to isolate the ideas of this literature, but rather to explore some of the traditions held in common with other Jewish sources. On this sharing of traditions, see Russell, Method, pp. 24-27, and further literature below, pp. 199-201, 227-28.
to last things. "Realised eschatology" means a participation in some sense in the benefits of the last days.

See Bultmann, Theology, 1:4-11. Because the stress here falls on "last things," it is possible to speak of God's saving deed in Christ as eschatological occurrence (so Bultmann, ibid., 1:43, 306, 329, etc.; and Herman Ridderbos, Paul. An Outline of His Theology, trans. John R. de Witt [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975], pp. 44-53), and the church as the eschatological community (Bultmann, ibid., 1:37-42 etc.).

See Ridderbos, Paul, pp. 40-41, who notes in Paul's writings a tension between "realised" and "futurist" eschatology.
PART ONE

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
CHAPTER ONE

THE IDENTITY AND THEOLOGY OF THE OPPONENTS

From Paul to Irenaeus

Because of the work of Ferdinand C. Baur, Joseph B. Lightfoot, etc., the postapostolic age, with its controversies, has become part of the Pauline debate itself. In the second century, the Galatian opponents were identified by both orthodoxy and the Marcionites as radical Jewish-Christians from Jerusalem. But there is more to the picture than this. The early Fathers evidently lost the heart of the argument in Galatians. Judaism was wrong, not because it nullified the cross, but because it was ἀφρόσομη; the law was said to lead to

1 The anti-Marcionite prologue is quoted in W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), p. 229. Bruce, "Christian Origins," p. 254, quotes the Marcionite prologue. It is interesting that, in the second century, Hegessipus says that there was no Gnosticism in Paul's time, Eusebius, HE 3.32; yet, by the fourth century, Epiphanius makes the Galatian culprit the Gnostic (or Jewish-Christian?) Cerinthus, Panarion 28.2.3, as does Jerome a little later, perhaps following him. See the material cited in Schmithals, Paul, pp. 36-38. But note the discussion of this same material in A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reininck, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects (Leiden: Brill, 1973), pp. 6, 8, 12, 19, who conclude that it is practically worthless.

2 To Diognetius 4 (ANF, 1:26).
belief in Christ; Christ was in fact a "new law." Walter Bauer, after examining the tenor of such literature, concluded that it left no room for Paul as an authority. On the other hand, the gnostic opponents of the Fathers seemed to make much use of Galatians; and later, Paul became almost the "Gnostic apostle." To further complicate the picture, Jewish-Christian literature painted Paul as the bogus apostle, the Gnostic, and caricatured him in the person of Simon Magus. The Gnostics saw Galatians as written against Peter and the Jews; and

1 Irenaeus Against Heresies 4. 2. 7, quoting Gal 2:24 (ANF, 1:465).

2 Justin Dialog with Trypho 11 (PG, 6:497): νόμος δὲ κατὰ νόμου τεθέν τον πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐπαυσε . . . αἰώνος τε ἡμῖν νόμος καὶ τελευταῖος, ὁ Χριστὸς ἔδεικ, . . . .

3 Bauer, Orthodoxy, p. 199.

4 Irenaeus Against Heresies 3. 13. . (ANF, 1:436), against Marcion’s claims for Paul’s superior apostleship; and 5. 35. 2 (ANF, 1:565-66), on Gal 4:26 and the heavenly aeon, Jerusalem.

5 Elaine H. Pagels, The Gnostic Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 157; and, for example, the Gospel of Philip. Irenaeus found it necessary to reclaim Paul from the heretics, Against Heresies 4. 41. 4 (ANF, 1:525).

6 See Georg Strecker’s introduction to Kerygmata Petrou, NTA, 2:108.

7 Pagels, Paul, pp. 101-6; Gos. Phil. 17, 47, and 95 (NHL, 132, 134, 149).
certain Jewish-Christians closely identified Paul and Gnosticism. One conclusion is that Galatians does not counter Gnosticism: if the opponents are Gnostics, Paul has misunderstood them, and given them much ammunition.

From Luther to Baur

John Calvin made some distinction between those who preached a "different gospel" in 2 Cor 11 and those who did so in Galatia; and between both these and the heretics encountered in the Pastorals. However, along with Martin Luther most Protestant writers have identified Paul's opponents as Jewish-Christian fanatics from Jerusalem.

About a century after Luther and Calvin, Henry H. Hammond of Oxford anticipated some later scholarship in identifying virtually all Paul's opponents as Gnostics, including those in Galatia. Another century later, Johannes L. von Mosheim joined Hammond and the Reformation

---


3 Henry Hammond, A Paraphrase and Annotations upon All the Books of the New Testament, 7th ed. (London: Tho. Newborough and Benj. Tooke, 1702), pp. 517, 537-52. He proposes circumcised Gnostics, preaching circumcision to Gentiles, opposed by both Peter and Paul, and sees these same opponents in 1 Timothy 5-6, and Ignatius' Magnesians and Trallians. They belong with Simon Magus, Menander, Basilides, the Nicolaitans, etc.
tradition. There were two heretical tendencies within the New Testament, one, Gnosticism, the other (as in Galatians), Jewish Christianity which later became Ebionism. In 1829 Edward G. Burton again proposed that Paul's opponents were, in the main, Gnostics. In Galatia they were either Jewish teachers or Gnostics who espoused Jewish ordinances for reasons political. Burton worked partly from Tertullian's apparent use of Gal 4:3, 10 and Col 2:12, 20 against Gnostics, who, he said, were clearly present in Colossae, though the predominant emphasis in Galatians is the scrupulous enforcement of the Jewish religion.

The Modern Period
Jerusalem Theories

The majority of modern commentators see the Galatian opponents as being connected in some way with the Christian church in Jerusalem.

Two-party theories

Baur was perhaps the first to make Paul's opponents a decisive key to the whole of the apostle's writings. The course of early Christianity, and of Christian history as a whole, was said to have been


determined by a dialectic between Pauline (Hellenistic) and Petrine (Jewish) Christianity. Gnosticism was restricted to the second century. Paul's opponents were the Jerusalem apostles themselves, preaching circumcision as the first step in the Christian faith.¹ They first appeared in Galatia, then later in Corinth, where the conflict entered another stage. Sources for this conflict were the four "authentic" letters of Paul, and especially the Clementine romance.²

Later followers took Baur's historical-critical theories to some of their logical conclusions, tending in the process to refute his own positions. The controversy between Peter and Paul became the controversy in the second century between Gnosis and Jewish legalism, now the orthodoxy of the Great Church. The New Testament documents were made reflections of this second-century struggle. Because that struggle was clearest in Galatians, Bruno Bauer made this the last "Pauline" letter.³ W. V. van Manen pressed this logic even further. Because the struggle between law and gnosis climaxed in Galatians,


²See Strecker, NTA, 2:103-6.

³Bruno Bauer, Kritik der paulinischen Briefe (Berlin: Hempel, 1852; reprint ed., Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1972), 1:5-6, 118-29. Baur's "four genuine Pauline epistles" are all assigned to the second century.
its author was a Gnostic, endeavoring, with the aid of other Pauline literature, to defend liberal Gentile Christianity against the Church itself, the "anti-Pauline opponent." In demanding such an unlikely dating of the whole New Testament, this theory has tended to disqualify its own assertions about the antagonists in Galatia. However, one position has remained: Galatians rejects legalism in terms of theological principles.

Despite reservations with Baur's theory at many places, Albert Schweitzer agreed in identifying Paul's Galatian opponents with the Jerusalem "Pillars." The apostles themselves had insisted that the Gentiles accept circumcision and the law. However, the tension between Petrine and Pauline Christianity is in terms of different eschatologies. The occasion of Galatians was said to have arisen from a particular aspect of Pauline eschatology.

---

1W. B. van Manen, "Marcions Brief van Paulus aan de Galatiërs," Theologisch Tijdschrift 21ste Jaargang (1887):382-404, 451-533. This writer reads little Dutch and has relied heavily on interpretations of this article in J. C. O'Neil, The Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians (London: SPCK, 1972), and others. O'Neil regards van Manen's work favorably and uses the latter's analysis of Marcion's version of Galatians (reproduced on pp. 497-533 of his article) as a basis for his own emendation of the text of the letter.


ology. Because of the unique form in which the Messianic kingdom had arrived in Christ, Paul developed a theory of spheres within Christianity, one Jewish and one Gentile—two separate churches. The Galatians had somehow learned that these two churches were two levels of privilege and salvation, and hence wanted to live as the Jewish church. Paul's answer is an eschatological one. For Gentiles to live as Jews is to deny all belief in Jesus as the Messiah (Gal 3:10-25, 4:4-5). Schweitzer has prompted the question of the place of eschatology in the opponents' argument, and in Paul's answer.

Hans Lietzmann modified Baur's position by postulating three parties in early Christianity. It is barely a modification. The third party is a "behind-the-scenes" party, secretly supported by James and Barnabas.\(^1\) However, the principle of a third party has become perhaps the most popular modern solution.

Three-party theories

A series of commentators have chosen this position for at least one outstanding reason: there is no direct attack in Galatians on the Jerusalem pillars, and certain portions of the letter (1:18-24, 2:1-10, 15-16) reveal a basic agreement between the latter and Paul.

Joseph B. Lightfoot, like Baur, placed the

Pauline controversies within the whole of Christian history of the first two centuries. He too felt the need to account for the second-century antagonism of Ebionites and Marcionites, and believed that "the epistle to the Galatians is the true key to the position." However, he suggested that Paul was not confronting a "party" but a "movement." It was distinct from the Jerusalem apostles, but was a Judaising movement that took two forms—Gnosticising and Pharisaic—which only became distinct and separate in the second century (libertine Gnosticism and ascetic Jewish Christianity). In Galatians Paul encountered the Pharisaic form, though there may also have been an anti-Judaistic, antinomian party, as in Corinth (shades of the "Two-Front" theories).

William Ramsay began by positing the trustworthiness of Acts, and the syncretistic background of the "South Galatians." It is a party of over-zealous followers from James (though not officially connected with


2William M. Ramsay, A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London: A. and C. Black, 1899), pp. 258, 326-71, 394-95. He equates the founding of the Galatian churches with Paul's first visit to Lystra, Antioch, and Iconium, which he also equates with the accounts of Acts 13 and 14 (p. 327). The "South Galatia Theory" tends to favor a third Jerusalem party as the opponents: it puts the Galatian churches in the province of synagogues and intense Jewish activity. Another alternative is that of Kirsopp Lake: the opponents were local Jews. See Gunther, Opponents, p. 1.
James) who create the occasion for Galatians. They assert that there are two stages in Christianity: those who keep the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15) achieve the lower stage, and those who keep the whole law reach the higher stage. The anti-syncretistic and ethical passages of Galatians were directed against ways in which the Galatians themselves had modified this "new gospel."

H. J. Schoeps, though in some ways returning to the positions of Baur, opposes the latter's school with a three-party theory.\(^1\) Besides Paul's party and the "Pillars" (a moderate Jewish-Christian group), there are τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἵρεσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων (Acts 15:5), who espouse the stricter views of Shamai. The great gulf is not between Paul and the "Pillars,"\(^2\) but between Paul and this stricter group, the ancestors of the Ebionites. This group is directly countered in Galatians.\(^3\) They did not demand the keeping of the whole law for Gentiles

---

\(^1\)Schoeps, Paul, pp. 65-77. He agrees with Baur regarding the importance of the Ebionites and the central place of the Clementine romance as a source for early Christian conflicts. See Strecker, NTA, 2:104.

\(^2\)Though there is a basic disagreement between them: Schoeps' position is close to Schweitzer's.

\(^3\)But can Pharisees, Galatian opponents, and Ebionites all be so simply equated? See, for instance, Strecker, NTA, 2:104-5. The Ebionisms in the Clementines may be interpolations, etc. Also Gunther, Opponents, p. 20: the Ebionites and Paul's opponents cannot be the same, as the former reject animal sacrifices, the Temple, and many Old Testament books and prophets; and 67-73: Paul's opponents are not from "normative" Phariseeism, but are closer to Jewish sectarian legalism (Qumran) and apocalyptic Jewish-Christianity.
(Gal 5:3); but Paul opposed the Jerusalem Decree as well as these Judaisers when he rejected the entire Mosaic law in principle (Gal 3).\(^1\) To Schoeps, the different opponents behind Paul's letters are all related to the one basic conflict running through Christianity, and all stem from the strict Pharisaic party (even in 1 and 2 Corinthians). These opponents, in their Jewishness, are closer to true Judaism than Paul himself, who, in his attacks on works of law, has totally misunderstood the law in Judaism.\(^2\)

Most conservative writers see the opponents as a third, stricter Jewish party.\(^3\) To all of them, the

\(^1\)This, to Schoeps, explains why Galatians comes after Acts 15 and yet does not mention it. He differs with Ramsay. Here it is Paul, not the Judaisers, who reject the decree. But in both cases, the decree is part of the problem Paul faces. Schoeps reiterates a point of Schweitzer's: Acts 15 deals with law by formulating specific, pragmatic precepts, whereas Galatians rejects the idea of law in principle. See Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 75, 80.

\(^2\)Schoeps, Paul, pp. 171-83, 213-17. His criticism of Paul's treatment of law is drawn mainly from Galatians 3 and 2 Corinthians 3; and Romans 5, 7 and 10:4 are interpreted in terms of these first texts. But is this legitimate, where Paul confronts opponents in the former texts and not in the latter?

\(^3\)For instance, Richard N. Longenecker, Paul, Apostle of Liberty (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964), pp. 212-17; Herman N. Ridderbos, The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1953), pp. 16-18; and Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction (Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1976), pp. 466-68. Gunther, Opponents, pp. 314-17, takes this general position, though he sees a basically united anti-Pauline movement coming out of sectarian Judaism, witnessed by such texts as Ascension of Isaiah, Jubilees, the Qumran documents, Philo's Therapeutai, etc. It is mystic-
witness of Acts, especially Acts 15 and its views of the conflict within the early church, is crucial.¹

Francis F. Bruce goes so far as to say that Galatians refutes Baur, since it shows basic agreement between Paul and the "Pillars," against a third, Pharisaic group.²

For him, the main issue of the letter is not theology but principles of mission. The central term in Galatians is not "gospel" but "gospel to the uncircumcised" (2:7).

Paul is an independent authority in his sphere, as the "Pillars" are in theirs—and in this there is agreement.³

Certainly apostleship is central in Galatians. But if Paul and the pillars have one and the same "gospel" (as Bruce affirms), then where does the "other gospel" come from? Is it not this "other gospel" that is the main issue?

Several other commentators also prefer a "third-party" theory that has the opponents come from Jerusalem.⁴

¹Some put Acts 15 after Galatians, following a "South Galatian" theory that dates Galatians very early. But Acts 15 still reveals the parties in conflict.


³Here Bruce both follows Schweitzer (the concept of spheres) and disagrees with him on law as a principle in Galatians. Schweitzer's position on law seems to have more support.

There is general agreement among these writers on one fundamental point: a "legalist" cannot be an "antinomian" or "libertine."\(^1\) The issue in Galatians 1-4 is clearly one of law—a point of the Tübingen school that has been constantly reaffirmed—so Galatians 5-6 cannot be dealing with the same issue. This is, in fact, an implicit two-front theory: therefore several of these writers must be considered again under that heading.

Gentile Theories

Ernst G. Hirsch and Wilhelm Michaelis have suggested that the Galatian opponents were pre-Pauline Gentile Christians, circumcised before their baptism, now advocating the same to Paul's concerts.\(^2\) Johannes Munck has more recently advocated this position as part of his attack on Baur and the Tübingen school, and on the historical assumptions behind their literary conjectures—that everywhere Paul was fighting with Jewish Christi-

---

\(^1\)Gunther, Opponents, p. 10—a representative statement. It is often held that Paul deals with two fronts simultaneously. The "libertine" is either an errant Pauline Christian or a hypothetical creation of legalist objectors to Paul's gospel.

anity.\(^1\) If the literary conjectures are untenable, he claims, the historical ones are too, and we should not look for Jewish-Christian opponents.\(^2\) Munck makes much of the present participle in Gal 6:13;\(^3\) and the suggestion that the Judaisers themselves do not keep the whole law or teach their converts to (3:10; 6:13). Elsewhere in the New Testament the central issue between Jerusalem and Gentile Christians is proposed to be table fellowship, of which there is no mention in Galatians. And he stresses the unlikelihood of a Judaising countermission from Jerusalem in Pauline missionary territory. Rather, he says, the situation has been created because Paul's own converts, taking seriously the apostle's sympathetic portrayal of Judaism (as in Rom 9-11),\(^4\) gathering material from the Greek Old Testament which he himself had given them,\(^5\) and hearing that the Jerusalem Christians

---

\(^1\) Munck, Paul, pp. 87-134.  
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 70.  
\(^3\) Taken as implying that the opponents themselves are only now being circumcised.  
\(^4\) Munck here heightens a problem raised by William D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: SPCK, 1977), pp. 62-84, 95-97—Paul's great sympathy for Judaism. After his own Gentile missions, he, like Philo, returned to Jerusalem to worship as an orthodox Jew. How can this attitude, and Romans 9-11, be reconciled with Galatians 3-4? We do not solve the problem by ignoring Acts. And how can Gal 5:3, 4 be reconciled with Acts 16:3? Galatians seems to differ from both Romans and Acts.  
\(^5\) On the basis of Genesis alone, the opponents may be more exegetically correct than Paul about the congruence of faith, circumcision, and obedience to the command-
were themselves circumcised, decided that they would con-
form to Judaism.\footnote{Paul's apostleship is attacked: the Galatians suppose he has kept some vital teaching from them and has not preached the same message as the Jerusalem apostles.} The erroneous theology is Jerusalem seen from a distance, a Gentile version of Jerusalem religion.

There has been plenty of criticism. The partic-
ciple in 6:13 could be a middle of personal advantage;\footnote{Robert Jewett, "The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation," \textit{NTS} 17 (1971):199. The Judaisers circumcise the Galatians, not themselves.} the questions of keeping the law, and of a countermis-
sion, are answered better in other ways;\footnote{Jewett, "Agitators," pp. 198-99; Koester, \textit{Trajectories}, pp. 143-44.} the Judaisers seem clearly to be intruders;\footnote{Jewett, "Agitators," p. 198; see Gal 4:17.} and the questions raised by the Jerusalem theories are still unanswered.\footnote{That is, how to deal with the letter and the heresy as a unity.} Munck's overall thesis, of which this material on Galatians is a part, has been strongly criticised.\footnote{Munck asserts that the centre of Paul's theology is a message of salvation: first the Gentiles are to be saved, then the Parousia will come, then Israel will be converted. His opponents reversed the first and third stage. See the criticism in Koester, "Hellenism," p. 192.} However, for Gala-
tians, it is a theory that bears further examination.\footnote{There may be evidence of spontaneous Judaising}
He is correct in asking the traditional interpretation how it can adequately account for a Judaising mission from Jerusalem—in Galatia!

Two-front Theories

Wilhelm Lütgert posited that Paul had to wage war on two fronts simultaneously—against legalists (Gal 5:1) and libertines (5:13).¹ Like Lightfoot, he saw in Galatians a group of "free spirits" similar to those in Corinth, who charge that Paul teaches circumcision, re-establishes the law, has his gospel from men, and gives up Christian freedom in face of pressures from Jerusalem.² The argument of the letter meets the two groups in a complex way. The charge concerning apostleship is one of dependence on Jerusalem, not independence (1:11-12, 16-17), and it is libertines, not legalists, who make this charge. The attack on legalism is restricted to 2:11-4:31; and in chaps. 5-6 the attack on

among Gentile Christians. Ignatius Philadelphians 6:1 (ANF, 1:82) speaks of a Judaism taught by the uncircumcised. See also the appendix by Strecker in Bauer, Orthodoxy.

¹Wilhelm Lütgert, Gesetz und Geist: eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefes (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1919.

²An objection to this theory must lie in the work of Drane, "Tradition," where the totally different approach of Paul in Galatians and 1 Corinthians is pointed out. Would Galatians ever answer a libertine? But against Drane, would it create Corinthian libertinism?
libertinism is resumed. Both positions are distortions of Christian freedom.

James H. Ropes produced his own "singular" version of this theory. Paul is said here to face the same two opponents, but Gal 3:6-29 is assumed to be against libertines, errant Gentile Christians who fail to understand their obligations as sons of Abraham. This turns the traditional understanding of the passage on its head and reduces the legalist thrust to a few specific items (circumcision, feasts). He can therefore say that the "Judaisers" are Gentiles, not from Jerusalem at all: they seek to impose circumcision to escape persecution from local Jews. This historical argument has not found much support.

For all their weaknesses, these theories have highlighted three things: the force of the apparent contradiction between anti-legalist and anti-libertine sections of the epistle; the complex attitude of the opponents to Jerusalem and Judaism (the opponents have their own version of liberty); and the complexity of Paul's own answers, in which theology is intertwined with ethics.

Other writers who see something less than a unity

---


2 Jewett contradicts it by placing the persecution in Judea, not Galatia; see below, pp. 213-14. Lütgert saw the circumcision campaign as a means of coming under the state protection of religio licita, Gesetz, pp. 96-106.
in the thrust of Galatians should be considered here. 

Their is an "implicit" two-front theory. Bruce disconnects Paul's section on "works of the flesh" from the theological portion of the letter. It is directed to an uninfluential minority of libertines.¹ Hans Dieter Betz proposes that, initially, an over-enthusiastic interpretation of Paul's gospel among the Galatians led to a problem of "sarx."² Anti-Pauline Jewish-Christian legalists siezed the opportunity and proposed adherence to the Torah as a solution. The key to both false positions is "pneuma."³ Others see here an answer to a hypothetical situation charged by the legalists—that Paul's gospel of "antinomianism" leads to licence.⁴ Another alternative is that of Jost Eckert.⁵ The opponents are Judaisers who,

¹Bruce, "The Other Gospel," pp. 254-72. Drane, Paul, p. 87, sees two groups within Galatians, although he also wants to say that Paul here meets a hypothetical Jewish objection (pp. 81-82).

²Betz, "Geist," pp. 78-93.

³However, "pneuma" holds Paul's argument together, rather than separating it into two answers to two different opponents: Koester, "Gnomai," p. 145. Betz, ibid., also fails to account for the real nomism in the opponents, in that they insist that circumcision is vital for salvation. See Dieter Georgi, Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem (Hamburg: Herbert Reich, 1965), p. 35.


⁵Die urchristliche Verkündigung im Streit zwischen Paulus und seinen Gegnern nach dem Galaterbrief (Regens-
if not identical with the "false brethren" of Gal 2:14 and the "James-party" of 2:12, are at least one in spirit with them, belonging to the same Jewish-Christian front. The place of circumcision and the law in the dispute is to be determined principally from the teachings of the Old Testament.\(^1\) The paraenetic section of the letter is traditional rather than occasional,\(^3\) and is therefore "unpolemical,"\(^4\) elucidating neither the nomism of the opponents nor the actual behavior of the Galatians. Its function is to stress the new basis of the life of the

\(^1\)That is, they are Jewish-Christians from Palestine (pp. 76, 102, 235). They attack Paul's gospel as illegitimate because it does not agree with that of the Pillars (p. 233). Eckert relies heavily in Galatians 1-2 for defining the opponents (pp. 230-33), and has not seen the "historic" rather than "historical" function of these chapters and the way that the overall argument suggests that they be used.

\(^2\)Eckert dismisses the suggestion that a "syncretistic" form of Judaism is involved. The mention of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, and the equation of Judaism with Paganism, in 4:3-11, is explained rather by the radical and ironical way in which Paul argues, and his subjective involvement in the Galatian situation (pp. 23-24, 91-93, 127-28). The dualistic nature of the argument is also to be explained by Paul's tendency to see everything in "black and white" (p. 25—despite the uniqueness of the dualistic argument in Galatians). As far as the law is concerned, he also dismisses the suggestion that an intertestamental theology of law is in question (pp. 114-23).

\(^3\)Following Dibelius' definition of paraenesis (pp. 149-50).

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 232.
believer, the basis of the Spirit.  

Robert Jewett sees a real nomistic threat, a real moral problem, and an intimate relationship between the two. The background is zealot terrorism in Judea, which leads Judean Jewish-Christians to undertake a circumcising mission among the Gentiles to escape persecution. They find the Galatians with a background of cosmological syncretism, a Hellenistic desire for perfection, with enthusiastic traits; and they cunningly integrate their pragmatic demand for circumcision into this context. Nomism is an imported danger; enthusiasm is native. Each is dealt with in separate parts of the epistles. This comes under the criticisms that have been levelled against other writers; and Jewett does not seem to have been successful in a two-front theory.

---

1 Ibid.
2 Jewett "Agitators," pp. 198-212; that is, their circumcising mission authenticates them as loyal Jews.
3 A similar situation is pictured by Eduard Schweizer, "Christianity of the Circumcised and Judaism of the Uncircumcised," in Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Culture in Late Antiquity, ed. Robert Hammerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 245-60. The heresy is a pythagorised Judaism, using the Mosaic law to achieve ascent of the soul through the στοιχεῖα. Parallels are in Apuleius, Philo, and Colossians, and the heresy is ascetic, not libertine.
4 Why does this mission appear in Galatia? Are the opponents only pragmatic? Why are Gentiles so enthusiastic for circumcision?
5 Which he set out to do. He himself notes the unity of the letter and the way Paul deals with the Galatians as a homogeneous group. The paraentic sections
In a recent dissertation on the Galatian opponents, John G. Hawkins has reached a conclusion similar to Jewett’s. The opponents are only "Judaisers;"¹ the Galatians themselves are self-styled πνευματικοί and devotees of στοιχεῖα. The sections of the letter dealing with these issues are attacks on "popular religious attitudes and ideas," not on the intruding opponents. And the most enthusiastic and pneumatic of all is Paul himself, who uses language that puts him on the road to Gnosticism.

Gnostic Theories

Rudolf Bultmann, having pushed Gnosticism back into the pre-Christian era, asserted that the heart of Paul’s theology was a Gnostic redeemer-myth.² Christianity and Gnosticism have a fatal attraction for each other, and, in keeping with this, Galatians shares in Paul’s use of Gnostic language.³ And yet, in the ethical answer questions raised by nomism; and 5:1, 13 address the same group.

¹Hawkins, "Opponents." But what sort of "Judaisers"? In separating "Judaisers" from cosmological and speculative interest, he denies much recent scholarship that connects the two, as in Qumran, Colossians, etc.


³Ibid., p. 199, on Gal 3:23-28, 4:3-11.
portion of the letter, he debates a Gnostic problem—"the unworldliness of the self."^1

Walter Schmithals, going even further, has made all Paul's major opponents Gnostics, including those in Galatia.2 His theory for this letter has six basic supports:

1. The unlikelihood of Judean missionaries, more radical even than James, in Galatia

2. The specific nature of the question of apostleship in Galatians. It does not accord with a Jerusalemite view of the relative validity of message and apostolate. Paul is charged with denial of a Jerusalem tradition and with dependence on other apostles. In the context, an apostle is validated by ἀποκάλυψις

3. The concern for circumcision not being a nomistic-Jewish one (the opponents do not keep the whole law, 5:3, 6:13), but a Gnostic one of liberation of the pneuma-self from the prison of the body. When Paul puts circumcision in the context of Judaising (3:1-5:12), he has misunderstood the situation

^Ibid., p. 208, on Galatians 5. In his Theology, 1:164 he states, "side by side with positive influence from Gnosticism we also find rejection to it." However, he saw the central portion of Galatians, chaps. 3-4, as dealing with the problem of Jewish legalism. See Theology 1:164-66 on affinities between Christianity and Gnosticism (both radical religions of redemption); and 260-65 on the legalistic nature of Judaism. He did not try to characterize a specific Galatian opponent.

2Walter Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) and,
4. The concern for cultic festivals fitting better with Gnostic angel-worship (στοιχεῖα) than with Judaism.

5. The unity of the letter, and the "enthusiasmus" of the opponents, as revealed in the use of "pneuma" and "pneumatikos." The lists of virtues are integral to the argument against circumcision (5:1, 13, 23)—in fact, a quarter of the letter is against "sarkic" conduct—and exactly fits a Gnostic context (the main concerns are dissensions, divisions, et cetera, and their opposites).

6. The similarity of the opponents here to those behind 1 and 2 Corinthians, Philippians, and Colossians, who, it is asserted, are also Gnostics.

Others have agreed that there are "Gnostic colorings" to the Galatian opponents. But they are also much more Jewish in character than Schmithals has admitted and would better be labelled "syncretistic."

specifically on Galatians, Paul, pp. 8-66.

1So, too, Jewett, "Agitators," p. 212, assumes that these rites are not Jewish. However, see the evidence below, pp. 281-82. Schmithals at least sees that the calendrical rites are a part with the circumcising program, and Jewett's case is weakened by separating them. But when it is seen that Gnostic circumcision is highly unlikely (below, p. 270), it makes it probable that both are very Jewish.


3All of above. Stählin and Conzelmann say they must be of Jewish descent, based on the parallels in 2 Cor 11:21-22, Phil 3:2-6.
He appears to be correct in linking this heresy to those behind Colossians, 2 Corinthians, and Philippians (though not 1 Corinthians), but incorrect in labelling them all "Gnostic."¹

Willi Marxsen has followed Schmithals rather closely in identifying the opponents as "Christian-Jewish-Gnostic" syncretists, though he disagrees at certain points.² Elements in the letter point so clearly to Gnostic libertines that the only conclusion can be that, in discussing the heresy in relation to law, as if the opponents were Pharisaic Judaists, Paul has completely misunderstood the situation. In fact, the historic Galatian formulation of justification by faith was developed in the face of a situation that was misconceived.

Specific points of Schmithals' system have come under attack.³ However, some of his positions carry


³He has removed all objectivity by saying that Paul did not understand his opponents (Jewett, "Agitators," p. 199; Georgi, Kollekte, p. 35). He has not done justice to the struggle against nomism in the letter (Georgi, ibid.); Gnostics never seem to regard circum-
weight—the question of apostleship, the unity of the letter (theological and ethical portions addressing the same problem), and the significance of other anti-Pauline missionary movements.

Enthusiastic Theories

In these theories, as for several other writers mentioned above, the Judaism in question in Galatians is assumed to be of a sectarian, mystical type. But a step is taken that enables the problem of the unity of Galatians to be overcome: a legalist could be an antinomian or libertine, in a certain sense—or at least, both parts of the letter could be called forth by the same speculative source. These writers continue the work of Bultmann, though with significant differences.¹

Frederick G. Crownfield offered a version of this
cision as essential to salvation, and may condemn it (Jewett, ibid., and below, p. 270). His own theory has broken up the unity of Galatians, as he defines the opponent from only chaps. 1-2 and 5-6 (Georgi, ibid.); and he has misunderstood the anti-Pauline movements as a whole (Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 14-15, Pagels, Paul, pp. 162-64, and above, p. 30, note 3).

¹They disagree with Bultmann in some respects. Pharisaic Judaism is less legalistic, and Paul's concerns are more genuinely Jewish. Pre-Christian Gnosticism has a much less definite shape than Bultmann gave it, and more connections with sectarian and apocalyptic Judaism. Hellenistic influences on Paul are more in terms of Hellenistic Judaism, or Judaism that has come in contact with mystery religions. There is a difference here from Jewett, Gunther, Schweizer, etc. The syncretistic elements in Galatians are integral to the opponents' system.
Galatians is against Judaisers; and Paul only addresses one group throughout the letter. Thus, Judaisers and "pneumatikoi" are the same people—syncretistic Christians who had been adherents of Jewish mystery cults, now combining Jewish rites with a quest for a Christian form of illumination and deification. They are from Jerusalem, pretending to belong to the Petrine "legalist" party, but are "false brethren." Their purposes are unacceptable to both Peter and Paul. Galatians was written after Acts 15, but Paul does not invoke the decision of the council, as it is here irrelevant. It was an agreement reached with "normative" Judaism, not syncretists.

Helmut Koester claims that the opponents' observance of law cannot be explained by Rabbinic sources, as they stress the law's spiritual and cosmic dimensions. However, they have a real interest in law and its redemptive value. Especially important is the role assigned to Jesus—the revealer of the cosmic rule of God. All the major elements of the letter must be considered collect-


2Koester, "Gnomai," pp. 144-47. Paul's answer is more Rabbinic than the position of the heretics themselves. A partial agreement with Davies, Paul, 112-46, on Christ as the New Torah.

3Against Schmithals' position on Galatians 3 and 4.
tively as relating dialogically to the opponents' system, that is:

1. The central place of the discussion of law
2. The cosmos-language and mythology-language (3:19-20, 4:3-11)
3. The language of promise and covenant (3:6-25)
5. Christological statements (3:13, 4:4)
6. Ethical statements that stress "agape"—human responsibility to an existing, visible community

7. The "mystery-language," which is the counterpart of the Christological statements (2:20; 6:14, 15).

The heresy must be related to the ones behind Philippians, 2 Corinthians, and especially Colossians.

Dieter Georgi has set forth a portrayal of the Galatian heretics and their theology which has had great influence on recent scholarship. The heretics are pneumatics, and in some senses they anticipate Gnosticizing enthusiasts.

\[1\] Koester here picks up Schmithals' point. Galatians 5 seems to confront Gnosticising enthusiasts.

\[2\] The sources that have been used here are a passage from an article entitled "Einwände und Exegetische Anmerkungen," in Ernst Wolf, ed., Christentum im Atombombenalter (Munich: Kaiser, 1959), cited in Hawkins, "Opponents," pp. 53-54 (unfortunately the original source was not available); Kollekte, pp. 34-38; and circulated notes from the class, "Theology of the New Testament," Harvard Divinity School, Spring, 1977.

\[3\] Referring to 3:1-3 (the criteria of the opponents themselves), 5:18, 5:25-6:1, etc.
cism. They are gospel-preachers who stress the necessity of combining the law and the gospel. But they are nomistic Jewish pneumatics, with roots in wisdom movements. Their legalist interest includes the "elements of the world" (4:3-11) interpreted in terms of the speculative and liturgical interests of intertestamental Judaism in angels. These ὑπερήφανοι or angels are mediators of the law (3:19), mediators between heaven and the world. Moses, and even Jesus, may be seen by the opponents as angels as well. Christ is the last landmark in a long development of revelation of law. This law reveals the structure of things, brings the Spirit (3:1-3), and makes believers participate in the innermost of the cosmos and God (4:21-31). The opponents simultaneously practice

1Kollekte, p. 35: "Vorläufer einer Gnosis, wie sie dann später im Kolosserbrief und in den Ignatianen bekämpft wird."

2They have room for "faith" in their scheme, which to them is a deepened understanding of the law. However, they see Paul's doctrine of "righteousness by faith" as a summons to lawlessness (5:1-15).

3The heretical nomos-tradition goes back to the Wisdom of Solomon and other wisdom literature and is not to be understood in terms of Rabbinic casuistry. For them, law is not only Jewish law, but the law of the world in general. It could even be called "syncretistic," holding together Jewish and heathen revelation-traditions.

4Thus the opponents had a particular Christology: Christ stood in a long line of law-preachers and was himself the conclusive revelation of law. The expression "law of Christ" belongs to the opponents.
baptism\(^1\) and circumcision,\(^2\) which are understood in a mystical-sacramental sense. This legalism leads to individualistic nomistic-enthusiastic problems, which are confronted in the ethical portion of the letter.\(^3\) The attack on Paul and his mission, and especially on his doctrine of righteousness by faith, that here comes into the open, stems from a widespread church intrigue set in motion by Jewish-Christians, perhaps beginning in Jerusalem itself. The agitators were equals with the Jerusalem apostles and argued for the priority of all Jerusalem apostles.\(^4\) Jerusalem to them was the holy center of Christian mysteries, and the apostles were its mystagogues.\(^5\) Paul was charged particularly with contempt for the traditions and institutions of Jerusalem.\(^6\)

Others have seen more validity in such an assessment of Galatians. In a recent review of literature on the Pauline opponents, E. Earle Ellis would venture to

\(^1\)Baptism into Christ is set forth in an undisputed way in Gal 3:27.

\(^2\)The opponents' stress on circumcision is evident from 5:2-4, 6-13.

\(^3\)The opponents were perfectionist and ascetic, but they had not time for the "bourgeois" ethic of Paul, as set forth in Galatians 5-6.

\(^4\)Kollekte, pp. 15-21. In 2:6 Paul gives a polemical corrective to the opponents' claims about the Jerusalem authorities.

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 35-36.

\(^6\)The opponents were seeking to relate early Christian and Jewish traditions.
say little more than that Galatians was "problematic:" but that "it is quite conceivable that one group might have been both ritually strict (regarding circumcision) and at the same time theologically syncretistic and morally lax."  

Conclusions

Each of these theories has something essential to contribute to the question of the Galatian opponents. What is Paul's relation to Jerusalem and the apostles? What are their relative positions on law and gospel? Baur heightened these questions, but the persistence of "three-party" theories suggests that his answers were not adequate. Lütgert, Bruce, and, especially, Schmithals have each shown the complexity of the question of apostleship in Galatians.

The place of Judaism in the whole context is significant. The difficulty of reconciling Galatians on this point, not only with Acts but with Paul's own letters, has been pointed out by Munck and Drane. Lütgert shows that the opponents' relation to Judaism, too, is complex (as it is to the Jerusalem apostles). Luther, and later, Bultmann and others, quickly assumed that Paul was attacking "normative" Judaism. Schoeps has retorted

---

that Paul has completely misunderstood it, if that is the case. Is it a question, then, of some other form of Judaism?

How are anti-Pauline missionaries in Galatia to be explained? Is it really unlikely that they are from Jerusalem (Munck)? It must be borne in mind that they bear important resemblances to the "Hebrew" opponents behind other Pauline letters, especially 2 Corinthians and Philippians (Schmithals, Gunther, etc.).

It has been frequently affirmed (the Tübingen extremists, Schweitzer, et cetera) that Galatians deals with law as a theological principle. But did the opponents keep the "whole law" (Munck, Jewett)? If not, then in what sense does Paul deal with law in principle? How is it that the one letter deals with the apparently opposite questions of legalism and ethical laxity? The strength of the "two-front" solution since Lightfoot, Lütgert, and Ropes forbids a minimising of the real tension in the letter in these terms (Schmithals). And yet these very two-front theories overlook the essential unity of the letter (Jewett, Koester, Georgi), and, within the framework of these theories, it inevitably flies apart (Jewett, Betz).

The question of the place of eschatology in Paul's theology, and, therefore, in Galatians, was raised by Schweitzer. It is probably directly associated with the significant use in Galatians of mythical and speculative
language, wrestled with by many since Ramsay. Both may be subheadings within the larger category of Christology (Koester).

Later movements and literature of the second century are also part of the question. How could Galatians be against Gnostics (Schmithals, Marxsen) if it became so popular with Gnostics (Pagels)? How could it be against the ancestors of the Ebionites (critics of Schoeps)? Can the two second-century movements of Pharisaism and Libertinism be so clearly separated in the first century (Lightfoot)?

The Galatian opponents and their theology appear to remain "problematic" (to use Ellis' term). These seem to be some of the conclusions reached so far--which are at the same time questions that remain. Hence they will be used as somewhat fixed points from which the following chapters will take their bearing.
CHAPTER TWO

OPPONENTS AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter will attempt to examine the most significant contributions to methodology for locating and characterising opponents, not only in Galatians but in other contexts as well.

Interpretation out of the Context

Several attempt to interpret the Galatian conflict out of a preestablished context. Helmut Koester suggests that the teachings of opponents can be found by subtracting Paul's interpretation of certain terms, concepts, and forms of speech from those terms and concepts themselves, and replacing it with an opposite interpretation, in the historical context most appropriate to the terms and motifs in question.\(^1\) Behind this method there would seem to be two concerns in particular. Firstly, in Paul's letters the apostle's thought is to be found not so much in the terms, concepts, and myths that may be used. These may belong to his readers, or opponents. Paul's own thought is to be seen in the direction

\(^1\) Koester, "Hellenism," pp. 192-93.
of the interpretation. Secondly, and arising out of this, the syncretistic character of the theology of Paul and his environment forbids a facile preoccupation with history-of-religions parallels. There must be some overall frame of reference and ordering of the history-of-religions context for the parallels to be useful. The frame that Koester has chosen is a historical one, and thus the foremost task becomes that of defining most precisely the historical background of Paul's theological vocabulary and interpreting the movement of arguments out of this context.

These criteria are unquestionably essential in themselves. Paul must be seen as an interpreter of tradition; and there can be no faithful exegesis without

---


3 See Koester, Trajectories, pp. 114-36. He begins with a historical and geographical analysis of early Christian movements, and the theologies that first existed in the earliest centers of Christianity. Careful attention is paid to literary forms, and the functions they played in these early movements. The New Testament is then interpreted out of this reconstructed context. A similar method is used by Dieter Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964). He begins with a reconstruction of
attention to context. But the question of priority must be asked. What is to be the beginning point, the primary frame of reference? Koester himself comments that many forms of syncretistic-Jewish development may have disappeared altogether, "often leaving no more traces than the Qumran community before the year 1945." In this case, we may crush a fragile piece of evidence for earliest Christianity if we too quickly interpret Galatians out of systems reconstructed from external materials. As far as possible, the essential frame of reference within which movements of interpretation are traced should come from Galatians itself.

Interpretation out of the Text

Johannes Munck has set forth several principles for beginning exegesis with the text of the New Testament itself, two of which are relevant here:

1. Paul's letters are to be interpreted as such.

2. The writers whose conclusions seem to be too much influenced by a reconstructed context are Schmithals and his preoccupation with Jewish-Christian Gnostics (also criticised by Koester and Georgi, above, pp.31-32), Schoeps and his Ebionites (above, pp. 19-20), and Gunther with his coalescing of Pauline opponents and sectarian Judaism (above, pp. 6, 22).

Statements from other sources must not determine the exposition of the letters.

2. Paul's individual letters, and the situation that forms the background of each individual letter, must be viewed on their own merits in each case. Material in the letters may be unified only if this does not violate the individual nature of the particular letter and of the situation that lies behind it.

Others concur that, when studying any of Paul's writings, the letter in question must be the primary source, and that the uniqueness of each New Testament document must be allowed to stand. However, it must be asked whether Munck has been able to achieve this openness to the text of Galatians. He himself earlier states that Paul must first be understood on the basis of the "uncontroversial" texts, and then the "controversial"

---

1 For instance, Drane, Paul, p. 79: "... since the epistle is our only evidence for the Galatian heresy, any valid impressions of its character must in the nature of the case be based on an exegetical understanding of the epistle itself."

2 Drane, ibid., pp. 5-59, builds much of his case on the differences within Paul's letters (i.e., between Gal 1:11 and 1 Cor 15:3, Gal 3:18-26 and Rom 8:12-17, and Gal 5:6 and 1 Cor 7:19). However, he may have interpreted these very differences wrongly, as, again, he has no overall frame in which to understand them. See Donald Allen Stoike, "The Law of Christ: A Study of Paul's Use of the Expression in Galatians 6:2" (Th.D. dissertation, School of Theology at Claremont, 1971, p. 5, on the danger of an uncontrolled use of Pauline discrepancies.
texts must be interpreted in this light. His "uncon­
troversial" texts are 2 Thess 2:6, Rom 9-11, and
Rom 15:14-33. So Munck does have a "context" in which he
places Galatians, admitting that the letter is contro­
versial and difficult to exegete in itself. Here is the
rub: it is to be desired that Galatians be understood on
its own basis; but the very controversial nature of the
letter makes this exceedingly difficult.

Joseph B. Tyson has also postulated principles
for understanding the letter on its own terms:

1. We must limit ourselves to the internal evi­
dence provided by the letter itself

2. We must analyze Paul's defense in Galatians,
attempting to identify specific charges or objections
to certain contrary teachings. Galatians is a defensive
letter. We must find statements in the letter which seem
to be direct answers, those which seem to be counter­
charges, and those which reflect charges made by the
opponents

3. On the basis of Paul's defense, we must
decide what specific charges were made by Paul's opponents

1Munck, Paul, pp. 55-56.

2Munck interprets Galatians in terms of several
of his own unique themes, i.e., Paul's apostolic con­
sciousness, and the absence of any Jewish-Christian mis­
sion to Gentiles.

3Joseph B. Tyson, "Paul's Opponents in Galatia,"
and what positions they held. Mostly, the charge can be seen by taking the negative of the defense.

4. We must attempt to discover the source or sources of these charges.

The difficulty is that the charges Tyson postulates, using this method, would not call forth some of the most distinctive passages in Galatians, suggesting that this quest for the mirror-image of defensive statements must be inadequate, on its own, for reconstructing the Galatian opposition. Tyson is incorrect in concluding that Galatians is only defensive. It is also offensive, but even further, it is dialogical. It is significant, too, that Tyson's defensive statements come mostly from the "historical" portions of the letter, portions which, on the basis of literary analysis, would not be expected to

1. Tyson finds essentially six charges: Paul's apostleship derives from a human authority; he had frequent contact with the Pillars, and is their subordinate, trying to please them; the Pillars require circumcision; Paul preaches circumcision; physical descent from Abraham is required for justification; and circumcision is necessary in Christianity.

2. Tyson can find no way of saying what is obvious—that the opponents preach a "Christian" gospel in which justification and life are attained on the basis of both law and faith; that is, he cannot clearly relate Gal 3-4, the heart of the letter, to the opponents' theology.


yield the essence of the opposing theology.¹

Further, defensive statements are, to an extent, blanks to be filled in on other grounds. They could be denials of misconstructions of facts, denials of untruths, or denials of inferences.² John J. Gunther has seen further complications within the argument of Galatians.³ Paul does not react to the opponents by direct denial alone. He uses insult and caricature, asks rhetorical questions, reduces the opponents' views to absurdity, accepts one part of an argument and denies another,⁴ repeats the opponents' charges only to refute them,⁵ uses mere affirmation to counter what he has attacked elsewhere,⁶ and steals the enemies' thunder by using terms in a different sense⁷ or by repeating their teachings

¹They refer probably to the historical trappings which were only supportive of the opponents' real theological thrust. See below, pp. 90-92, 108-10.

²Munck, Paul, pp. 95-96, discussing Gal 2:3.


⁴For instance, what Jew or Judaiser would say much about Abraham and little about Moses, especially if he believed that law was the way to life (3:18, 21)? Paul will accept that Abraham is a true Jewish hero, but only belittles Moses, probably taking up half the opponents' argument, and rejecting the other half.

⁵For example, see 3:29 as a repetition of the claim, "We are Abraham's offspring."

⁶For example, 3:19-22. But Gunther may assume here more unity within Paul's letters than in fact exists.

⁷For instance, Paul's reinterpretation of πνευματικός, 6:1-10.
with approval while putting them in an entirely new frame.¹

With one who, like Paul, can use so many subtle methods of argument, the "mirror-image" approach to the discovery of opponents will be very unsatisfactory. But how can these criteria be used, and the exact nature of each pericope and argument be determined, while still making Galatians rather than some external priority the reference-point for exegesis? Munck's starting-point seems desirable, but, given the complex nature of the epistle, how is it to be done?

Franz Mussner suggests that the opponents' theology should be reconstructed by locating "Stichworten" and determining how Paul is using them. The majority of his catchwords come from chapters 1 and 2.² But considerations of genre and structure may suggest that these are the very chapters where the essential issues in dispute may not be found. Moreover, Mussner's own summary of the opponents' teachings reveals that the catchwords cannot fully yield the theological complex necessary to

¹See below, pp. 387-407, on 5:19-23.

²Mussner, Galater, p. 13, finds catchwords in 1:18 (Paul learnt his gospel from Jerusalem), 2:1 (Paul had to lay his teaching before the Jerusalem authorities), 2:2, 6 (οἱ δοκοῦνται), 2:6 (Paul paid a tax to Jerusalem), 2:11 (in Antioch, Peter was right), 2:17 (one who does not keep the law is a servant of sin), 3:7 (we are the true sons of Abraham), 3:19 (God Himself gave the law), 3:21 (righteousness comes by the law), 4:26 (Jerusalem is our mother), 5:2 (circumcision is necessary for salvation).
account for essential portions of the letter.\(^1\) And how is an opponent's catchword to be isolated? Claus Bussmann summarized the various arguments used to justify the presence of non-Pauline material, but notes that they are all inconclusive without a larger frame of reference.\(^2\) In fact, catchwords may more appropriately be used for tracing a theme or determining a pattern of argument.\(^3\)

Schmithals and Wilckens have relied heavily on the significance of "Gnostic terminology" from within Galatians, in order to assess the context and the source

---

\(^1\) Mussner summarises the opponents' teachings as follows: they demand a Jewish law piety (4:21, 5:4 etc.); they promote circumcision (5:2, 6:12); they advocate calendrical piety and worship of the στοιχεῖα (4:8-11: which is not deriveable from his catchwords); Paul's "gospel" does not correspond to that of the "Pillars" (1:1-12, 2:2-10), Jerusalem is the true place of the Messianic salvation (4:21-31). Also essential to the debate, but missing from the catchwords, are the opponents' criticism of the Jerusalem apostolate, their own place for faith, ethical considerations, etc.

\(^2\) Claus Bussmann, Themen der paulinischen Missionsspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1971), p. 22, refers to lexical arguments (hapaxes, words used in unusual ways, grammatical constructions), literary arguments (style, parallels, etc.), and logical arguments. On the basis of a larger frame of reference, Jewett, "Agitators," pp. 196-218, finds several catchwords that are contradictory to Mussner's, suggesting that the opponents claim that Paul is on their side, that he too is zealous for the law (1:14), and Paul has always preached circumcision (5:11). In fact, the argument for a catchword in 3:19 may point in the opposite direction from the one suggested by Mussner.

of opposition. A synchronic investigation of the milieu of various terms, phrases, et cetera, will be essential, and to this extent Schmithals' method is not wrong. However, he may read a whole theological system into certain terms, failing to realise fully the syncretistic nature of Gnosticism, which "pirated elements of earlier myth" and grew in a situation in which there was "a free-floating availability of traditions that are no longer binding, but pregnant with redefinable meaning." Vocabulary was useful to Gnosticism only because it was important in other theological systems; and Paul's use of certain terms may only indicate that he drew from a literary and intellectual context common to other systems and writers. The linguistic method reaches extremes when, in the case of Schmithals and Marxsen, the system out of which the text is being understood is retained at the

1"Gnosticism" is one of those ambiguous words of modern scholarship. Perhaps the most adequate brief definition is the one formulated at the Messina Colloquium: "... a coherent series of characteristics that can be summarised in the idea of a divine spark in man, deriving from the divine realm, fallen into this world of fate, birth, and death, and needing to be awakened by the divine counterpart of the self in order to be finally reintegrated. ... This gnosis of Gnosticism involves the divine identity of the knower (the Gnostic), the known (the divine substance of one's transcendent self), and the means by which one knows (... a revelation-tradition ... ). See Ugo Bianchi, ed., Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), p. xxvi.

expense of the text—that is, it is deduced that Paul has misunderstood his opponents, and that they can be sketched only from certain portions of Galatians.¹

Interpretation out of a Portion of the Text

Further problems are raised by the suggestion part attacks the opponents and in part rebukes the Galatians themselves.² Then what signals would we look for to decide that Paul had shifted audiences? Here Galatians is more problematic than Paul's other letters. In 2 Corinthians, problems of unity aside, most agree that it is possible to see where Paul addresses the church and where he debates the opponents.³ Again, in Philippians, such a distinction is fairly clear.⁴ But in Galatians, the whole letter is polemical, and yet only brief verses refer to the opponents themselves.⁵ Paul does

¹See above, pp. 33-37.

²See above, pp. 27-32, on explicit and implicit two-front theories.


⁴For instance, Phil 3:2-21.

⁵For instance, τινές, 1:7; τις, 1:9, 3:1, 4:17, and 5:7; δ . . . ταράσσοντος ὑμᾶς, . . . δος ἡ ἡ, 5:10;
distinguish sharply between the congregations themselves and the opponents; but the distinctions are not between the opponents' theology and the theology of the congregation. Mussner notes that the direct personal references to the opponents reveal their method of propaganda, but not their teachings. These must be reconstructed from other parts of the letter. Just as the direct defensive statements do not yield the opponents' theology, neither do the direct personal references. It becomes apparent that Paul's handling of the opponents' theology is bound up with the structure of the letter as a whole.

How, then, would it be known that there were two opponents, or that the letter was directed to two groups? Liitgert and Ropes began working from the paraenetic section of the letter. Without discussing the literary relationship between theology and paraenesis in the Pauline letters, or the literary characteristics of...


2 Mussner draws attention to the verbs used in these verses: ἑλεῖν, 1:7, 4:17, 6:12 and 13; ἀναγκαζέείν, 6:12; ἀναστατοῦν, 5:12. The opponents are forcing their teaching on the Galatians.

3 See the note on the teachings of the opponents, above, p. 53, note 1.

4 See above, pp. 48-52, on Tyson's method and its weaknesses.
paraenetic material,¹ they assumed that the vocabulary of the ethical passage must directly reflect the situation in Galatia, which must be libertinistic. This group and its teachings can therefore not possibly be in view in the portion of the letter which confronts a nomistic heresy. There must be two fronts involved, a legalistic and a libertinistic one. However, Lütgert and Ropes managed to arrive at contradictory conclusions about the central passage of the book,² and the overall result of their work is to show the complexity of the argument of Galatians and the difficulty of making such a distinction.³ The letter resists subdivision that starts from within its final section. The same concerns appear in the so-called anti-legalist and anti-libertine sections,⁴ and to suggest two audiences may be to misunderstand Paul's polemic against the law,⁵ as well as to misunderstand

¹See the references to Dibelius, Funk, Furnish, etc., and the way in which Paul's ethics are both traditional and contextual, below, pp. 117-19.

²Lütgert assumed that 3:6-29 was against legalists, and Ropes said it was against libertines. See above, pp. 27-30.

³Especially when the question of apostleship is brought into the argument. Is it used to debate those who reject the Jerusalem tradition (libertines), or those who exalt it (legalists)? These appear not to be two distinct options, but a unitary complex that runs through the whole letter.


⁵Typified by his revolutionary assertion that law
stand the relation between theology and paraenesis in his letters.\(^1\) Jewett has noted that all two-front theories fail to explain why Galatians deals with the congregation as a homogeneous group.\(^2\) The literary signals that Paul has two audiences are lacking, and the entire congregation seems as much in danger of the one extreme as of the other (if they are extremes).\(^3\)

Regarding distinctions within Galatians, three considerations stand out:

1. There is a clear distinction between the Galatians and the opponents, which is not a theological distinction. Direct references to opponents fail to adequately supply their theology.

2. Defensive statements (referring back to Tyson) are also inadequate for constructing the opponents' theology. There is an important way in which the letter promotes παραβάσεων (3:19). Apparently, being "in sin," "in the flesh," and "under the law" are synonymous. See Sanders, "Patterns," pp. 470-78.

\(^1\) Victor Paul Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), pp. 68-69: Paul's ethics are not confined to the so-called paraenetic sections in his letters, which cannot be neatly divided into doctrine and ethics.

\(^2\) Jewett, "Agitators," p. 198. He notes further that Gal 1:6, 3:1-5, and 5:7 imply that all the Galatians had equally accepted the opponents' propaganda.

\(^3\) Jewett himself must be criticised here: he rejects the idea of two parties among the Galatians, but retains the two theological and ethical extremes of the two-front theorists, thus still inevitably pulling the letter apart.
as a whole confronts the opponents

3. The Galatians themselves are treated homogeneously, and there are no literary signals that there are two groups within the congregations.

It would appear, then, that there is no clear method, using the internal evidence of Galatians, for distinguishing two groups that hold different theologies, have different problems, et cetera. Two-front theories have not supplied a methodology for distinguishing the theology of the opponents.

Two other writers, though partially discussed above, must be considered again here—Jewett and Hawkins.1 Jewett finds a distinction within the letter between the Judaism of the opponents and the speculative-syncretistic Hellenism of the Galatians themselves. Any suggestions of Hellenistic religion are native, not imported.2 Such a distinction encounters several problems. The vocabulary of the vice-list does not imply, as he assumes, that the Galatians themselves are ethical libertines.3 Account must be taken of the degree of both tradition and contextuality in the Pauline ethical passages. Further,

---

1 See Jewett, "Agitators," and Hawkins, "Opponents," referred to above (pp. 31-33). They represent most recent attempts to make distinctions within Galatians.

2 Jewett finds such suggestions in 4:8-10, 6:1, 7-8.

3 He claims that, on the basis of 5:16-24, immorality and Hellenistic libertinism exist in the congregations.
if it is said that the calendrical observances are non-Jewish, then it should probably also be said that circumcision in this context is non-Jewish,\(^1\) as has Schmithals. But as the latter is very unlikely,\(^2\) the former would appear unlikely too, especially in the light of abundant parallels to Gal 4:10 in Jewish sources.\(^3\) Finally, it seems improbable that 4:8-11 is to be taken out of the sequence of Paul's attack on the intruders' program. 4:3 brings the experience of Judaism under the same head as the matters dealt with in 4:8-11,\(^4\) and 4:8-11 seems very much to refer to a turning back that is directly occasioned by the intruders.\(^5\) There seems therefore to be an intrinsic connection between this turning back and what the opponents teach, and 4:10 appears to be a part of the

---

\(^1\)Because the peculiar Pauline expression, "works of law," which appears only in Galatians 2 and Romans 3 (but which is probably close in meaning to other expressions such as "works" and "righteousness by works") is always in the context of selections of Jewish law, especially circumcision and calendar-feasts. See below. So the calendar feasts of 4:10 are probably part of the program of circumcision. At least Schmithals seems more consistent here.


\(^3\)See below, pp. 281-82.

\(^4\)See below, pp. 277-79. The unusual treatment here of Israel and its religion, even for Paul, must be accounted for.

treatment of law begun in chapter 3 (to Jewett, an anti-Jewish argument).

It would appear that Jewett encounters the same problems of structure that he raises against the more "classical" two-front theories,¹ because he really works from the same basis as they did—the assumed picture of the Galatian church derived from a mirror-reading of the paraenetic section. He concludes that the libertinism of the Galatians is irreconcilable with an interest in nomism, and there must therefore be two problems, one native, one imported. He cannot explain why the Galatians should fall prey to nomism—and the letter was obviously written because they did.² Jewett has put such a distance between the theology of the Judaisers and that of the Galatians that he cannot hold the letter together. Whereas Marxsen says that the classical expression, justification by faith and not by works of law, was formulated in the face of a situation that was not understood, it must be concluded from Jewett's reconstruction that it does not address the Galatians' real concerns at all. This is the predicament. If the language of the ethical section is assumed to demand a party of liber-

¹See above, p. 32. Note the homogeneity of the Galatian churches, the same concerns in the theological and paraenetic sections of the letter, and the way the letter as a whole appears to address one problem.

²See 1:6-9, 3:1-5, 5:2-4, 6:12-15. The letter indicates that the Galatians as a whole had accepted the opponents' propaganda—even circumcision!
tines, then if it is a separate group among the Galatians there is no accounting for the way Paul addresses the congregation as a homogeneous unit. But if it is the Galatians in distinction from the intruders, there is no accounting for the way Paul writes the first part of the letter—to the Galatians!

Hawkins makes a distinction similar to Jewett. Terms such as στοιχεία, πνευματικός, et cetera, are suggestions of speculative Hellenism, "popular religious ideas and attitudes" that belong to the Galatians themselves, not to the opponents.\(^1\) The above objections therefore apply to his thesis too. He claims to base his study only on an exegesis of Galatians,\(^2\) but ignores the complicated nature of the book, and begins by examining various verses in isolation.\(^3\) His work is based on an important a priori assumption—that the "traditional understanding of the situation in Galatia is generally correct."\(^4\) By "traditional understanding" he means the assessment of the Galatian situation by the Fathers, and the equation of the opponents with Jewish-Christians as

---

\(^1\) See above, p. 33, on Hawkins, "Opponents."

\(^2\) Hawkins, "Opponents," pp. 1, 4, etc.

\(^3\) He attempts to begin his exegesis of the letter from Gal 6:12-13 (p. 86)—one of the most controversial texts in the book.

picted by Justin Martyr and the later heresiologists.\(^1\) It is not for internally derived literary reasons that he makes his distinctions between Galatians and intruders.

These two most recent attempts to characterize the opponents by making distinctions within Galatians seem to lack an adequate literary basis. When there is such abundant evidence of a Judaism capable of being responsible for such a "syncretistic" theology as is suggested by 3:19, 4:8-11, et cetera,\(^2\) there must be sound methodological reasons for saying that these verses cannot be attributed to a Jewish opposition. The need for an overall, holistic appreciation of Galatians, and a larger frame of reference derived from the epistle itself, is still apparent.

**Interpretation out of the Literary Genre**

It is evident from the above analysis that one of the most recurring and as yet unresolved problems for the identification of the opponents is the relationship of the parts of the letter to each other.\(^3\) There are

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 79-84. Note his high evaluation of Justin and the other Fathers. But see the criticisms of the early Fathers' understanding of Galatians, above, pp. 13-15, and of the assessments of the later heresiologists, pp. 336-37.

\(^2\)See the brief review below in the introduction to tradition-analysis (pp. 198-202); and the following treatment of various passages (pp. 281-82, etc.).

\(^3\)It is this uncertainty that lies behind the explicit and implicit two-front theories, Schmithals'
obvious weaknesses in methods that begin from a reconstructed history-of-religions context, rather than the text.\(^1\) But there are also glaring weaknesses in those methods claiming to begin with the text.\(^2\) Obviously, there must be some holistic control over the way the parts of the letter are related in order to handle adequately its complicated, dialogical nature, and over the way it is motivated by an offending theology coming from offending individuals, referring to those individuals in terms of theology only scantily, and addressing the theology almost exclusively to the congregations who have been "bewitched."\(^3\)

It is suggested therefore that an important step in the identification of the intruding theology must be a search for some indication of the structure of the letter of the largest possible scale. Galatians should be examined as a piece of literature and should be classi-

---

\(^1\)See above, pp. 52-54.

\(^2\)For instance, Munck must admit that he really starts from outside the text, because of the "controversial" nature of the letter (see above, p. 41); and the approaches of Mussner and Tyson, fastening onto indications in the text of controversy, charge and counter-charge, etc., fail to explain some of the most obvious thrusts of the intruders (see above, pp. 48-52).

\(^3\)This need for holistic control is especially the case in the face of the breakdown of traditional categories for classifying Judaism (see below, pp. 198-203).
fied in terms of literary genre. This may help to uncover possible suggestions of structure and to provide some sort of control over subjective or predetermined dissection of this very difficult text. Such a method has not yet been applied to the question of the opponents, their theology, and Paul's response. And it seems a logical step. Galatians was not written in a vacuum, and, if the writings of Paul himself should prove too small a sample for analysis of the letter, some other analogous literature should be expected to exist.

This approach should not contradict the beginning presupposition that it is preferrable to start with the text rather than the context. Genre analysis must be determined in conjunction with a simultaneous analysis of internal indicators in the piece of literature itself which confirm that a particular literary genre is

1By "genre," this thesis will mean the "larger forms" of literature such as gospel, epistle, etc. See William G. Doty, Letters in Primitive Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), p. 53; and William A. Beardslee, Literary Criticism of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), p. ix, who speaks of the "larger forms of whole books," the equivalents of genres. He also notes "the significance of structure or form for meaning" (p. iv).

2Beardslee, ibid., p. 1: "If a work of literature is to be understood, it must be placed in some kind of larger framework; it must be tested in one way or another."

3As is suggested below, pp. 71-75.

4See above, pp. 47-49.
It is important to notice that this internal analysis has begun already. There is a distinction between intruders (1:8-10, 5:12, 6:12-13) and the congregation (3:1-5, 4:8-16, 5:7-8), but the theology of the intruders is the theology of the congregation, and the whole letter deals with the heresy in a particular way. Further, there are evidently the same concerns in the so-called "anti-legalist" and "anti-libertine" sections (3:1-5, 5:13-24, 6:1, 2, 7-8). And the congregation is treated as a homogeneous group in which all have equally accepted the opponents' propaganda (1:6, 3:1-5, 5:7). In this letter, Paul pursues one particular object, an intruding theology, with unique singleness and vigor. It appears, then, that this is an appropriate stage to raise the question of literary genre.

Again, this is not to leave the text behind. It is never simply a question of dealing with the text, and then external literature, or of dealing with the external literature, and then the text. One can never be lost sight of in absorption with the other, especially when

---

2See above, p. 54.
3See above, p. 55.
4See above, p. 56.
5See above, p. 57.
6In a similar way, Bultmann speaks of the tasks of historical investigation and interpretation of the text. See Theology, 2:251: "Neither exists, of course,
dealing with such a complex piece as Galatians. Hence the following chapters will move constantly from Galatians to possible genres and back in an attempted process of suggestion, confirmation, and elaboration.  

Genre analysis will be used with an awareness that it is not a method to be used on its own, and that the very genres themselves demand a sense of flexibility. The section will include "a comparative literary analysis of the arrangement and construction of the entire composition," that is, an analysis of the form and function of smaller segments of the letter such as transitional statements, vocabulary, catchwords, and pieces of pre-Pauline tradition.

without the other, they stand constantly in a reciprocal relation to each other. . . . "


Beardslee, Criticism, pp. iv-v, notes that literary criticism is to be used in conjunction with form- and redaction-criticism.

See Veltman, "Defence Speeches," pp. 251-52, and below, p. 89, on flexibility within the genre under consideration.

Veltman, ibid., p. iv.

Beardslee, Criticism, p. 2, includes under the head of "literary criticism" both the examination of small literary details and analysis of the overall structure of the work and its parts. This differs from literary criticism in the older sense, that is, the historical study of authorship, date, and sources (ibid., p. 6). See also Doty, Interpretation, pp. 55-56. Since this dissertation was defended, Professor Hendrikus Boers
Using the evidence of structure of argument and relation of the parts to each other that these chapters will provide, an hypothesis will be constructed regarding the probable theological positions of the opponents. The remaining section of the thesis will then test this hypothesis against "contextual" or external evidence such as the Jewish literature of the period, other Pauline

kindly sent to me, upon request, three papers in which he discusses Betz' attempt to analyze Galatians in terms of "macro-structure" ("The Structure and Meaning of Galatians," "Gen 15:6 and the Discourse Structure of Galatians," and "The Structure of Galatians: Rhetorical or Text-linguistic Analysis"). He offers many valuable insights which, unfortunately, cannot now be utilized in this dissertation. But certain of his statements on method should here be noted. He points out that Betz' work, properly called "form-critical," seeks to determine the outline of Galatians, and hence its meaning, by moving from the unit of meaning of the largest scale to those of smaller scale. His own work, on the other hand, follows the opposite procedure of beginning with units of smallest scale, and looking for cohesion between them, until the structure of the discourse as a whole is determined. A criticism is offered of Betz' work. "The mold of the apologetic letter is too determinative" ("Gen 15:6," p. 15), and he is not able to approach the text of Galatians except in terms of this structure. This dissertation partially agrees with such a criticism, and seeks to guard against it, firstly, by noting flexibility in the genre of apologetic speech itself, and secondly, by extending the task of genre-analysis (in the terms of Beardslee and Veltman) to include analysis of indications of structure of smaller scale. Boers' work is also subject to criticism, of which he himself is probably quite aware. He admits that his semantic analysis is "heavily dependent on intuition" ("Gen 15:6," p. 24); and would probably be quick to admit that such a method needs the external control of "given conventional forms in which meaning is brought to expression" ("Gen 15:6," p. 4), that is, genre- and form-analysis. To a large extent Betz and Boers share a "common endeavor" ("The Structure of Galatians," p. 1)--"What is fundamentally important is that we are both persuaded that there is no way in which a text such as Galatians can be interpreted properly.
letters, and some of the later "trajectories" of Christian theology into the next century.

Perhaps this is following the lead of Günther Bornkamm. After looking for the major polemical thrusts in Colossians, the pattern of the argument of the book, and the most likely theology that would have called it forth, he confirms his work from "contextual" sources:

If we succeed in assigning the details of the whole (of the reconstruction of the Colossian heresy) to a place in the history of religions, then we shall have attained the desired degree of certainty and avoided the suspicion of vague combinations and hypotheses.¹

PART TWO

GENRE ANALYSIS
CHAPTER THREE

GALATIANS AND LITERARY GENRE

This chapter will seek to relate Galatians to a known literary genre—assuming that a literary genre gives expression to a corresponding thought pattern. It seems to be customary to pay no attention to genre at all in analyzing the structure of Galatians; or to assign the book to a genre of letters (Pauline or Papyri) which allows us to say little more than that we should expect an opening, a middle, and a conclusion. This seems inconsistent with the growing awareness that Paul's letters (Galatians included) evidence careful arrangement and structure. It will be the thesis of this chapter that

1Beardslee, Criticism, p. 4.


4Funk, Language, p. 170.

5White, Body, pp. 74-75; Betz, "Composition," p. 357; Ralph P. Martin, New Testament Foundations: A
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the epistolary nature of Galatians has little consequence for the structure of its contents, and that the body of the letter may be closer to something other than simply epistolary genre.

**The Genre of the Pauline Letter?**

It should first be decided whether one can speak of a "typical Pauline letter" and whether an examination of the various structures of Paul's letters can suggest anything about the relation of the parts of Galatians to each other.

It does seem possible to differentiate between Pauline and non-Pauline New Testament letters. Because, in the latter, epistolary features tend to become convention, they are best classified as literary tracts. James is paraenetic throughout, stringing together general moral maxims. 1 and 2 Peter and Jude have no sequence of interrelated and mutually supportive units but are theological reflections around Christian traditions. 1 John has lost all epistolary characteristics.

---


2 For convenience, the disputed Pauline letters will be left out of consideration.

3 Funk, Language, p. 254.

2 and 3 John appear to be a move in another direction, approximating even more closely than Paul's epistles the Greek common letter traditions.\(^1\)

In comparison, Paul's letters reveal a much more lively use of epistolary features.\(^2\) The customary salutation and closing are a strikingly Christianized form of both Jewish and Hellenistic letter conventions.\(^3\) An opening prayer or thanksgiving is also a regular feature,\(^4\) which often serves the function of a prooemium,\(^5\) tending to "telegraph" the content of the letter to

---

1977), p. 232, notes that there is here a recurring pattern that has bewildered the commentators.


\(^2\) Martin, \textit{Foundations}, 2:247, summarizing much recent scholarship, notes that Paul's letters were an extension of his person, mediating the apostolic presence and charged with apostolic power, building a lively bond between himself and his congregations.


\(^4\) Paul Schubert, \textit{Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings} (Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1939), passim; Rigaux, \textit{Letters}, p. 170, suggests that these thanksgivings are adaptations of the מִלְחָמָה of Ps 144:1 etc., and use a literary framework known from Qumran and elsewhere.

\(^5\) Conzelmann, \textit{1 Corinthians}, p. 6.
follow. There are quite regular formulae that open the main segment of the letter (i.e., the letter body), such as παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοῖ, γνωστῷ . . . ὑμῖν, et cetera. Paul also seems to incorporate regular features into his letters, such as autobiography, travel narrative, and paraenesis, so-called. Such consistency of structure and style in Paul's letter-writing has led to an "hypothesis concerning the structure of the Pauline letter form," of salutation (sender, addressee, greeting); thanksgiving; body (opening formulae, connective and transitional formulae, concluding eschatological climax, in conclusion).

1Funk, Language, p. 257, and especially Schubert, Thanksgivings, pp. 71-82. See 1 Cor 1:4-9.

21 Cor 1:10, Philem 8, etc.


4See Rigaux, Letters, p. 171, who has five classifications of autobiography, some rather strained. His main examples are 1 Cor 16:5-9, 2 Cor 7:5, Rom 1:11-14, Phil 1:12-16, Rom 15:17-21, and Gal 1:11-2:14.

5See Funk, Language, pp. 264-72, on Rom 15:14-33, 1 Thess 2:17-3:13, etc., and his thesis of the "presence of apostolic authority and power."

6Betz, "Composition," p. 376, seems correct in saying that either paraenesis is poorly defined as "special caveats often in the form of proverbs either loosely strung together or simply following one another without connection" (Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, trans. Bertram L. Woolf [New York: Scribner, 1965], p. 238); or what we have in Paul's letters is not paraenesis, when compared to James.

7Funk, Language, p. 270; White, Body, p. 70.
and travelogue); paraenesis; and closing elements (greetings, doxology, benediction).

However, it must be asked whether this "letter form" is fixed enough to be the basis of an analysis of structure in any one of Paul's letters and to explain the presence of various parts and their relation to each other. There is no lack of awareness of diversity of form among Paul's letters.\(^1\) 1 Corinthians breaks all the rules of Pauline structure: there are evidences that it is "genuine correspondence,"\(^2\) and the unique arrangement of the development of Christ as wisdom (chaps. 1-4) followed by extended paraenesis (chaps. 5-15)\(^3\) is best explained by a relationship between form and content where wisdom speculations are being related to existence and faith.\(^4\) 2 Corinthians is widely held to be composite and so cannot be used as a basis for the structure of the Pauline letter.\(^5\) If Philippians is not composite\(^6\)

\(^1\) Rigaux, Letters, p. 168, noting diversity and individuality within the letter genre itself.

\(^2\) It has a letter-opening, 1:1-3, a prooemium, 1:4-9, and a concluding greeting. See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 6.

\(^3\) Which does not at all stand in the paraenetic tradition, Funk, Language, p. 272. He notes that 1 Cor 5-15 is unique in the Pauline corpus.

\(^4\) See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 7.

\(^5\) Barrett, 2 Corinthians, pp. 21-25; Funk, Language, p. 273.

\(^6\) That it is: Funk, ibid., p. 272, and literature.
then at least it must be said that 3:1-4:1 gives the appearance of an independent letter and is not the expected paraenetic section. 1 Thessalonians is also unique in the way the body of the letter flows out of the thanksgiving (which occurs at 1:2-10, 2:13-16, and 3:9-13). If Colossians is Pauline, then still it is difficult to separate body from paraenesis, as the two are inseparable (i.e., 2:16-20), and "paraenesis" takes up more than half the letter. Philemon is different again, most closely approximating the Greek private letter.

Only Galatians and Romans are constructed according to the homiletic schema of dogmatic teaching and paraenesis. Even Galatians, in many respects the only real approximation to Funk's "hypothesis," has such significant departures from it that Funk himself calls for an examination of the structure of Galatians on its own grounds. Thus, on the one hand, if one speaks of the

1Ibid., p. 269.
2See Jacob Jervell, Imago Dei: Gen 1:26 im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960), pp. 232-33, for the way paraenesis in this letter takes over the scheme of the opponents, and grows out of the polemical claims that are made for baptism.
3Rigaux, Letters, p. 168.
4Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 7. The two differ too: Romans approximates more closely the structure of a tract, Rigaux, Letters, p. 168.
5That is, Galatians has no opening, thanksgiving, or travelogue, and the closing is unusually polemical. See Funk, Language, p. 268.
"Pauline letters," it must be said that identification of both overall structure and parts within the structure is still tentative; and on the other hand, for any individual letter, some factor other than its being a letter best explains its construction. Doty has concluded that "There is more differentiation between any of several of his (Paul's) letters than between hundreds of hellenistic letters."  

Other Letter-Genres?

Will other contemporary letter-traditions be more productive in providing a genre on which to base a structure-analysis of Galatians?

There seems to be wide and well-established agreement that Adolf Deissmann was wrong in equating the Pauline letter too closely with the private Greek letters.

Funk, ibid., p. 269, admits that the structural variation raises the question of the relation of the letters to each other and to letter "form."

This applies especially to any predictable arrangement of the body of the Pauline letter. See Doty, Letters, p. 42, and Fischer, "Literary Forms," p. 209.

For instance, 1 Corinthians has letter characteristics, but its structure is explained on other grounds.

Doty, Letters, p. 42.

Gustav Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. L. R. M. Strachan (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901), pp. 3-59, distinguished between "epistles" (Literary productions) and "letters" (spontaneous, personal, and unaffected). Paul wrote true "letters," which were dashed off quickly, with no coherent, logical structure to their argument.
among the nonliterary papyri. These objections are based on such things as:

1. The awareness that Deissmann's distinction between "literary" and "nonliterary" breaks down, both for pagan Greco-Roman letters and for later Christian letters

2. The fact that Paul's letters are not private letters, except for Philemon

3. The presence of paraenesis in Paul's letters

---

1Disagreement comes from, for example, Wendland, Conzelmann, Funk, White (see below, pp. 77-78), Martin, Foundations, 2:243.

2Paul Wendland, Die hellenistisch-römisch Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum. Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1912), p. 344: "Aber die Grenzlinie zwischen echtem Brief und literarischem Epistel darf nicht zu scharf gezogen werden." He rejects Deissmann's association of Paul's letters with papyri. Cicero wrote two types of letters, one more "literary" (Ad Fam 14. 21. 4 [LCL Cicero Ad Fam 3, 313-14]; Ad Att 4. 15 [LCL Cicero Ad Att, 3, 307]), but both are "letters." The letters of Seneca are genuine letters, but also literary.

3Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 6, notes that Clement is an artistic literary creation, but also a genuine letter.

4Selby, Paul, p. 239. Wendland, Literaturformen, p. 346, notes that there are the same variations among Paul's letters, that is, between for instance Philemon and Romans, as among the letters of Cicero and Epicurus, where some are intended for private consumption, others for publication. Paul's letters depart from the model of the private letter more and more as they are intended for wider circulation: the letter that stands furthest from Philemon in this sense is Galatians.
suggests that they stand nearer to literary than epistolary conventions\(^1\)

4. The papyri give no help in understanding the overall structure of Paul's letters\(^2\)

5. The awareness that factors other than epistolary ones are crucial in determining the structure of individual Pauline letters,\(^3\) passages within those letters,\(^4\) and the style and language of the letters\(^5\)

\(^1\)Funk, Language, p. 256. The Sitz of "parae­nesis" is a vexed question (see above), but it is not a typical part of nonliterary letters.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 252, quoting Weiss. If Deissmann is correct, "the Pauline letters at least will continue to be conceived as salutation, thanksgiving, and closing, with virtually anything in any order thrown in between."

\(^3\)See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, above, and the significance of Wisdom and existential questions for the structure of 1 Corinthians.

\(^4\)See Rigaux, Letters, pp. 165-99, for various literary factors evidently at work in Paul's writing, such as kerygmatic formulations, use of scripture, rhetoric, apocalyptic, prose and hymnic rhythm, paraenesis, etc. See also, for instance, the influence of the techniques of "Spätjudentum" on such passages as Rom 1:18-31. See Hans Lietzmann, An die Römer, HNT 8 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934), pp. 31-33, and Günther Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience, trans. Paul L. Hammer (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), pp. 50-51.

\(^5\)On Paul's use of diatribe style, see Rudolf Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoisch Diatribe (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910), passim; and Hartwig Thyen, Der Stil der Jüdische-Hellenistischen Homilie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955), passim. Paul's style is more akin to popular philosophy, i.e., the diatribe, than to the language of the common Egyptian letters. Portions of his letters are not "epistolary" at all, but are dominated by diatribe style, Bultmann, Stil, pp. 64-72.
6. The growing awareness, based on style, form, and sequence analysis, that there is a careful structure in Paul's letters, and that they were not dashed off hastily in the midst of a busy apostolic career.¹

It seems rather strange, therefore, that new attempts should be made to analyze the structure of the Pauline letter-body on the assumption that "the common letter-tradition . . . is the primary literary Gattung to which the Pauline letter belongs."² These investigations of the nonliterary letters have fulfilled Weiss' prediction—we are told little more than that a letter has an opening, a middle, and a closing.³

Are other categories of letter-writing more appropriate for understanding the structure and content of Galatians? It has been noted by Wendland that the essential themes of Galatians come firstly from the missionary and theological thinker and only secondarily

¹See references above, p. 68, note 5.

²White, Body, p. 3. Later, on p. 68, he says Deissmann was wrong in "his proposal that the common letter tradition was the literary genre to which the Pauline letter belongs."

³Ibid., pp. 7-66, especially p. 65. "The body (of the letter) usually has three discrete sections: body-opening, body-middle, and body-closing." His subsequent analysis of Galatians (pp. 79-111), in which he assumes that the letter-body is 1:6-5:12, based on transitional devices culled from the papyri, seems to slide over other studies on body-opening transitions such as Sanders, "Transition," pp. 348-62. Fischer, "Literary Forms," p. 210, criticizes the artificiality of the use of transitional devices from the papyri.
from the letter-writer.¹ In fact, one wonders what the
typical letter-writer was like, as letters in the ancient
world performed such a variety of literary and communica-
tive functions. Plato used the letter-form for apology
and self-justification;² Isocrates' letters are general
in subject-matter, best classified as political writings;³
and the letters of Appolonius of Tyana are religio-
philosophical tracts.⁴ The essential criterion among
Cicero's letters is whether they are public or private.⁵
Seneca's letters are mostly brief, artistic discourses
in which form is dominated by Stoic diatribe style,⁶

¹Wendland, Literaturformen, p. 349. There is no
necessary connection between Paul's work and the terms
and suppositions of letters.

²Plato, Epistle 7, in Loeb, Plato, trans. R. B.
Bury, 7 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University
Press, 1946), 7:463-565. Bury notes that the epistolary
features are merely a literary device: the work is an
apology and manifesto in epistolary form. Arnaldo
Momigliano, The Development of Greek Biography (Cam-
bridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 60-
61, calls it an "apologetic letter" and the first auto-
biographical letter.

³Isocrates, trans. George Norlin, 3 vols. (Cam-
epistolary features are minimal.

⁴Doty, Letters, p. 3.

⁵See above, p. 77, note 2.

⁶Seneca, Epistulae Morales, trans. Richard M.
Gummere, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University
Press, 1953). There are the briefest epistolary features.
George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princet-
on, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 293-98,
notes that Stoic rhetoric was dominated by dialectic.
The thought of the speech was the speech, and would pro-
duce its own natural and good expression. He cites Cato:
although he could also write "discursive letters." Even such Jewish examples as those in 2 Maccabees and the Letter of Aristeas are better classed as "letter-essays." It becomes apparent that one of the least significant things about letters is that they are letters. The letter as a written form was "almost as flexible as oral speech itself," and the letter was in fact often 

"rem tene, verba sequentur." This domination of structure by style is evident in Seneca and Pliny. But Seneca's letters are still letters.

Doty, Letters, p. 7, commenting on Seneca's letters to Lucilius—"the letter type farthest from the private intimate letter."

Doty, Letters, p. 8. Again, epistolary features are minimal. Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, 2 vols. (London: SCM Press, 1974), 1:110, referring to the Jewish epistles in the Hellenistic period (the Letters of Jeremiah, 2 Macc 1:10-2:18, letters in the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Letter of Aristeas, and the letters of Solomon in Eupolemus), notes that they are not much more than "an expansion of the exchange of messages."

Many other letter-writers could be referred to. The definitive collection of Greek epistles is R. Hercher, Epistolographi Graeci (Paris, 1873). Most of the Cynic epistles in this collection have now appeared in uncritical form in A. J. Malherbe, The Cynic Epistles (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977); and of these, the letters of (pseudo)-Heracleitus in critical form in Harold Attridge, First-Century Cynicism in the Epistles of Heracleitus (Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1976). The letters in these last two collections show a close relationship to popular philosophy and the rhetoric influenced by such philosophy. The epistolary features are minimal, and the structure is dominated by the subject-matter in diatribe style. See Attridge, ibid., p. 12 (on the relation between diatribe and rhetoric), and Bultmann, Stil, p. 20. The main contributions for the New Testament are in style (diatribe) and form (haustafeln, virtue and vice lists, etc.). See Malherbe, ibid., pp. 1, 14, 28.

Wilder, Rhetoric, p. 39; and Doty, Letters, p. 15.
regarded merely as another medium of oral speech.\(^1\) The fact that material should come in the form of a letter, then, will not be essentially relevant for understanding the structure of that material.\(^2\) The typical lament, in letter-handbooks, over the mistreatment of letter-form only indicates further the wide variety of functions the "letter" was made to perform\(^3\) and the small influence the handbooks had on letter-writing.\(^4\)

The research of Bultmann\(^5\) and Thyen\(^6\) into Cynic-Stoic and Hellenistic-Jewish letters (as well as other forms of literature)\(^7\) has led to important conclusions about style, but not about overall structure. The main techniques of diatribe are the disputative question, the

\(^1\)Cicero sees the letter as speech in written medium, *Ad Att* 8. 14. 1 (LCL, 2:163); 9. 10. 1 (LCL, 2:225-26); 12. 53 (LCL, 3:107); and Quintillian writes that letters should be in the style of a dialogue, *Oratoria* 9. 4. 19-20 (LCL, 3:517).

\(^2\)Veltman, "Defense Speeches," p. 252, after his examination of the various media in which speeches occur, concludes, "... speeches, letters, and stories, were common stock-in-trade items available to every writer."

\(^3\)For instance, the regret at mistreatment of the letter. See Demetrius, *On Style*, trans. W. R. Roberts (London: Cambridge University Press, 1902), ## 229, 231 (pp. 175-76).


\(^7\)The main sources used by Bultmann are Seneca and Epictetus.
imaginary opponent who holds an opposing philosophy, taking up part of an opponent's point to win one's own point, plays on words, et cetera. Particular phrases are characteristic,\(^1\) and forms such as virtue and vice lists are frequent. Writings are often hortatory or imperative in tone. There is no clear pattern of overall construction—structure is dominated by subject-matter, and rhetorical influence is confined to phrases, expressions, and literary devices (antithesis, analogy, etc.).\(^2\) There are clear parallels to Paul's letters, though the diatribe style is most apparent in those that are farthest removed from the personal letter, that is, Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians,\(^3\) where Paul shows least personal acquaintance with his readers and deals mostly with conjectured opponents.\(^4\) And Paul's diatribe style is softened in comparison with the Cynic-Stoic authors,\(^5\) while there is at the same time a move towards the

\(^1\) Such as οὐκ ἁλάς, τί οὖν, ὄρατε, μὴ γένοιτο, the α-privative, etc.

\(^2\) The relation of cynic-stoic literature to rhetoric is somewhat contradictory. There is a rejection of oratory, rules of rhetorical structure, etc.; and yet small-scale rhetorical devices are used frequently. See Bultmann, *Stil*, pp. 20-24.

\(^3\) The best examples of the dialogical diatribe are Rom 2:1-29, Romans 6, Romans 10, 1 Cor 7:18-24, 1:20-2:5, and 3:5-9.

\(^4\) Though it seems strange to say that Paul was not personally acquainted with the situation in Corinth.

Concerning Galatians, it is significant that, though the diatribe style of answers to questions posed does occur, there are here comparatively few examples of diatribe, and little use of a conjectured opponent. This further suggests that Galatians was written to perform a particular function.

Three conclusions can be drawn from the material examined so far. Firstly, the letters most closely approximating conventional epistolary form, the nonliterary epistles, are too distanced from Paul's letters to help in understanding their structure. Secondly, the literary epistles, though true epistles, are not dominated by epistolary form. If they add anything to the investigation, it is that the essential structure and nature of their material is to be explained in some other way than by calling them letters. And thirdly, if the genre of the letter or epistle is not adequate to analyze Paul's writings, then some other appropriate genre should be sought. Though the letter does not explain the structure of Galatians, neither does the diatribe, suggesting that there is some meaningful structure involved.

---

1Thyen, Stil, p. 41. The diatribe does not dominate the structure of Paul's letters, as it does for the cynics and stoics.

2For instance, Gal 2:14, 17 (using μὴ γένοιτο), 3:1-5, 19, 21 (again, μὴ γένοιτο), 4:9, 16, and 21. But of these, 3:1-5, 4:9 and 21 clearly have in focus the Galatians themselves, and not some conjectured opponent.
Apologetic Speech and Rhetorical Canons

In the light of some of the suggestions by letter theorists and rhetoricians regarding the relationship between letter and speech referred to above—that is, the tendency for rhetoricians to dominate letter-writing and for letters to serve the purposes of oral speech—Hans Dieter Betz appears justified in carrying out what others have suggested before him, an examination of Galatians in terms of rhetorical structure. He refers to an "apologetic letter" genre, evidenced particularly by Plato's Letter 7. This genre itself stands close to autobiography and apologetic speech, which in turn stands in the one stream of development of the autobio-

1See pp. 81-82 above, especially p. 82.


3J. Weiss, Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik (Göttingen: 1897); Rigaux, Letters, pp. 176-78; Doty, Letters, pp. 50-51; J. P. Sampley, "Before God, I Do Not Lie," (Gal 1:20). Paul's Self-Defense in the Light of Roman Legal Praxis," NTS 23 (4, 1977):477-82. To be noted are the warnings of such classicists as Wendland (Literaturformen, p. 344: 'der paulinischen Briefe . . . sie ursprünglich nicht Literaturprodukte im strengsten Sinne gewesen sind . . . ') and Wilder (Rhetoric, p. 44: "In comparison with Greco-Roman models . . . none of the New Testament writings could be identified as "literature" as then understood . . . ") against applying classical canons too rigidly.

4Betz, "Composition," pp. 354-55. See also above p. 78, for the comment of Bury and Momigliano.

5Momigliano, Biography, p. 60.
graphical letter.\textsuperscript{1} It is here, then, that a speech form and a letter form come together.\textsuperscript{2} The "apologetic letter" can be classified as a subheading under the genre of "apologetic speech" which, as with other categories of rhetoric, could be conveyed in either oral or written form.\textsuperscript{3} The "apologetic speech" appears in literary form in such examples as Plato's \textit{Apology} of Socrates,\textsuperscript{4} perhaps the first example of the conversion of a speech of defense into a literary form and confession of faith;\textsuperscript{5} Demosthenes' \textit{De Corona};\textsuperscript{6} Isocrates' \textit{Antidosis},\textsuperscript{7} "a blend

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 58-62, 93-101, where the development of this literary genre is traced.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp. 58-59. Momigliano notes that some of the most influential apologetic speeches were "never uttered," that is, they were speeches in literary form only.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Kennedy, \textit{Persuasion}, p. 5: once oral literature became written, speech did not lose the special significance it had, either in form or in substance. And p. 270: rhetorical forms were always closely related to literary forms.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}Plato, LCL, 1:61-146.
  \item \textsuperscript{7}Isocrates, LCL, 2:181-366.
\end{itemize}
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of forensic oratory, self-defense, and autobiography,\(^1\) itself influenced by Plato's *Apology;\(^2\) and Cicero's *Brutus, in turn influenced by Isocrates' autobiographical apology.\(^3\)

Besides these speeches in literature, there are purported records of speeches, particularly in Greek and Latin historiography.\(^4\) Although rhetoric had a strong and unfortunate influence on history-writing in the Hellenistic period,\(^5\) the rhetoricians themselves distinguish between historiography and oratory,\(^6\) and an

\(^1\)Jaeger, *Paideia*, p. 133, who speaks here of a "mixture of forms," and a refinement of rhetorical skill. It pretends to be what was said in lawsuit.


\(^3\)Cicero *Brutus*, LCL, 10:68-144. Momigliano, *Biography*, p. 60, notes the Socratic influence on Cicero through Isocrates. See below, pp. 239-41, for the way in which Plato's Socrates influenced Jewish apologetic literature.

\(^4\)Veltman, "Defense Speeches," pp. 79-202, has analyzed the reports of defense speeches in the historiography of the Greeks (Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Appian), Romans (Livy, Q. Curtius Rufus, and C. Cornelius Tacitus), and Jews (1 and 2 Macc, Josephus, and Philo), as well as such speeches in Greek and Latin romance, in an attempt to determine the genre of the defense speech in such literature.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 74, noting the "close association of historical composition and oratory," with primary and secondary sources. That historians intentionally edited the speeches they reported, to present them as models of oratory, is clearly suggested by Quintillian *Oratio* 9. 4. 18 (LCL, 3:515): "... in the speeches inserted by historians we may note something in the way of balanced cadences and antitheses."

\(^6\)Cicero *Oratore* distinguishes between historiography and oratory, noting that the two have different
examination of these historiographic speeches itself reveals that, on the whole, they were recorded in the briefest manner.\(^1\) It is justifiable then to limit this investigation to literature that is concerned to present speeches themselves, or literary imitations of speeches, rather than to include the reports of speeches in literature that has some other purpose.

When Betz examines the structure of rhetorical apology, he turns firstly to the rhetorical textbooks.\(^2\) This procedure seems in fact to be correct. Although rhetoric was primarily intended for the forensic situation of the law-court,\(^3\) its scope was much wider than this, and it was seen as providing a vehicle for persuasion in any sphere.\(^4\) On the other hand, rhetorical styles, aims, and criteria: 2. 15. 62-622 (LCL, 1:243-49).

\(^1\) Veltman, "Defense Speeches," p. 250, concludes that the speeches in historiography are not numerous, are often incomplete, and are not rhetorically complex; in fact, it is difficult to define a genre of defense speech in historiography with any precision.


\(^3\) Donald Lemen Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), p. 25: rhetoric was primarily intended for law-courts; and Kennedy, Persuasion, p. 11. The basic rhetorical speech applies best to judicial oratory. See Cicero Oratore 1. 10. 44 (LCL, 1:35). Note that law, politics, and oratory come together. Ad Herennium 1. 2, referring to the scope of rhetoric, speaks especially of "law and citizenship."

\(^4\) Cicero Oratore, 1. 11. 45-47, claims that oratory is to be used in philosophy and science as well as law, that is, politics (LCL, 1:35-43); and Quintilian
canons were typically formulated in terms of forensic speech, and it is clear from the examples above that apology was fond of the forensic setting, even if artificial, to present its case.\textsuperscript{1} Thus the rhetorical textbooks reveal the accepted way of structuring any apology.

Further, William Beardslee makes a distinction between two classes of larger form or genre.\textsuperscript{2} Beginning perhaps with Aristotle's \textit{Poetics}, there is a line of tradition in which the literary form is an essential part of the work. The form itself is part of the message and content, revealing something of the life-situation of the writer and audience. But beginning with Aristotle's \textit{Rhetoric} is a line of tradition which treats the form as a vehicle for a content which can stand in its own right. Form is simply a means of communicating content, a way of making a point of view persuasive. Ancient rhetoric belongs to this tradition. In this case there must be a clear distinction between content and form; the form cannot be analyzed in terms of the content conveyed by the

\textit{Oratio} 2. 21. 3 states that "the material of rhetoric is composed of everything that may be placed before it as a subject for speech" (LCL, 1:357).

\textsuperscript{1}So, Demosthenes' \textit{De Corona} is an apologetic speech before a court of law (Momigliano, \textit{Biography}, p. 58); Isocrates blends forensic oratory with his self-defense and autobiography (Jaeger, \textit{Paideia}, pp. 132-33); and Plato's \textit{Apology} has a forensic setting. Veltman, "Defense Speeches," p. 64, remarks that apologetic speech is a category of forensic speech.

\textsuperscript{2}Beardslee, \textit{Criticism}, p. 3. See above, p. 64, on the terms "genre" and "larger form."
form. Because of this particular characteristic of a rhetorical genre or larger form, rather than defining the structure of the genre by attempting to analyze instances of it in terms of each other (which may give an untrue picture of wide variation within the genre), it would seem preferable to place each instance of the genre alongside accepted models of speech structure, that is, canons of rhetoric.

When this is done, it becomes evident that there is a significant correlation between canons of rhetoric and the structure of the various instances of "apologetic speech." The textbooks themselves, then, are important literary evidence for the structure and dynamics of apologetic speech, as well as representing the theory of

---

1 This is the method adopted by Veltman, "Defense Speeches," passim.

2 Demosthenes' De Corona probably conforms most closely to the textbook structure of rhetorical speech, dividing into prooemium (1-8), narratio (10-52), probatio (60-109), confutatio (160-296), and peroratio (297-324). See Murphy, Demosthenes, pp. 137-44. Kennedy, Persuasion, pp. 229-32, analyses the speech almost identically, and speaks of a "traditional pattern." The same structure is basically discernable in the other examples, though the bulk of Isocrates' speech is probatio, and confutatio is difficult to distinguish; and in Cicero's Brutus, diatribe style begins to dominate the probatio. Theory demanded flexibility (Quintillian Oratio 7. 1. 12 [LCL, 3:13]) and there was careful attention to the quaestio or speech situation (ibid., 3. 5. 5-18 [LCL, 1:399-407]). It could be of two kinds, infinita (general discussion) or finita (concerned with particular persons or cases). It could also be designated forensic (judicial), epideictic (demonstrative), or deliberative (discussion of policy). Similarly, Ad Herennium 1. 2. 2 (LCL, 5).
rhetoric as it was in Paul's own time.¹

Rhetorical theory was based on a discourse of six related parts, although some parts were often combined into larger categories:²

1. Introduction, also called prooemium or exordium.³ This was used to prepare the hearers' minds and gain attention,⁴ and also to state the case or causa, that without which there would be no dispute⁵

2. The narrative or statement of facts. Here the events that have occurred are set forth, the historical background to the case itself.⁶ This is not material

¹The texts used here will be those of Cicero, (De Oratore and De Inventione) in his prime about BCE 75–63; the supposedly anonymous Ad Herennium, dated about 81 BCE and followed closely in classical and postclassical times; and Quintilian (Institutio Oratoria), who belongs in the first century CE, coming at the close of a great period and summing it up. See Clark, Rhetoric, pp. 70, 14.

²For instance, Cicero makes the speech have four parts by including partitio with narratio, and treating confirmatio and confutatio under one category (Oratore 1. 4 [LCL, 3:313]). See Clark, Rhetoric, p. 70.

³Ad Herennium 1. 3. 4 (LCL, 9).

⁴Ad Herennium distinguishes two kinds of openings: the direct opening, or prooemium, and the subtle approach, or ephodos (1. 4. 6 [LCL, 11–12]). There were four methods of making the hearer well-disposed (1. 4. 8 [LCL, 15]), and where there was no need to gain attention, a direct opening or prooemium could be used.

⁵Cicero Oratore 2. 30. 132 (LCL, 1:293), also called exordium.

⁶Ad Herennium 1. 9. 14–15 (LCL, 25–27): it should have three qualities, brevity, clarity, and plausibility. It should only cover those facts necessary to the case; the shorter it is, the easier it is to follow; and it is best to follow chronological order.
that is in dispute. The function of the part is not merely historical, but also persuasive

3. The divisio, also called partitio or propositio. Its purpose is to make clear that which the speaker and his opponents agree on, and what remains contested. In this sense it sums up the legal content of the narratio and provides a transition to the probatio.

4. The proof or probatio, also called the confirmatio. This is the essential part of the speech, the presentation of the argument. It is here that the case will stand or fall, and much attention is given to methods of argument, best order of presentation, et cetera. It is essential that it be directly related to the narratio: the latter is a connected exposition

---

1 Quintillian Oratoria 4. 2. 31 (LCL, 2:67).
2 Ad Herennium 1. 3. 4.
3 Cicero Inventione 1. 22. 31-32. 33 (LCL, 63-67).
4 Quintillian Oratoria 4. 4. 1-4. 5. 26 (LCL, 2:131).
5 For instance, Ad Herennium 1. 10 17: Orestes killed his mother (agreed); but did he have a right to (disagreed)?
6 Quintillian Oratoria 4. 4. 1 (LCL, 2:131).
7 Ad Herennium 1. 3. 4.
8 Cicero Inventione 1. 24. 34 (LCL, 69).
9 See the details summarized in Clark, Rhetoric, p. 147.
of that which is to be proved, and the former is the verification of that which has been stated.

5. The refutation, called refutatio or con-futatio. It is negative in tone, being a destruction of the adversaries' argument.

6. The peroratio or conclusio. It is the last chance to remind the judge or audience of the case and is to make a strong emotional impression. It could be subdivided in various ways, but has to be related to the individual parts of the speech.

Looking ahead to Galatians, it is interesting to note that the body of a forensic speech, excluding prooemium and conclusio, and including divisio with narratio as does Cicero, would have three major parts, a narratio, a probatio, and a refutatio.

---

1 Quintillian 4. 2. 79 (LCL, 2:93).
2 Ad Herennium 1. 3. 4 (LCL, 9).
3 Ad Herennium 2. 30. 47-2. 31. 50 (LCL, 145-51); Quintillian 6. 1. 1-9 (LCL, 2:383-94).
4 For instance, into recapitulation, emotional appeal, and refutation. See Quintillian 6. 1. 1-2 (LCL, 2:393-85); Cicero Inventione 1. 52. 98-1. 53. 30 (LCL, 147-53); and Ad Herennium 2. 30. 47 (LCL, 145).
5 Ad Herennium 2. 30. 47 (LCL, 145): "The summing up gathers together and recalls the points we have made . . . and we shall reproduce all the points in the order in which they have been presented, so that the hearer . . . is brought back to what he remembers."
6 Above, p. 91, note 2.
Apologetic Speech in Paul's Context

But could the use of rhetorical forms be expected in Paul's context? Firstly, the canons of rhetoric had an integral place in Greco-Roman life and literature.

1 W. C. van Unnik, in Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth, trans. G. Ogg (London: Epworth Press, 1962), has widely influenced scholarship by his proposition, based especially on Acts 22:3, its syntax, and the use of γεγενημένου, ἀνασθραμμένος, and πεπαλαίμνενος, that Paul spent the years of his youth in Jerusalem, and that he received all his education there. It is really immaterial to this discussion whether he was in fact educated in one place or the other. In both cities he would have become aware of rhetoric (below, pp. 94-98), and this is one more area in which the distinction between "Hellenistic" and "Palestinian" is not very helpful (below, pp. 196-200). As Davies, Paul, p. xi, remarks, "The Judaism within which he grew up, even in Jerusalem, was largely Hellenised, and the Hellenism he encountered in his travels was largely Juda-ised." And wherever he was educated, he spent large portions of his life among Roman paganism and Diaspora Judaism, both of which would have inevitably exposed him to rhetorical forms of communication (below, pp. 94-96). But certain things must be said to van Unnik's argument. Nigel Turner, Grammatical Insights into the New Testament (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1965), pp. 83-85, addressing Acts 22:3, raises the question of the antecedent to the phrase ἀνασθραμμένος . . . εν τῇ πόλει ταύτη. The most natural translation of the plea to Claudius Lysias would make Tarsus the antecedent. Even van Unnik's punctuation of the verse really makes the words "brought up" go with "Tarsus." Usually participial clauses precede the words with which they are associated, so that "brought up" should go with "Jerusalem." But in a large number of instances, Luke does not follow this rule (Acts 1:3, 14, 2:33-3:2, 6:1, and many more). So grammatically, it is not required that "this city" go with "Jerusalem." Turner concludes, "The argument that Tarsus played no part in the early education and training of the apostle lacks conviction" (p. 84). Acts 26:4, ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου ἐν τῇ Ἰεροσολύμωι, which van Unnik translates "among my own nation, including Jerusalem," is much more naturally translated "among my own nation, and in Jerusalem," giving τῇ its natural contrasting force: "my own nation" would then refer to the people of Cilicia, of whom Paul was proud, Acts 21:39, 22:34 (Turner, ibid., pp. 84-85).
Rhetoric was fundamental to Hellenistic education, comprising the curriculum for intermediate schooling, and

Van Unnik goes on to assert that Aramaic was Paul's mother tongue: while he wrote in Greek, he thought in Aramaic. This is perhaps the most hotly contested part of van Unnik's argument. Sandmel, Paul, pp. 5-21, along with many others, is equally sure that Paul's Greek marks him as a Diaspora Jew. Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 9-10, quotes the verdict of the great Greek scholar, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: Paul "... thinks and writes in Greek" which "comes right from the heart" and is "not Aramaic in translation:" his writings are "a classic of Hellenism." Of course, this does not prove that Paul was educated in Tarsus: Greek was widely used in Palestine (many Palestinian Jews were "zweisprachig;" even two of the twelve disciples had Greek names: Hengel, Judaism, 1:86-87), and there are Greek texts from Qumran. What it does suggest again is the breakdown of the false distinction between "Hellenistic" and "Palestinian."

Van Unnik himself admits that Paul wrote all his epistles after he had spent many years in a "Greek" environment (i.e., outside Palestine: ibid., pp. 46-51). He is in Tarsus between Acts 9:30 and 11:26, which covers a period of five years, estimated conservatively. This continued connection with Tarsus is also evidenced by Acts 9:11, 21:37-39, and 23:34. A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), pp. 179-80, notes that Paul's references to his citizenship in Acts 21:37-39 and 22:3 are typical for a man of the Hellenistic world: "Tarsus is Paul's city, and he takes pride in it." Paul's Roman name also points to his deep connections with the Diaspora world: it was not a part of his missionary equipment, and he had it even before his conversion (Acts 13:9). He is aware of Greek literature; he not only quotes Menander (1 Cor 14:33) but also Aratus—a fellow Tarsian (Acts 17:28). Wherever Paul grew up, his later life shows an intimate contact with Tarsus.

A factor that appears to contradict van Unnik is that there is no mention of Jerusalem in any of Paul's citations of his pedigrees (Phil 3:4, 2 Cor 11:22, Rom 11:1). This is strange in the light of the people these citations were designed to impress.

As far as the influence of rhetoric on Paul is concerned, the best evidence is his own letters. Not only is there a restrained but familiar use of the cynical-stoic diatribe (above, pp. 83-84); there is also the use of rhetorical devices on a smaller and larger scale (below, pp. 98-99). This has led many to conclude that
having an important place in advanced education. The Roman schools took over this tradition with little or no modification. Education tended to reinforce basic patterns, and rhetorical imitation was fundamental to the system. These canons, and probably also several of the above apologetic speeches, could be expected to be fundamental to the education of anyone who received a careful schooling in the Roman empire in the first century AD.

Secondly, Judaism came under the influence of this system of education, directly or indirectly, both within and outside Palestine. For the Diaspora, the Greek school and gymnasium had been planted in almost every Asian city. Jewish names are common in lists of "his rhetorical education is Greek" (Koester, "Hellenism," p. 187), wherever and whenever he may have received it.

1Kennedy, Persuasion, p. 7.

2Clark, Rhetoric, p. 59. He notes that the Hellenistic pattern of education was well established in Rome by the mid-second century BCE and was extended to Gaul and even Britain by the end of the first century CE, according to Juvenal (Satire 14. 110 [LCL, 297]).

3Kennedy, Persuasion, p. 270. Hengel, Judaism, 1:69, notes that education was mainly devoted to the dominant fashions.

4Kennedy, Persuasion, p. 332: "This rhetorical μίμησις or imitation, in which one studied an author and tried to reproduce his style, became such a major interest of teachers of rhetoric that in later Hellenistic times it tended to overshadow everything else." See, for example, Quintillian on imitation, Oratoria 10 (LCL, 4:75-122).

5Hengel, Judaism, 1:65.
ephebes in Greek cities.\(^1\) Josephus implies that Jews attended the gymnasium in Antioch,\(^2\) and the letter of Aristeas, with its stress on καλοκαγαθία, shows that the Jewish upper class in Alexandria had accepted Hellenistic educational ideals.\(^3\) There was evidently a close association between admittance to the gymnasium and acceptance into Alexandrian and Roman citizenship.\(^4\) Philo took it for granted that upper-class Jews would be at the gymnasium\(^5\) and speaks of the necessity of a knowledge of rhetoric.\(^6\) Palestine did not escape this influence. The Greek literature of Palestine and even the synagogue and temple schools bear its mark,\(^7\) and the region produced its writers and rhetors, though they were Pagans.\(^8\)

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 66.  \(^2\) Josephus Ant 12. 119.  
\(^3\) Hengel, Judaism, 1:67.  
\(^4\) The prohibition of Jews from the gymnasium in Alexandria in 41 CE led the way to a Jewish rebellion and eventual annihilation of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt, 115-117 CE, ibid., p. 68.  
\(^5\) Philo Spec Leg 2. 230; Som 61. 129-30.  
\(^6\) Philo Spec Leg 2. 230; Ebr 49; Som 1. 3-6.  
\(^7\) Hengel, Judaism, 1:102: the Greek literature of Palestine gives evidence of training in rhetoric, though not used against Hellenistic civilization; and 81, the dialectic form of instruction of Rabbinic Judaism, with its sequence of question and answer, could almost be called Socratic and shows the influence of Greek rhetorical schools.  
\(^8\) Strabo Geography 16. 2. 29 mentions four famous writers from Gadara, among them "Theodorus the rhetor of our days" (i.e., BC 63-19 AD).
Thirdly, Paul's "own city," Tarsus, was famous for its university. Strabo writes that not only in philosophy but in education in general the city even surpassed Athens and Alexandria, and he particularly mentions schools of rhetoric. Even if Paul did not attend these schools, he would have been influenced by them. But his letters give evidence that he had received a Greek education and that he knew Roman law. Many have noted rhetorical characteristics in his letters, both on a larger and smaller scale. Not only did rhetoric surround him on all sides; it has also directly influenced him.

1 Ibid., 14. 5. 13: "The people of Tarsus have devoted themselves so eagerly, not only to philosophy, but also to the whole round of education in general, that they have surpassed Athens, Alexandria, or any other place that can be named where there have been schools and lectures of philosophers. . . . Further, the city of Tarsus has all kinds of schools of rhetoric."

2 Selby, Paul, p. 126.


5 See the references above, p. 85, note 3; and Rigaux, Letters, p. 178, for further bibliography.

6 Rigaux, Letters, p. 178, considers the whole of Romans and Ephesians to reveal rhetorical structure.

7 The use of rhetoric has been seen in 1 Cor 1 and 2 (Munck, Paul, p. 153; Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 39-48), Rom 15, 2 Cor 8-9, 1 Thess 2:15, 5:4-12 (Rigaux, Letters, pp. 179-80; Bultmann, Stil, pp. 74-76).
One other piece of evidence for rhetoric in Paul's context, though a very sensitive one, is the speeches of Acts. The three defense speeches of Paul before Pagans in Acts 24 and 26 show clear rhetorical structure, especially the more complete one in Acts 26.\(^1\) Acts 17 is the centre of much debate, but there is good evidence that it is to be understood as a trial speech,\(^2\) and it

\(^1\) The speech of Tertullus in Acts 24, only briefly reported, opens with a captatio benevolentiae (Veltman, "Defense Speeches," p. 213, discussing 24:2-3) that conforms to the direct opening built upon goodwill of Ad Herennium 1. 4. 6 (LCL, 13), which goes on to say, "From the discussion of the person of our hearers goodwill is secured if we set forth the courage, wisdom, humanity, and nobility of past judgments they have rendered . . . " (1. 5. 8 [LCL, 17]). 24:4-6 can be understood to be the causa (p. 91, above), and 24:8 is a brief conclusio. Paul's reply is also briefly recorded. It opens with a captatio benevolentiae (Veltman, ibid., p. 215), then has a brief narratio, 24:11-13 (above, p. 91), a divisio, 24:14-16 (above, p. 92), and the beginnings of a probatio, 24:17. However, from here on the speech structure dissolves (Veltman, ibid., p. 215). The more complete speech of Acts 26 has a prooemium that is a captatio benevolentiae, 26:2-3 (Veltman, ibid., p. 218), followed by a causa, 26:4-8. Then there is a narratio (26:9-18), a divisio (26:19-23), and evidence that the speech was then interrupted, 26:24. As far as it continues, then, it follows classical structure.

\(^2\) F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, 4 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), 4:213, understand Acts 17:22-31 to be a trial or defense speech. Timothy D. Barnes, "An Apostle on Trial," JTS 20 (1969):407-19, has more recently examined the evidence in favor of this assessment, pointing to such things as the powers and functions of the Ἀρείς Πάγος and the use of ἐπιλαμβάνεται. Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), p. 517, points to indications in the speech and its context that there is an attempt at reminiscence of Socrates and his defense, such as references to the ἄγορα, the Ἀρείς Πάγος, ζένα δαίμονα, etc.
shows a definite rhetorical structure.\(^1\) In these two respects, then, it proximates the genre of apologetic speech and the literary models referred to above, perhaps standing in the Socratic tradition of Plato's \textit{Apology} and Isocrates' \textit{Antidosis}. Even further, the speech ends with a missionary exhortation\(^2\) which may still be considered to be the rhetorical \textit{conclusio}.\(^3\)

This is of even further significance for the analysis of Galatians.\(^4\)

All this material at least indicates that, by suggesting that Galatians should be examined in terms of


\(^2\)Norden, \textit{Agnostos Theos}, pp. 10-11, draws attention to the parallels between the end of the Areopagus speech and Hellenistic apologetic missionary speeches such as those in Poimandres, Odes of Solomon, the \textit{Kerygma Petri}, etc.

\(^3\)Barnes, "Apostle on Trial," pp. 418-19, sees no anomaly between the conclusion from the evidence he presents, that is, that the speech is a trial or defense speech, and the obvious apologetic or hortatory tendency of the conclusion of the speech.

\(^4\)See below on the paraenetic portion of Galatians, and the suggestion that a forensic \textit{refutatio} has here been adapted to the "speech situation," so that it performs a hortatory function, pp. 96-97.
rhetorical canons, Paul as a writer has not been placed in an unlikely context. Those who see in him the "Platonic precedent" and the influence of larger rhetorical structure may not be far wrong.¹

Galatians and Apologetic Speech

In accord with the principle that a genre should function as both an external and an internal control, there should be here a consideration of indications from within Galatians that it is to be understood in terms of apologetic speech.

The previous chapter has already suggested that the nature of the direct references to the opponents, the defensive statements, and references to the Galatians themselves, indicates that the letter as a whole confronts the opponents' theology, though the letter as a whole is also written to the Galatians.² In terms of epistolary form, too, Galatians is polemical in the sense that the "whole letter is body" in a unique way, with an unusually sustained interest in one problem.³ Further.  

¹Momigliano, Biography, p. 62, suggests that the "Platonic precedent" reappears in Paul; and Clark, Rhetoric, p. 142, writes that the rhetorical canons as they appear in Ad Herennium guided many of those who addressed the public in writing—Demosthenes and Cicero in their speeches, and Seneca—and Paul—in their letters.

²See above, p. 57.

³So, Funk, Language, p. 272, quoted above, p. 75. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 63, notes that "The epistle of Galatians is especially distinguished among St. Paul's
there is here a departure from typical Pauline style in the smaller use of diatribe and the contrived opponent.¹

This suggests that Galatians is written to perform a unique function—and so probably uses a unique larger form.²

There are phrases in Galatians that suggest that Paul is presenting a case and demanding a decision in his favor. Gal 1:8, 9 uses a double curse (ἀνάθεμα ἔστω) in a unique way,³ which is, however, a known rhetorical feature in "apologetic speech."⁴ In 1:20 Paul professes an oath of truthfulness ( yyn[i]'v oμεν, ιςον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ δι' αὐτό ψευδομαντος), also used in Roman law in the presentation of a legal case.⁵ And in 5:10 Paul makes an appeal for a decision in his favor, ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς υμᾶς

Letters by its unity of purpose. The Galatian apostasy . . . is never lost sight of from beginning to end."

¹See above, p. 84.

²Sampley, "Self-Defense," p. 478, suggests that rhetoric should be especially applicable to Galatians, where Paul is both defending himself and making counter-charges.

³Paul uses the curse elsewhere only in 1 Cor 16:22, at the end of a letter.

⁴Betz, "Composition," p. 334, who notes the use of the curse by Demosthenes in De Corona 324. Quintilian discusses the place of the curse in the forensic speech in Oratoria 4. 1. 20-22 (LCL, 2:17).

⁵See Sampley, "Self-Defense," pp. 477-82; and Quintilian, 5. 6. 1 (LCL, 2:165), who states that the oath was a sign of bad faith unless the same privilege was allowed to the opponent. Paul in effect does this in 4:14-15, "I bear you witness that, if possible, you would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me."
ἐν κυρίῳ δτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φορνήσετε, having a decidedly forensic flavor. There are at least ten interpretations for 6:17, τοῦ λοιποῦ κόπους μοι μηδεῖς παρεχέτω, ἕγω γάρ τα στigmata του Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι μου βαστάζω. It seems most plausible that Paul by στigmata is referring to marks or bodily scars that have resulted from his apostolic office, powerful to persuade because the trials of the apostle are part of his share in the crucified Jesus. He is speaking in the context of the "scars" (ἡ περιτομή, 6:12-15) in which the opponents boast. They have only flesh-wounds, the στigmata of slavery under the law; Paul's wounds are στigmata of freedom in the service

1Note how Tertullus rests his case in Acts 24:8. Quintillian Oratoria 6. 1. 3 (LCL, 2:385) says that an effective conclusion is to pretend to wonder "what hope the accuser can have after the manner in which we have refuted all the charges brought against us." A concluding type of appeal may be made in several places in the speech (ibid., 6. 1. 53; Ad Herennium 2. 30. 47).

2Both BAG and H. D. Betz, "στίγμα," TDNT, 6:663-64, follow LS in translating στίγμα as a tattoo, mark, etc. BAG notes Hierod., Carm. Aur. 11, p. 445 Mull., where στίγματα are the scars left by the rod of discipline. The word is used in the NT only at Gal 6:17. Mussner, Galater, p. 417, summarizes nine of the interpretations given this verse: the psychopathic-hysterical (Assissi); effects from the Damascus experience (Hirsch); analogy; mystical; brand of ownership or στίγματα ἱερα of temple devotees (Lightfoot, Deissmann, Schlier); a bodily marking with a sign; the epiphany theory; signs of fellowship; and wounds received in apostolic labors, proofs of apostleship.

3See 2 Cor 1:5, 8, 4:10, 6:4-6, 11:23-26, and Col 1:24.

4See Gal 2:20 in conjunction with the above texts; and Mussner, Galater, p. 417.
of the crucified Christ. What, then, is the significance and function of such a remark at this point? Rhetorical texts and literary examples reveal that one of the most effective final appeals, in a forensic case, was to present one's wounds received in action, at the same time belittling the claims of the opposition. Paul here evidently makes a last appeal for a favorable decision.

The modifications of the typical Pauline letter-opening and letter-closing are significant. There is an epistolary framework that easily separates from the body of the letter, almost like an external bracket, and, when separated, the body is left with few epistolary features. The letter-opening itself is striking for its "apologetic" tone, showing Galatians to be no private letter but an official apostolic missive directed to particular concerns. The postscript departs even

---

1Ibid., p. 418. LS refer to Gal 6:17 as a metaphorical use of στυγμα.

2Sampley, "Self-Defense," pp. 477-82; Betz, "Composition," p. 329, gives examples. Quintillian Oratoria 6. 1. 21 (LCL, 395-97) states that "... the defendant ... his worth, his manly pursuits, the scars from wounds received in battle, his rank and the services rendered by his ancestors, will all commend him to the goodwill of the judges."

3Betz, "Composition," p. 327.

4Kümmel, Introduction, p. 294; Mussner, Galater, p. 43. It is clearly different from Rom 1:1-7, 2 Cor 1:1-9, and other introductions to Paul's letters. This section of the epistle will be discussed further below.
further from Pauline custom. Apart from 6:11, 18, which are epistolary, the section is analyzed more satisfactorily in terms of a rhetorical conclusio. It is striking in the way it recapitulates the main themes of the epistle (personal attacks of the troublemakers, circumcision, the cross, the new people of God, and Paul's personal struggle), and in its strongly personal references to both Paul and to an opponent. This is unusual for a postscript, but typical of a conclusio. It can be divided into a refutatio (6:12-13, a negative final appeal and denunciation of opponents); recapitulatio (6:14-16, a recapitulation in the form of a final exhortation); and conquestio (6:17, Paul's personal worth as grounds for a favorable decision). These modifications in the letter-opening and the letter-closing suggest that the body of the letter, too, is to be understood in terms of a particular form and function.

There is also a striking modification of the typically Pauline prooemium or thanksgiving—that is, there is no thanksgiving at all, which is such a

1See, for example, the manner in which the speaker concludes in Demosthenes' De Corona, Socrates' Apology, and Isocrates' Antidosis, etc.

2See above, p. 93, on the way a conclusio could be subdivided, with references. For the different emotional appeals that were appropriate in this part of the speech, see Quintillian Oratoria 6. 1. (LCL, 2:383-94).

3The remarks of the commentators are well summarized by Mussner, Galater, pp. 53-54.
departure from the Pauline practice that it calls for explanation.\(^1\) In terms of the rhetorical model, the explanation is simple: Paul is using a particular kind of prooemium or exordium in conformity with the nature of a certain type of situation.\(^2\) The use of ἰσαμαντία, which Paul nowhere else uses in a letter-opening,\(^3\) was a familiar rhetorical expression in connection with the exordium.\(^4\) Paul is here setting forth the causa, that without which there would be no dispute.

Another fact noted by most commentators, though not in the light of rhetorical structure, is that, apart from the "epistolary envelope," the body of the letter divides into three clear sections, which Lightfoot has labelled "narrative" (chaps. 1 and 2), "argumentative" (chaps. 3 and 4), and "hortatory" (chaps. 5 and 6).\(^5\) This is in fact what would be expected of a forensic speech constructed in terms of rhetorical canons.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Funk, Language, p. 270.

\(^2\) See above, pp. 88-89, on the types of exordia. Gal 1:6-11 conforms closely to the "direct opening" of Ad Herennium, where the attention of the audience is assured.

\(^3\) Compare Rom 1:8-17, 1 Cor 1:3-9, 2 Cor 1:3-5, Phil 1:3-6, Col 1:3-4, 1 Thess 1:2-4. See the comments of Mussner, Galater, p. 53.

\(^4\) Betz, "Composition," p. 359, refers to the use of ἰσαμαντία in exordia by Demosthenes, Plato, Isocrates, etc.

\(^5\) Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 65-66.

\(^6\) See above, pp. 91, 93, noting that Cicero
The larger structure of Galatians will now be examined in terms of these rhetorical canons, as an external criterion (introduced into the discussion for internal reasons) for distinguishing the parts of the letter-body and ascertaining how they hold together.

The Prooemium, 1:6-10

As already noted, this section sets forth the causa, that without which there would be no dispute. In this case, the central issue to which the argument of the whole letter is directed is not only the "different gospel," serious though this is,¹ but it is also that the Galatians are turning to it (δαυδειν δι οντως ταχεως μετατεθες ἀπ το καλεσαντος υμας . . . ες ετεραν ευαγγελον).² Certainly the issue has been raised by intruders, the Galatians are both judge and jury,³ as Paul appeals for a decision against them (5:10, 6:17). But the Galatians have identified themselves with the included partitio with narratio. In fact, partitio and narratio in Galatians are both connected and separate in a way suggested by the texts.

¹ Its seriousness is indicated by the fact that, in verses 6-9, the nominal or verbal form of ευαγγελον is used five times. The preacher of a false ευαγγελον is placed under a double curse. The source of the disturbance is clearly a Christian heresy, a false ευαγγελον. See Mussner, Galater, pp. 59-62.

² The force of δαυδειν has been noted above, p. 106. Paul is astonished partly because it has all happened ταχεως.

offending party. If they had not deserted (μεταπεθανε), the letter would not have been written. The letter is not written against two or more problems (a false gospel, deviant Galatian praxis, etc.), but against one central problem (with several implications)—the Galatian acceptance of the false gospel. This explains why Galatians as a whole disputes a theology that has been introduced by intruders; and yet the book is directed specifically at the Galatians themselves. Being understood as a prooemium, 1:6-10 stands at the head of the whole letter as the causa.

The Narratio, 1:12-2:14

The "apologetic letter" genre explains why this historical passage is here. The narratio gave the back-

1 It has already been noted above that Paul writes as a missionary (Wendland, above p. 79) and as an apostle (Martin, above, p. 72). He does not write merely to theological issues or to theologians but to churches. It must be the Galatians themselves who have called forth the letter. Sampley, "Self-Defense," pp. 477-82, notes that, according to legal theory, the privilege of the oath was offered to the opponent. However, in the example of this that he cites from Galatians, 4:15-16, the privilege is offered to the Galatians. This confirms that the Galatians are at once judge, jury, and offending party.

2 As proposed by Drane, Paul, pp. 137-39, who makes the letter an attack on three false doctrines, one dealt with in each of chaps. 1-2, 3-4, and 5-6.

3 The causa is in the second person plural: the Galatians are considered as one group. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 63, notes that "The sustained severity of this epistle is an equally characteristic feature with its unity of purpose."
ground to the dispute, the events that elaborated the situation. It is significant that 1:13 begins with 

Paul is giving no new information, and it is an interpretation of history, not history itself, that is in dispute, as is expected in a forensic *causa*.\(^1\) In the light of Paul's autobiographical statements elsewhere, he here gives not "an historical but rather an historic, that is, significant" or even apologetic account of his early life as a Christian.\(^2\) This is to be expected in a rhetorical *narratio*, which must be "adapted to persuade."\(^3\)

In the light of rhetoric, three things can be said about this difficult passage. Firstly, Paul has not here taken up a different subject to the one raised in the *causa*; he is still primarily concerned with the defense of his gospel, not his apostleship.\(^4\) The latter question has only arisen because the gospel has been questioned; and the question of apostleship is historical background to the question of the gospel. Paul here only

\(^1\)See *Ad Herennium* 1. 9. 14-15 (LCL, 25-27) on the function of the *narratio*. *Quintillian Oratoria* 4. 2. 11 (LCL, 2:55) says the facts should here be presented as simply as possible.


\(^3\)Quintillian *Oratoria* 4. 2. 31 (LCL, 2:67).

\(^4\)Against Drane, *Paul*, pp. 137-3\(\text{j}\), and others who see Gal 1-2 as dealing specifically with apostleship.
defends his apostleship to provide an alibi; his gospel is not κατὰ ἀνθρώπου.

Secondly, in his defense, Paul must show that his gospel is not derived from Jerusalem and the Pillars. This suggests that he is answering a movement that is hostile to the Jerusalem church as well as to Paul. The charge is two-pronged: that Paul's apostolic authority derives from human sources and he is dependent on other apostles; and that he is denying the authentic Jerusalem tradition while preaching this gospel κατὰ ἀνθρώπου.²

Thirdly, the narratio deals with the historical events without which the case cannot be understood, not necessarily the historical events of the case itself.³

The issue in Galatians is not to be understood to be exactly the same as that in Jerusalem (2:1-10 and circumcision of the Gentiles from the point of view of Pharisees) or Antioch (2:11-14 and table fellowship between

---

¹Sampley, "Self-Defense," p. 478, noting the significant place at which Paul's oath occurs in 1:20--Paul is saying that, in Jerusalem, he saw only Cephas and James.

²See Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 300-1; Schmithals, Paul, pp. 8-66; Drane, Paul, pp. 13-14, who notes that if, to the opponents, the Pillar apostles' gospel was the authentic one, the charge of dependence would discredit Paul as an apostle, but it would be a commendation of his gospel. See below, p. 205. The principal charge against Paul is against his gospel.

³Quintillian Oratoria 7. 1. 12 (LCL, 3:13). See, for instance, how Cicero, in his Brutus, begins with a narratio that deals with a general history of the teaching of rhetoric, not the specific events that have occasioned the charges and his reply.
Jews and Gentiles), just as the issue in Antioch was different to the issue in Jerusalem, but the principle was the same.¹ Nor do the opponents in the narratio have to be the opponents behind the causa. The account in the narratio is only intended to illustrate Paul's struggle to save the freedom of the gospel. The rhetoricians taught that the narratio should end where the issue to be determined begins.² The issue with which Paul confronts Cephas in 2:14 is therefore in principle the issue that confronts the Galatians themselves: πῶς τὰ ἐστὶν ἄναγκες Ἰουδαίες. And this is, in principle, the issue that Paul has always struggled against. But the exact form this issue takes in Galatia must be decided from the rest of the letter, not from the narratio.³

The Propositio, 2:15-21

The propositio or partitio⁴ could be considered part of the narratio or a section in its own right.⁵ Either way, it was intimately related to what had preceded, summing it up in terms of the precise issue to

¹Munck, Paul, p. 100.
²Quintillian Oratoria 4. 2. 132 (LCL, 2:121).
³This is why the exact positions of the opponents cannot be decided from the historical portion of the letter; against Tyson and others, above, pp. 49-50.
⁴See above, p. 92.
⁵See above pp. 91-93.
be discussed in the probatio. It made more precise that which was agreed upon and that which remained to be disputed.\textsuperscript{1} Most commentators have noted the change of tone after 2:14 that indicates that Paul has begun a new section in his argument.\textsuperscript{2} This is precisely what is to be expected if Galatians is constructed according to rhetorical canons. Then 2:15-16 is probably that which is agreed upon (including the doctrine of justification as stated here).\textsuperscript{3} The Judaisers are, by their teaching and behavior, denying something which Jewish and Gentile Christians have always agreed upon, and that the Judaisers in principle must accept—that a man is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Christ. The exact point in dispute appears to be 2:17-18, where the tone changes from agreement to disagreement: \textsuperscript{4} εἰ γὰρ ἐκκατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἶκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάω. The propositio was to provide a transition to the

\textsuperscript{1}See above, p. 92, and references.

\textsuperscript{2}For instance, Ernest de Witt Burton, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians}, ICC n. lxxii, summarizes 2:15-21 as the "continuation and expansion of his address at Antioch so stated as to be for the Galatians also an exposition of the gospel which he preached."

\textsuperscript{3}This assertion will be examined more carefully below, pp. 153-76.

\textsuperscript{4}Noting the adversative δὲ and the μὴ γένοιτο of 2:17 and the polemical change from ἀμφοτέρως to παραβάτης in 2:17-18. See below, pp. 159-64.
probatio, and look forward to it.¹ The striking change in language in 2:19-20 (from forensic terms to διδοθησο- ειν, εκατ, etc.) must sharpen the issue under debate in those terms that are most relevant to the Galatian situation.² In this way 2:15-21 makes more precise that which is agreed upon, that which is in dispute, and the language in terms of which it is to be disputed.

The Probatio, 3:1-4:31

The probatio was the central argument against the accusers, on which the case stood or fell. It is to be expected, then, that the central assertions of the opponents are to be debated here, and that the essentials of their theology are to be found here, rather than in the narratio.³

Several pericopae within these chapters can be expected to be serving particular functions. 3:1-5 appears to be an interrogatio,⁴ or examination of witnesses, which was assigned to the probatio, though

¹Quintillian Oratoria 4. 4. 1 (LCL, 2:131).
²The structure and language of 2:15-21 will be examined more carefully below, pp. 153-75.
³It is significant that the diatribe style is used most frequently in these chapters: 3:1-5, 19, 21, 4:9, 16, 21.
⁴Betz, "Composition," p. 370. On the interrogatio, see Quintillian Oratoria 5. 7. (LCL, 2:171-90), and Ad Herennium 4. 15. 22 (LCL 283).
relating directly to the partitio. Its language was to be most relevant to the issue and most understandable to those involved. Here the Galatians become witnesses to the debate: their own experience, past and present, is essential to the case, and the language in which the interrogatio is framed is understood by all involved to be carrying on the main point at issue, sharpened in 2:15-21, justification.

The piece of evidence produced by the witnesses under interrogation will be constantly referred to throughout the proof, which itself will be a carefully reasoned piece. Because of their place at the centre of the probatio, it is not to be expected that 4:1-11, or even 4:8-11, are a turning to a new issue; rather, they are probably a reactivation of the original argument against the new theology which the Galatians have adopted.

The material in 4:12-20, probably to be designated by the title περὶ φιλαργίας, could also be included in a probatio and was understood to have inherent per-

---

1 Ad Herennium ibid., states that the most impressive interrogation reinforces the argument just delivered, in this case Gal 2:15-21 and Paul's particular statement of justification.

2 Quintillian Oratoria 5. 7. 31 (LCL, 2:187).

3 Thus the question of the presence and power of πνεῦμα and δύναμις (3:2, 5) directly carries on the argument about the way of justification; and the experience of the Galatians referred to here (whatever that might be: see below, pp. 176-84) is an essential part of Paul's answer about the way of justification.
suasive value. This places the passage and the events it refers to directly in the debate itself. Again, the behavior of the Galatians is part of the *causa* of the letter. The passage also shows the repudiation of Paul by the Galatian churches, revealing that the opponents have taken his place as the community apostles.2

The *Refutatio*, 5:1-6:10

This section was negative in tone, and destructive of the adversaries' argument. 5:1-12 seems to be a *refutatio* in the classical sense. Paul's tone clearly changes from chapters 3 and 4, and his attention turns, perhaps more than elsewhere in the letter, to the intruders themselves (5:7, 10, 12). Their influence is only bad (5:9), and the section ends with a curse that is unusual in its bitterness even for Paul (5:12).

It is in this pericope that Paul appeals for a decision (5:10). The most suitable place for such an

---

1 Betz, "Composition," p. 372, with reference to the use of the topos ητεροφιλίας in speeches and letters. See Quintillian *Oratoria* 5. 11. 41 (LCL, 2:295).

2 See further below, p. 127.

3 Betz does not consider that Galatians may have a *refutatio* and tries to explain this passage rhetorically as paraenesis by claiming examples of paraenesis in rhetorical literature. However, the sole example he cites (Seneca, Epistle 76) is unconvincing. It belongs to Stoic diatribe literature, which used rhetorical techniques but not a rhetorical structure (see above). Bultmann speaks of a hortatory or imperative tone in diatribe literature, but not paraenesis (Der Stil, pp. 32-34). The rhetorical handbooks make little or no allowance for paraenesis.
appeal was after the strongest argument.\(^1\) In this case it is significant that the sharpened issue of the *divisio*, justification by faith without the works of the law, has been brought to a climax in this unsparing denunciation of circumcision.

For the rest, it must be admitted that it is difficult to get from rhetoric to paraenesis, as 5:13-6:10 is usually considered to be, although there may be another instance in Acts 17.\(^2\) However, this passage is not paraenesis in the sense of disconnected topoi\(^3\) but is still carrying through the debate. The language of the *interrogatio* (*σοφία, πνεῦμα, νόμος, πάσις*) is central to this passage (5:13, 14, 16-25, 6:1-2, 7-8).\(^4\) And chapters 5 and 6 divide into three parts (5:1-12, 5:13-24, and 5:25-6:10), each beginning with an indicative statement that assumes that Paul's argument of 3:1-5 has been won:

\[
\begin{align*}
5:1 & \quad \text{ἐλευθερία ἡμῶν ἡ Χριστός ἡ λευθερώσειν} \\
5:13 & \quad \text{ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερία ἐκλήσιον} \\
5:25 & \quad \text{εἴ δὲμεν πνεῦμα} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Each of these passages pushes the argument to its conclu-

---

\(^1\)Ad Herennium 2. 30. 47 (LCL, 147). See above, p. 103.

\(^2\)See above, pp. 99-100.

\(^3\)See the criticism of Dibelius' definition above, p. 73, note 6.

\(^4\)Above, p. 56, quoting Jewett, "Agitators," pp. 196-98. It is significant, too, that both 5:1-12 and 5:13-6:10 are bound together by the exhortation to *ἀγάπη* (5:6, 6:14-15, 5:22).
sions in practical terms. So it could be said that Paul is not abandoning a rhetorical model but is following sound rhetorical procedure in adapting his material to the specific speech situation\(^1\) and putting his forensic refutation in terms of ethical exhortation.\(^2\)

The refutation was the destruction of the opponents' argument. Since the *causa* (1:6-10) states that the letter is written because the Galatians have adopted an alien theology, 5:1-6:10 must be related directly to the acceptance of that theology. But even more than this, the *refutatio* was typically the destruction of the opponents' argument in the opponents' own terms, by an appeal to norms to which even the opposition had to agree.\(^3\) So in terms of rhetoric, there will be a subtlety to the passage. The standards of the opposition will be used for an attack on an ethos that is owned by the opposition. This is in keeping with the dialogical

\(^1\)See the reference to Quintillian Oratoria 7. 1. 12, above, p. 90, and the need for attention to the quaestio or speech situation.

\(^2\)Perhaps analogous to Hellenistic missionary propaganda, which used rhetorical techniques, but followed the presentation of the main argument with ethical exhortation. See Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 10-11.

\(^3\)Clark, *Rhetoric*, p. 210, refers to the oratorical procedure of showing that the case under consideration comes as a minor premise under a large generalization or major premise: all temple robbers should be prosecuted; this man has robbed a temple. Quintillian Oratoria 5. 13. 17 (LCL, 2:321) states that it is sometimes an orator's duty to make it appear that an opponent's argument is really favorable to his own client.
nature of the whole of Galatians.

This becomes particularly applicable when the *refutatio* takes on a paraenetic function, because this subtlety is a characteristic of paraenesis too: it is both traditional and contextual. An examination of the forms used in Pauline paraenesis\(^1\) makes it clear that there is a heavy drawing on traditions.\(^2\) To this extent the problems enumerated may not be the problems of the community.\(^3\) Yet on the other hand, Paul argues by adapting traditional material in a particular way.\(^4\) There is always a contextuality and concreteness in his ethic growing out of his apostolic concern.\(^5\) Thus the

---

\(^1\) Doty, *Letters*, pp. 37, 57-58, refers particularly to virtue and vice lists and "rules for the household." It is the use of these forms which led Dibelius to his definition of paraenesis, above, p. 73, with its stress on tradition.

\(^2\) Furnish, *Ethics*, pp. 71-72, notes that Paul "does not seek to distinguish between the content of his ethical advice and (his readers'), but supports his own exhortations by relating them to what, on other grounds, his readers are already willing to acknowledge." This is especially apparent in Galatians, where, Paul says, the "works of the flesh" are ϕαραδεδεσωνατο. He sees Christian tradition in Paul's exhortations in 1 Cor 7:10-40, 14:37, 1 Thess 4:15 (dominical traditions), 1 Cor 11:23 (liturgical traditions), 1 Cor 15:3-11 (παραδεδομενα, παραδεδεσωνατο), Phil 2, Rom 1:3-4, 1 Cor 11:2 (customs in the churches), etc.

\(^3\) Doty, *Letters*, p. 57; Rigaux, *Letters*, p. 197. To this extent, Dibelius is correct.

\(^4\) Doty, *Letters*, p. 38; Furnish, *Ethics*, p. 84. It is the subtle modification of vice-lists etc., that is the genius of Paul's ethic.

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 84. Paul was not a wandering street preacher but an apostle, and his ethics reflect this
paraenesis is dialogical; and the task becomes that of determining both tradition and contextuality\(^1\)--the place where Paul is echoing his readers' sentiment, and the place where he has turned that sentiment firmly against them. In these terms, too, the *refutatio* is the destruction of the opponents' case, denying an ethos attributable to their theology in terms of norms to which the opponents must agree. Here Paul will be claiming that the debate has been won, demanding compensation--on the opponents' own grounds.

**Galatians as a Dialogical Response to Opponents**

The genre of apologetic speech tells something about the overall structure of the letter to the Galatians. It suggests the sense in which it is a dialogical response to opponents. Every speech or letter is in function. There is a contextuality and concrete relevance to his ethics. He does not leave the identification of "good" and "evil" deeds to the congregations' imaginations. In Galatians, for example, Paul "describes concretely" how the exhortation to love is fulfilled. To this extent, Dibelius was wrong.

\(^1\)Funk also questions Dibelius' assumption about the general rather than specific nature of Paul's paraenesis, noting that use by Paul of traditional material does not mean he no longer has a specific situation in mind. Paul's customary method of argument is to adapt traditional material in a particular way. To resolve the question, it is necessary to consider (1) the way in which paraenesis is set in the letter as a whole; (2) the way the traditional material has been framed in the context; and (3) Paul's disposition to traditional language. See *Language*, pp. 270-71.
a sense a dialogue, but genre-analysis here gives some external criteria (which are at the same time internal criteria) for deciding what form the dialogue takes, dialogical to what extent, and dialogical with whom. The "apologetic speech" genre suggests that Galatians is dialogical throughout; it is a dialogue with opponents who are intruders; but it is a dialogue especially with the Galatians who have accepted the theology of the intruders.

In indicating something of overall structure, the genre also indicates something about the intruders' theology. At this preliminary stage, it is suggested that this theology has an interest in both δικαιοσύνη and νόμος. It expresses itself in certain language, such as σάρξ, πνεῦμα, δύναμις, ζωή, ἔλευθερία, et cetera. It must have some interest in the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and in calendrical observance, while the climax of the works-program of which these are a part is circumcision. And it leads to a particular practice, which Paul claims his gospel refutes.

Because of the form-tradition or genre-tradition to which rhetoric belongs, it will not tell something of the Sitz im Leben of the opponents or their theology. Rhetoric is simply a vehicle for a content which can stand in its own right. It is not incongruous to a

---

1Bultmann, Stil, p. 30, and Quintillian and Cicero, quoted above, p. 82.

2See Beardslee referred to above, p. 89.
Diaspora opponent, but neither is it incongruous to a Palestinian opponent. Rhetoric, and even the "Socratic tradition," was deeply imbedded in Palestinian literature. But the genre suggests that Galatians is a carefully-written piece in which all the strands of the argument are in some way being woven together. It provides an overall frame for an analysis of the structure of the argument.

1See above, p. 97, on the place of rhetoric in Palestine; and the place of the Socratic tradition in Palestinian Jewish literature, below pp. 238-41.
CHAPTER FOUR

INTERNAL INDICATIONS OF STRUCTURE

This chapter will examine various indicators of smaller scale (transitional devices, sayings formulae, inclusions, word-patterns, mots crochets, etc.), partly to illumine more fully the parts of the letter and their relationship to each other and partly to confirm the above structural suggestions based on genre-analysis.¹ The various themes and antitheses that run through the letter will also be examined in terms of their contribution to the structure of the argument.²

Others have elaborated on the methods to be used here. Epistolary practice is of help in 1:1-4 and 6:11-18.³ The studies of John L. White and J. T. Sanders on Pauline transitional phrases are useful.⁴ James A.

¹In accordance with the definition of and procedure for literary criticism suggested by Wilder, above, p. 66.

²Building on the suggestion of Bultmann above, p. 83, that Paul's writings are influenced by diatribe, an important element of which is the antithesis. See also Kennedy, quoted above, p. 80.

³The epistolary features of Galatians are almost all confined to these passages: and because of this, they are profitably analyzed in terms of epistolary practice. See above, p. 105.
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Fischer and others have shown the importance of "mots crochets," words used a significant number of times and in significant places.¹ Bultmann points to Paul's use of catchwords as part of his diatribe style,² and to the way he organizes passages around antitheses.³

There will be a detailed exegesis only where it is essential to the present purposes; and it will not be possible to assess fully the dialogical nature of Paul's argument until possible sources have been examined in detail. The attempt will be made here to work from the outside to the center of the letter.⁴ The examination of genre has suggested that the central argument is in the central chapters, but these are integrally related to what precedes and follows. It may be that the precise


²Bultmann, Stil, pp. 97-98. For instance, 1 Cor 7:19-22 is organized around the word ἡλίαος. See also the work of Ellis referred to above, p.

³Bultmann, Stil, pp. 74-75. See also Ernst Käsemann, An die Römer, HNT 8a (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1974), pp. 131-33; and Egon Brandenburger, Fleisch und Geist (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), pp. 45-49, on the antithesis of ὁσπὶ and ἀνεμοί in Galatians.

⁴Following to a limited extent the procedure of John Bligh, Galatians (London: St. Paul Publications, 1969), who assumes that the letter is a large chiasm. Betz, "Composition," p. 353, seems correct when he remarks that the "commentary genre is at present not the most creative format within which to work," that is, a simple verse-by-verse treatment of a document quickly loses touch with its vital dynamics. Sanders, Paul, pp. 12-23, also writes of the necessity of a "holistic" method.
form in which the central argument is to be understood will become more apparent if it is approached through the ways Paul is developing and concluding it.

The Prescript

There is a close relationship, in Paul's letters, between particular modifications in the prescript and the following subjects dealt with in the letter. Thus the contents of Gal 1:1-5, and the particular ways Paul has shaped this material, will indicate in a significant way the central theological issues of the letter.

Apostleship

A comparison with 1 Cor 15:4 suggests that Paul has opened Galatians with a piece of Christian tradition, which makes his own modification of this tradition in Gal 1:1 more striking: ἀπόστολος, οὐκ ἀπʼ ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ διʼ ἀνθρώπου. . . . Paul typically opens his letters

1See the references above, p. 72, to Rigaux, Schurbert, etc. Note, for example, how Romans expands Rom 1:2-6, and 1 Corinthians expands 1 Cor 1:2.

2Paul here uses a typical epistolary salutation (sender, addressee, greeting: see p. 73 above) and material that is apparently traditional (ἀπόστολος, θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 1:1; χάρις . . . καὶ εἰρήνη; κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ δίκτυος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτίων ἡμῶν, 1:3-4; καὶ δόξα, 1:5: Mussner, Galater, pp. 36, 43). The significant thing is the way Paul adapts these conventions and this material.

3Compare the phrase θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 1:1, with ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, 1 Cor 15:4, which is called a piece of παράδοσις (1:3).
with a reference to his apostleship, but never with such polemical force. Apostleship is an issue in Galatians only because the authority of the office is seen to guarantee the truth of the gospel. In 1:6-8 the Galatians have turned to another gospel; in 4:12-20, 5:2-12 they have turned to other apostles. Throughout the epistle, Paul's mention of himself is rigorously subordinated to the purpose of the letter, the defense of the gospel.

It is clear from Galatians 1 and 2 that Paul defends his relationship to the circle of the Jerusalem apostles. To pit Paul against the Jerusalem Pillars is to misunderstand the complexity of the charge of the opponents: not only that Paul was taught his gospel from men (1:11, 12) but that he is denying authentic

1 Cor 1:1, Rom 1:1, Phil 1:1.

2 See above, pp. 107-8, on the importance of έν αγγέλῳ in the causa. Stählin, "Galaterbrief," p. 1188, notes that in 1:1 Paul says he is not a "man's apostle;" in 1:11 he says his gospel is not a "man's gospel." In Galatians, "the source of the apostolate automatically passes judgment on what is taught." See Schmithals, Paul, pp. 19-26.

3 Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 64. He notes that the letter both begins (1:1-5) and ends (6:11-18) with two main themes in juxtaposition--Paul's apostolicity and the validity of his gospel.

4 Georgi, Kollekte, pp. 35-38. Wherever possible, Paul stresses agreement between himself and the other apostles (2:2, 6), and his gospel is testable by the Jerusalem gospel (2:2).
Jerusalem tradition.⁴ If an apostleship must come by ἀποκάλυψις (1:12), then the opponents reject the teachings of the Jerusalem apostles too.² The opponents' charge that Paul taught a gospel he got from other men would have no force if his gospel was different from that of the apostles.³

The importance of ἀποκάλυψις in the opponents' scheme (evident from Paul's stress on it here in the prescript) does not, however, lessen their interest in παράδοσις, but may even enhance it.⁴ Any connection between the intruders and later Gnostics would also

¹The place of tradition in the opponents' scheme will be considered directly below.

²Schmithals, Paul, pp. 19-26, notes particularly the different understanding of the relation between apostleship and authoritative doctrine held by the opponents and the Jerusalem church.

³See above, p. 110 on the complexity of the charge against both Paul's apostleship and his gospel.

⁴A final conclusion must wait until the nature of the revelation-tradition in the Galatian context has been more fully examined: see below, pp. 203-41. At this stage, it can be said that, in circles with strong doctrines of "vertical" revelation and inspiration, there was also a strong cherishing of traditions of succession. So, Hengel, Judaism, 1:136. Drane, Paul, p. 13, has stressed that Paul strives for agreement between his gospel and that of the Pillars, which itself indicates something of the way Paul understands ἀποκάλυψις and its relation to παράδοσις. There need be no contradiction between Gal 1:11-12 and 1 Cor 15:1-4. Both use technical language for receiving and transmitting tradition, παράδοσις and παράδοσις, but one stresses the fixed form of tradition, and the other its dynamic character. See Sanders, "Autobiographical Statements," pp. 335-43; Delling, "λαμβάνω," TDNT, 4:13-14; Duncan, Galatians, pp. 48-49, 39.
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suggest an enthusiasm for tradition.¹ The connections between apostleship and gospel that the opponents have promoted is to enhance their own traditions, not to eliminate tradition from the argument.² No doubt they have their own version of Paul's apostolic curse (1:8, 9), as not only Paul's gospel but Paul himself has been repudiated by the Galatian community.³ This indicates that they have a strong sense of missionary calling and teaching office—and have rejected Paul in both senses.

These conclusions about the opponents' missionary calling and teaching office have consequences for the unity of the letter. Given the authoritative nature of the intruders, their pride in authentic tradition, and their rejection of any other gospel than their own, it is

¹Also to be examined more carefully below, pp. 210-17.

²The opponents obviously have their own traditions, such as scripture and its interpretation, traditions of Abraham, Moses, law, Jerusalem, etc.: see below, pp. 210, 371. Paul is being charged with denying the authentic Jerusalem tradition, 2:11-14, 4:26; and the Galatians are by no means open to a free interchange of ideas, however directly they have come from heaven. They have called Paul a heretic and turned the Galatians away from him and his gospel (1:10, 4:12-20).

³See the texts immediately above, and the significance in rhetorical terms of the passage περὶ φίλας, 4:12-20, above, p. 114. The Galatians' treatment of Paul is part of the whole argument about the two gospels that is introduced in 1:6-10. This passage, and the communities' treatment of Paul, combines with other factors to suggest that the opponents themselves make apostolic claims: see below, pp. 204-5.
extremely unlikely that the Galatians, under their administration as community apostles,\(^1\) have spontaneously taken up some religious practices of their own.\(^2\) If the opponents label Paul a heretic, they would be very quick to condemn any other forms of syncretism (as they regard Paul's gospel),\(^3\) especially if they are as Pharisaic as the Judaisers of Acts 15. Gal 4:8-9 is a thoroughly Jewish criticism of Pagan religion.\(^4\) If the practices here belong to Pagan religion and not to the Judaisers' propaganda,\(^5\) the opponents become very poor propagandists and community apostles. They would probably be as critical of this behavior as Paul. The very stress here on the relationship between apostolicity and doctrine, and the importance of the issue of apostleship, suggest strongly that the whole letter is directed against problems that can all be related to the one intruding theology.

\(^1\)See above on the passage περὶ φιλίας and its implications: the opponents have taken over the community and have not just brought in new teachings. On community apostles, see Georgi, Gegner, pp. 41-42.

\(^2\)That is, service of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, days, months, etc., Gal 4:8-11: see Jewett and Hawkins, above pp. 29-32.

\(^3\)For instance, Gal 2:17. See below, p. 272, on the opponents' charge against Paul of inconsistency: they say he rejects law but preaches circumcision.


\(^5\)As claimed by Jewett and Hawkins: see above, pp. 29-32, 58-63.
Deliverance from the Present Evil Age

In Gal 1:4 there is a further significant modification of Christian tradition: ¹ διώκεται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ. The Christ-event is interpreted in such a way that Jesus is made the eschatological freer of mankind.² Paul refers to this Christ-event in the same way at the end of the letter: ὥσπερ οὖν ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταθεὶ τὰ γὰρ κόσμω (6:14). In Paul's letters, κόσμος and αἰών are common equivalents,³ as they are in Jewish apocalyptic.⁴ Just as the present aion can be represented as a powerful dominion of sin and evil that grasps men and rules over them,⁵ the present kosmos is the domain of superhuman powers, including angels, which rule in connection with the sin of men.⁶ Paul

---

¹ See above, p. 124.

² Mussner, Galater, p. 51.

³ For instance, σοφία οὗ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου (1 Cor 2:6), compared with σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου (1 Cor 3:19); see also 1 Cor 5:10, 7:31, and Eph 2:2; and Sasse, "αἰῶν," TDNT, 1:203-5.

⁴ See 2 Enoch 66:6, 7, 43:3, 65:8, 61:2, etc. Sasse, ibid., p. 206, gives further examples from 2 Baruch, and also 4 Ezra, where saeculum, mundus, and tempus are all equivalents.

⁵ See, for instance, Eph 2:2; κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου, κατὰ τὸν άρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἄρχου.

⁶ See 2 Cor 4:4 ὁ δὲ διὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου, compared to 1 Cor 2:6 οἱ ἀρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου; Sasse, "κόσμω," TDNT, 3:892. An expression that stands very close to this Pauline tradition is Col 2:20, εἰ ἀπεδάνετε σὺν χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τῇ ὁς ἄφαντος ἐν κόσμῳ δογματιζότως; see Eduard Lohse, Colossians and Philemon, trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J.
apparently asserts, in Gal 1:4, that through Christ's death on the cross he is free from the authority of these powers. Where he goes on to speak of the Christ-event in terms of justification, the opening and closing of the letter place the debate in an apocalyptic-cosmological frame. This must be the basis for Paul's Christological answer to the opponents; and the apocalyptic language in which he couches it must be significant to them.

The Christological language of Gal 1:4 is eschatological language as well, and the phrase του αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ strongly suggests the eschatological scheme of the two ages as it appears in the New Testament and Jewish apocalyptic literature. Thus


1 Mussner, Galatians, p. 51.


3 Mark 10:30, Luke 16:8, 20:34, Mark 3:29, Matt 12:32; in Paul, Rom 12:2, 1 Cor 1:20, 2:6, 8, 3:18, 2 Cor 4:4. See also 1 Enoch 48:7, 71:15, 2 Enoch 66:6, 7, 43:3 (Sasse, "αἰών," TDNT, 1:203-5, and Sasse, "κόσμων," TDNT, 3:883). In apocalyptic literature, cosmology and eschatology are intimately related. Categories of time and space cross each other: this age is the abode of sin, etc. (2 Enoch 66:6, 4 Exra 4:11, 1 Enoch 48:7), and the new age will bring a new κόσμος. Compare Rom 8:28-32. "Normative" Judaism had a much more positive view of the cosmos.
Paul's modification of tradition here stresses the presence of eschatological deliverance in Christ. Eschatology apparently plays an essential part in Paul's argument. The central issue of the letter, διακοσμοῦν, is to be understood as deliverance from the enslaving powers of the cosmos. In these verses it is placed on a Christological and eschatological basis; it conforms to the "shape" of the eschatological Christ-event. When Paul rebukes the Galatians for returning to subjection to these eschatological powers (4:8-11), this must be the same polemic against the intruding theology.

The polemical thrust of 1:4, and of eschatological restatement throughout the book (4:4-5, 5:24, 6:13-14), suggests clearly that the opponents hold something much less than a realized eschatology. For them, the deliverance from the present age has not yet come, and cannot come without obedience to the covenant and the

1So, 3:1-5 continues the argument of justification in 2:16-21, but now in eschatological terms, that is, in terms of the reception of the Spirit. "This gift of the Spirit has a cosmical significance, for it shows that men are not entirely under the sway of the powers of this world, but may be brought into living contact with God Himself," Duncan, Galatians, p. xliii. See also Brandenburger, Fleisch, p. 49, on the eschatological significance of the reception of the Spirit at baptism. Further, at the heart of the Probatio, the proof of 2:16-21, is the crucial eschatological statement of 4:4, 5, διε δὲ ἔλευν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπεστειλέν ὁ θεὸς τὸν μὴν αὐτοῦ ... ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμου ἐξαγοράσῃ ... Koester, Trajectories, p. 146.

2Paul here claims that, in Christ, the eschatological reservation typical of two-way schemes in Jewish apocalyptic has been dissolved. See below, pp. 354-59.
Torah. It is Paul who would appear to border on eschatological enthusiasm. From a comparison of parallel passages in the New Testament and similar traditions in later Christian literature, both orthodox and heterodox, Gal 3:27-29 is a bold interpretation of baptism which would be far too explosive in an eschatologically enthusiastic setting and can only mean that the opponents (and the Galatians, for that matter) have a far less than realized eschatology. They have a great interest in angels, but are still concerned, through the cosmic significance of the law, to reach the angelic state at some future time. It is Paul who is the enthusiast.

The Will of God

Here in the prescript, Paul emphatically states

1They apparently make Christ a teacher of the covenant, somewhat like the Teacher of Righteousness in the Damascus Document: below, pp. 428-29, on the place the opponents give to Jesus in the succession of Israel's teachers of the law.


3For instance, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Gospel of Thomas, 2 Clement, and the Gospel of Philip. See below, pp. 347-48.

4It would seem to be a similar interpretation of baptism that Paul encounters in Romans 6 and especially the enthusiastic context of 1 Corinthians 11. See below, pp. 362-64.


6On circumcision in the opponents' theology, and its connection with their interest in angels, see below, pp. 322-39.
that the deliverance effected in Christ was according to the will of God. This, too, is an important premise for his following argument. He says that there can be no other gospel than his gospel (1:8-9), that his calling to apostleship was according to the will of God (1:15-16), and that his gospel does not deny the grace of God—implying that it is actually those who try to maintain the possibility of both faith in Christ and righteousness by works of law who resist the will of God. He maintains that the law cannot annul the will of God as revealed in His promise to Abraham (3:15-17). He seems to be constantly attempting to refute the charge that he has introduced an inconsistency into saving history. Apparently the opponents stress the consistency of any new revelation or saving act of God with all past revelations and saving acts.1

Schoeps builds much on the tradition that "the law ceases when the Messianic kingdom begins."2 However, 

---

1As was done, for example, by the Qumran community: 1 QS 5:1, 9:14, 1 QH 1:15, 10:22, 16:16. It was commonly held by all of Judaism that the law, given on Sinai, existed from all eternity and was to exist to all eternity: Strack-Billerbeck, l:244-45; George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Christian Centuries of the Christian Era, 2 vols. (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), l:263-66.

2Schoeps, Paul, p. 171, referring to the scheme of Sanh. 979, Ab. Zara 9a, and Jer. Meg. 70d, of 2,000 years of Tohuwabohu, 2,000 years of Mosaic law, and 2,000 years of the era of the Messiah. He claims that this is partly the basis of Paul's theology of law. He depends heavily on Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 188-90, and the assumption that apocalyptic had no place for the law in
W. D. Davies and others have rightly questioned whether this tradition, or this interpretation of it, ever existed in pre-Christian times. The tradition to which Schoeps refers was perhaps related to discussions about the applicability of Torah to the Messianic age, and may even be relevant to the debate in Galatians, because of Paul's unique scheme in Galatians 3 of Abraham-Moses-Christ and the unique expression "the law of Christ." But it does not seem to have been understood as meaning that law would cease to exist in the Messianic age.

the Messianic era, because of the supramundane nature of the Messianic kingdom.


3But Paul's polemical intent makes the scheme mean for him the opposite to its meaning for the opponents. Nor do the opponents mean, if the scheme is a dialogical answer to one of theirs, that there was no law in the era of Abraham (see below on Abraham as the perfect example of one who kept the law, pp. 248-50), or that Jesus has brought an end to the law.

4Gal 6:2. On the Jewish law-traditions that the expression suggests, see below, pp. 223-24, and the place the opponents give to Jesus among the great law-teachers of Israel.

5This is the conclusion of Jervell, "Tora," pp. 106-8. God through the Messiah will give a new law in the sense that both the torah and Israel will be perfectly renewed, and the new age will be one in which the
Apocalyptic was as interested in the fulfillment of the Torah as the rabbis,¹ the Damascus Document looks for a Messianic Teacher of Righteousness who will lead Israel to keep the law more perfectly than ever before,² and Hellenistic Judaism also expected that, in the coming time of salvation, the heathen would finally submit to the law of God.³

The opponents apparently have similar notions. They have accepted Jesus and have given Him some saving significance.⁴ But for them, Abraham, the law, and Christ must be harmonized: Jesus has come especially to renew the Mosaic covenant.⁵ This explains why Paul must

---


² See CD 1:11, 6:11, etc., and Fitzmyer, in Solomon Schechter, Documents of Jewish Sectaries, prolegomenon by Joseph A. Fitzmyer (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1970), p. xii; Davies, Sermon, pp. 147-48, concludes that the expression "new covenant" does not mean an annullment of the old covenant, and the aim of the sect is to return to Moses (CD 3:13, 19, 15:8-10).

³ Philo, Vit Mos 2. 43-44, Sib Or 3:719, 757.

⁴ See above, pp. 93-94, on the causa (1:6-10) and the prominence of οὕτως γέλων. The opponents are gospel-preachers.

⁵ Marie Joseph Lagrange, Saint Paul; Epître aux Galates (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1950), p. xxxi; Koester, Trajectories, p. 146. It is for this reason that Schoeps must be wrong. The opponents accept Jesus, probably as messianic in some sense; but they see his coming as
fight so hard (in 3:15-17) to draw the line of God's salvific will directly from Abraham to Christ.¹

In this apocalyptic stream that is looking for a new authentication of the covenant will of God by a Messianic figure (such as in the Damascus Document), there was much criticism of Jerusalem Pharisaism—just as the opponents evidently stand in criticism of "orthodox" Jerusalem Christianity,² and Paul can criticise the authenticating law, not eradicating it. See especially the portrayal of the Teacher of Righteousness in Qp Hab 1:1-2:10, 6:12-8:3, CD 6:11, who teaches how to live by the law and the covenant. In Wisd 2:12-20, 5:1-7 he is opposed to wicked men who do not recognize the covenant. This teacher is an apocalyptic figure, arising at the end of the days. See J. A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 92; and Fitzmyer, in Sectaries, pp. xii-xv.

¹Schoeps, and Schweitzer, must be wrong further, in that Paul himself does not argue that the coming of the Messiah brings the cessation of the law. This misunderstands the whole endeavor, on the part of both Paul and the opponents, to maintain consistency in the revealed will of God. Both claim that what now obtains in Christ is perfectly consistent with the period of law: and Paul asserts that he is consistent because the period of law was a period of bondage and condemnation (which has no counterpart in Jewish literature, Sanders, Paul, p. 479). For Paul, the new, Messianic era is not a radical break in salvation-history, but is perfectly consistent with it, because the promise passes from Abraham to Christ. The law falls out of salvation-history because if one could be righteous by the law, Christ need not have died (2:21). This is vastly different from saying the Messiah has come, and the previous salvific order is now done away with. See Sanders, Paul, pp. 483-84.

²On the criticism of Jerusalem Christianity by the opponents, see above, p. 96. And on the criticism of "normative" Judaism in the Damascus Document, see Fitzmyer, in Sectaries, p. xv. Apocalyptic reform teachings are taken up into Christianity in the Testament of
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opponents from a Pharisaic point of view. In this debate, Paul never caves in nor denies his Pharisaic heritage. His gospel at no point anulls the will of God, and he alone is the one who is true to the real heroes of Israel's past, maintaining the consistency of saving history.

Slavery and Freedom

As antithesis is an important key to Paul's meaning, the announcement of deliverance in 1:4, becoming the "keynote of the epistle," is particularly significant.

This antithesis runs through the whole epistle. There is ἔλευθερος in Christ, while the goal of the opponents is bondage (καταδολοῦν, 2:4). The ἔλευθερος that Paul preserves is the ἀληθεία τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (2:5).

the Twelve Patriarchs, so that Jesus Himself becomes the renewer of the law, in the context of the general apostasy of Judaism.

15:3 and the charge that they do not keep the law. See below, p. 142.

2Schrenk, "δικαιος," TDNT, 2:190. Paul has not abandoned the definition of the righteous man as the one who fulfills the law (Gal 5:14), but only in Christian freedom from the law can he conduct himself according to the divine norm.

3See above, pp. 83-84, on Bultmann and diatribe style.

4Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 73, notes that ἔλευθερον, "to deliver," and cognates, strikes the keynote of the epistle. The gospel is a rescue, an emancipation from a state of bondage (4:9, 31; 5:1, 13). In
Under the dispensation of law, ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρομένα (3:23). The law is a παιδαγωγὸς (3:24), and the end of its jailorship is not just freedom but justification (ἐνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν, 3:24). He calls the period under the ἐπιτροποὶ καὶ οἰκονόμοι (4:2), that is, the period ὑπὸ νόμον (4:5), a period of slavery to the στοιχεῖα του κόσμου, from which Christ, at the exact time, brought freedom (ἐνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἔξαγοράσθη, 4:5). But now the Galatians are turning again to bondage under the same powers (οἵς πάλιν ἀνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε, 4:9). The final pericope of the probatio contrasts the children of παιδισθή and ἐλευθερία (4:21-31). Paul begins the next section by reminding the Galatians of their call from δουλεία to ἐλευθερία (5:1), reiterated in 5:13. Here it is the basis of the imperative. 1 Thus the antithesis again brings together cosmology and eschatology, and law, faith, and justification.

In Romans, freedom is always in relation to some particular object; 2 but in Galatians the object is free-

1Mussner, Galater, p. 543. 5:1 lays the basis for the argument of 5:2-10, and 5:13 for the argument that follows. But see how the indicative/imperative structure holds the two together. See above, pp. 116-17.

2That is, freedom from sin (6:18, 22, 8:2, 21); freedom with respect to righteousness (6:20); free from the law (7:3). See Brandenburger, Fleisch und Geist, p. 55.
Typically for Paul, the powers which grasp man in this age are law, sin, and death. But in Galatians man's problem as διώκτησις quickly becomes man's problem as bondage, and διώκτησις is used surprisingly infrequently.

Even less is man's problem death. The only death referred to is Christ's death, and man's death with Christ. Whereas, in Romans 5 and 7, law produces sin and death, in Gal 3:23-4:11 law comes bringing bondage. Whereas, elsewhere, the gospel is the way to life, in Galatians it is especially the way to freedom.

"Justification" in this letter must be interpreted in this context of freedom, which is also a cosmological/eschatological context. Justification is evidently being defined as freedom from the enslaving powers of the present evil aeon. The opposing assertion must be

1Mussner, Galater, p. 342, calls this a "dativ des Zieles," where freedom is the final goal of all redemption.

2Rom 5:20-21, and 1 Cor 15:56. In Galatians there is an absence of the antitheses of law-sin-flesh/Christ-grace-Spirit of Romans (Rom 5-6). See Brandenburg, Fleisch und Geist, p. 55; Käsemann, Römer, p. 131; and Schlier, "ελευθερος," TDNT, 2:496-97.

3See the progression in 3:22-23: Scripture consigned all things to sin ... we were confined under the law, kept under restraint.

4Even in 3:10-14, the stress does not fall on the inability of man in sin to meet the law's obligations. That suggestion is there (3:10), but the stress comes to fall on the polemical use of Hab 2:4--the law cannot justify, because justification is by faith. This is a
that Christ has **not** brought such freedom from the enslaving powers; that is left for the believer yet to work out, with the aid of the law.

The Postscript

The postscript is both epistolary, written in Paul's hand, his own personal summary and apostolic pronouncement, and rhetorical, functioning as a **conclusio**, summarising the letter and pointing to the main themes.\(^1\) In both senses it will have much significance for the argument of the letter.

The **Refutatio**, 6:12-13\(^2\)

Paul immediately takes up the question of circumcision, \(οὗτοι ἄναγκαζον τοὺς ἡμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι\) (6:12). It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the opponents teach the necessity of circumcision for salvation.\(^3\) It very different use of Hab 2:4 from that in Rom 1:17. See Sanders, *Paul*, p. 483.

\(^1\)See Betz, "Composition," p. 359. Gal 6:11-18 is fully integrated with the rest of the letter. Jewett, "Intruders," p. 200, suggests that the opponents' aims will appear here most clearly.

\(^2\)A conclusio was often divided into parts (see above, p. 93); and Gal 6:11-17 seems in fact to divide into these parts, though in a different order (pp. 104-5.

\(^3\)See Stählin *Galater*, p. 1188; and against Drane, *Paul*, pp. 16 etc., who minimises the place of circumcision in the Galatians' program because it appears most clearly in 5:2-6:10. He has misunderstood the literary function of the various passages. Mussner, *Galater*, p. 346, notes that Paul refers to circumcision not as an individual act but as an institution, that is, as a part of the program of the offending theology.
is clearly a vital issue, as can be seen from its place in the narratio (2:3), the refutatio (5:3-6), and the conclusio. This speaks against other explanations of its place in the debate which make it something less than a salvific necessity. These last are not able to explain the absoluteness of 5:3-4, Paul's utter despair over the Galatians, and his fierce and uncompromising assertion of the inviolability of the gospel.

But this raises another problem: how to explain the Galatians' sudden enthusiasm for the rite, where it becomes the equivalent of justification by law (μαρτυρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτευμολόγω διὰ φυλέτης ἐστιν δολον τὸν νόμον ποιήσαι. κατηγορήσετε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ οἰκίσκες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοσύνης [5:3-4]), and brings to a conclusion the debate begun in 1:6-10 and 2:16-21 (justification by faith rather than by works of law). See above, pp. 102, 116 on Paul's appeal for a decision in 5:10, probably coming after his most powerful argument in the case.

1Where it becomes the equivalent of justification by law (μαρτυρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτευμολόγω διὰ φυλέτης ἐστιν δολον τὸν νόμον ποιήσαι. κατηγορήσετε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ οἰκίσκες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοσύνης [5:3-4]), and brings to a conclusion the debate begun in 1:6-10 and 2:16-21 (justification by faith rather than by works of law). See above, pp. 102, 116 on Paul's appeal for a decision in 5:10, probably coming after his most powerful argument in the case.

2See especially Jewett, "Intruders," p. 198, who says the intruders introduced it for expediency; and Betz, "Geist," pp. 78-80, who says they introduced it to check a problem of "the flesh." See also the Review of Literature.

3See below, p. 322, on the striking contrast between Gal 5:2-5 and 1 Cor 7:19 (almost identical in many ways), where circumcision is one of the ἀδιάφορα; and between Gal 4:10-11 and Rom 14:5-6, where Paul takes the side of the weaker (probably Jewish-Christian) brother. In the latter he says, Observe whatever day you like: here he says, You observe days . . . I've labored over you in vain!

4Mussner, Galater, p. 348, concludes, "Die ganzen theologischen Darlegung des Apostels in Gal. hatten keinen rechten Ruckhalt in der konkreten Situation in Galatien, wenn dort von den Gegnern nicht die Heilsnotwendigkeit der gesetzlichen Lebens, wozu die Beschneidung wesentlich gehört, gelehrt worden wäre."
when history and archaeology provide so few examples of acceptance of circumcision by Gentiles.¹

Then Paul asserts not only that the opponents have failed to explain to the Galatians the full implications of Jewish law (5:3), but that they do not keep the law themselves. It is unlikely that, in perverting the gospel, they "were in Paul's view rejecting God's will as revealed in Torah."² This equates law and gospel, whereas in Galatians Paul makes them antithetical.³ It does not take account of the concrete sense in which law keeping is an issue (2:14-15, and especially the term 'Ioudaioi, make it clear that it is a question of national and cultic laws, those laws which separate Jew from Gentile);⁴ and it brings in arguments that have not

¹Kuhn, "προσθήλυτος," TDNT, 6:730, notes that Josephus has really only one "success story" about the conversion of a Gentile to Judaism and the requirement of circumcision—the king Izates (Ant 20. 41-42). See below, pp. 334-36, on circumcision.

²Jewett, "Intruders," pp. 206-7. But when Paul speaks of breakers of law, he means those who transgress in concrete terms. For instance, see Romans 2 and 7, where the breaking of the law is concrete transgression, not, as Bultmann has asserted, the "Leistung" of law-keeping (Theology, 1:308-9). See the criticisms of Wilckens, Freiheit, pp. 78-80.

³See 3:15-29, and the treatment of this passage below, pp. 263-70, 276-77. In Galatians, Israel and the law are in no sense a praeparatio evangelica.

⁴This is the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament. On the basis of Josephus Ant 20. 139 (τά Ιουδαίων εσθη μεταλαβείν), Apion 2. 210 (ὑπὸ τοῦς αυτούς ἡμῖν νόμους ζῆν ὑπελεγεῖν), Ant 20. 38, Bell 2. 463, and Esther 8:17, K. G. Kuhn, "προσθήλυτος," TDNT, 6:732 defines it as "to live in strict accord with all
yet appeared already in the body of the discussion. This
contradicts the function of a conclusio. The expression
in 6:13 therefore is to be understood much more logically
in terms of the way only certain aspects of legal observ­
ance are brought in to elaborate what Paul means by
"works of law" (that is, circumcision, and ἡμέρας . . .
καὶ μήνας καὶ καίρος καὶ ἑνδαυτης, 4:10).1 The oppo­
nents are only partial observers of the national and
cultic inheritance of Judaism, and it is Paul who appears
to be the Pharisee in 5:2-5 and 6:13.2 He and the Juda­
isers of Acts 15 appear to be quite orthodox,3 whereas
the opponents of Galatians do not, if it is left to Paul

Jewish customs and commandments." Where law keeping is
in such literal terms, it steps outside the discussion
to speak of law breaking in some different sense. There
is no hint of this last in Galatians.

1This is not to say that by law Paul means only
the cultic law in Galatians. In chapters 3 and 4 he con­siders law as principle, and certainly takes in the law
of Sinai. See the discussion below, pp. 263-75. There
is a selectivity in the opponents' law keeping, and Paul
is pointing to a logical weakness in their program.

2Palestinian Judaism taught that the one who
wished to come over to Judaism had to accept circumcision
and submit to the law in its entirety. See Kuhn,
"προσήλυτος," TDNT, 6:739. Thus the Pharisees of Acts
15:5 appear orthodox: ἐξανέστησαν . . . τινὲς τῶν ἀπὸ
τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες, λέγοντες δὲτι
dεὶ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς παραγγέλειν τε τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον
Μωϋσεως.

3So, Mussner, Galater, p. 347, concludes that
there is a clear difference between the theology of Paul
and the Pharisaic Judaisers of Acts 15, on the one hand,
and the Galatian opponents on the other. It is not only
acceptance of Christ that has led Paul to call the oppo­
nents less than lawkeepers. The Judaisers of Acts 15
to state the connection between circumcision and the "whole law."

This is further evidence that the opponents at the same time see themselves as the true heirs of the covenant and keepers of the law; and yet they stand over against Pharisaic Judaism, having dispensed with some aspects of Jewish law.

The Recapitulatio, 6:14-16

Over against the opponents' teaching of circumcision, Paul stands the cross in both its cosmic (ὅτε οὖν ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταθώτατι) and personal (κἀγὼ κόσμῳ) significance.

As noted already, there is a parallel here to 1:4. In 6:14 the cross has brought an end to the dominion of κόσμος or αἰών. But this language now draws to a conclusion the central argument of the epistle, and echoes 2:19 in the distributio: ἐγὼ . . . διὰ νόμου ἀπεθάνων.1 Here Paul stresses that the Christ-event has for him brought about a complete end of the earlier

have also accepted Christ, but still insist on circumcision and the law.

1It will be argued below that 2:19-20 refer to baptism, in which the Christian comes to share in all that has been accomplished in the Christ-event. Throughout the letter, baptism is referred to in terms of crucifixion (2:19-20, 5:24 see below). Hence this last reference to crucifixion is also probably referring to baptism, and it is in this way that Paul brings his defense to a close. This emphasises the Christological/sacramental nature of his argument throughout.
relationship between himself and the powers of the cosmos. Again he stresses the "realised eschatology" in his gospel. The result is καὶ νησίς, life in a totally new dimension. This proclamation of a saving work of God in a radically new dimension is the summary answer, not to libertinism, but to the circumcision program (6:15). This not only points to the unity of the epistle and its argument: it shows the central place in the debate of Christology and eschatology--expressed in cosmological terms.

Paul here speaks of deliverance from the cosmos in terms of the cross. The eschatological newness of Christianity is usually expressed in terms of the cross.

---

1 There is a repetition here, with modification, of a formula which appears in 5:6, as well as 1 Cor 7:19. In 5:6 the formula is used in an unusually uncompromising way, compared to 1 Cor 7:19 and the larger issue in 1 Corinthians (and Romans) of the "weak." This emphasizes the opponent who is in view here. In 5:6 the formula is preceded by the formula ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, which localizes the sphere to which the anti-circumcision saying applies. Bultmann, Theology, 1:311, calls this an "ecclesiological formula," referring to "the state of having been articulated into the 'body of Christ' by baptism . . . ", and notes that it is also an eschatological formula, connected with both the new creation and the Spirit. These last two are also brought to pass in baptism. So, too, Eduard Lohse, Die Einheit des neuen Testaments (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973), pp. 238-41.

2 Ernst Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 73, writes that Paul's doctrine of justification, with the doctrine of the law that belongs to it, is ultimately his interpretation of Christology. See also Ridderbos, Paul, pp. 52-56, and Sanders, Paul, pp. 474-82, on the Christological character of Paul's eschatology.
resurrection of Christ:¹ but in Galatians there is only one brief mention of the resurrection, probably in traditional language (1:1), and attention rather is on Christ crucified.² The postscript is here drawing together a central issue in the Galatian controversy, the cross, which becomes a polemical doctrine against cross-less apostles who pay more attention to both κόσμος and νόμος. The cross expresses the full humanity of Jesus, the paradox of the saving act of God in the context of human weakness and suffering (4:4).

It is significant, too, how Paul links theology and experience in terms of this theme. The cross brings to an end the dominion of αἰών, νόμος, and κόσμος, but only for those who themselves experience the cross (2:19, 6:14). The οὐ κάνοναν τοῦ σταυροῦ (Gal 5:11) evidently refers to both theology and experience. Paul characterizes the opponents only in terms of καθαρσίας (6:13), but his life is characterized in terms of the cross (2:19-20). The human weakness and suffering of Christ comes to epitomize Christ's apostle—but not the opponents.


²In Gal 2:19 Paul says Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι. Christ lives in Paul, but it is the Christ who "gave Himself for me." In 3:1 he reminds the Galatians that, in his preaching, before their eyes Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προειρημένη ἐσταυρωμένος. But from this message someone ὦμας ἔβδομαν. In fact, the false gospel of circumcision katérγηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ (5:11). And in
It is in this context that the place of 4:12-20, the passage περὶ φιλίας, in the whole argument concerning justification, can be seen. Paul pleads with the Galatians, γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ (4:12)! Because they have turned to works of law, he cries, τέκνα μου, ὁδεῖς πάλιν ὡδίνῳ μέχρις ὧδε ὑμῶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν (4:19), referring no doubt to the crucified Christ. These two verses form a bracket to the passage. Here the apostle of the cross inserts in his rhetorical case for justification by faith a call for a personal return to the message and experience of the cross, as well as to the apostle of the cross. The Galatians have been deceived and drawn away by cross-less apostles (4:17). Paul notes that, previously, in his bodily weakness, he was received as an angel of God, as Christ Himself (4:13-14). But the new apostles, with their rejection of the cross, and their religion of νόμος and attention to the κόσμος, have brought a profound change to the attitude to "weak apostles." Evidently, in the new program, angels can have nothing to do with one who is physically weak and poor. A genuine apostle, who knows all the secrets of the cosmic powers, must be a perfect priestly specimen, the epitomy of Christ glorified, not Christ crucified.

* * *

the imperative the Galatians are reminded of the fact that οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἱησοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν (5:24).
The prescript and postscript together reveal the central concerns of Galatians, and the terms in which the central argument concerning law and grace is to be fully understood. In these sections of the letter several important stands are initiated and drawn together. The concern of apostleship stands at both the beginning and the end; and the apostle becomes the epitomy of the gospel he preaches, so that apostleship and gospel are inseparably bound up together. Cosmology is also crucial and reveals the way in which law, justification, slavery and freedom, et cetera, are to be understood. Eschatology, typically bound up with cosmology, is a central issue, and the "realized" eschatology of Paul's gospel, the present end of the old aiōn and the present participation in God's new creation, is an important part of the answer to the circumcising program. And the roots of the two opposing positions, the two assessments of cosmology, eschatology, apostleship, gospel, and experience, are in two opposing Christologies and two different assessments of the significance of the cross.

The Prooemium or Causa, 1:6-10

This passage states the issue without which there would be no debate—not only the intrusion of the opponents and their theology but also the Galatians' desertion (μεταταγέω) to the opponents. It is characteristic of rhetorical procedure to restate the causa in
various places throughout the defense. The concern here will be to determine whether this happens in Galatians; and, if it does, to determine from these restatements the precise nature of the causa.

In 2:14 Paul brings the narratio to a climax by returning to the central issue of the debate: εἰ σοῦ Ἰουδαιοὶ ὑπάρχων ἑθνικῶς καὶ οὐχ Ἰουδαικῶς ζῆσ, πῶς τὰ ἥθη ἀναγκάζεται Ἰουδαίες. The abandonment of 1:6-10 is here given particular form. The distributio restates the disagreement in other terms again: εἰ γὰρ κατέλυσα τοῦτο πάλιν ὀλιγοσεμώ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτῶν συνιστάνω (2:18). The ultimate transgression is a turning back, a Christian heresy. As the distributio puts the debate into new language in 2:19-20, δικαιοσύνη becomes equated with ζωή, confirming the suggestion in 1:6-10 that the Galatians' own experience is an essential part of the debate. Again, 3:1 takes up the causa of

1See Quintillian Oratoria 4. 1. 73 (LCL, 2:47: it is possible to give the force of the exordium to other parts of the speech, to continually remind the judge of what the chief issue is), and 3. 11. 26 (LCL, 1:353: there is need to continually keep attention on the subject "lest . . . we should let our weapons drop from our grasp"). See also 4. 1. 53, 72 (LCL, 2:35, 45).

2See above, p. 111, authorities cited on the way the narratio ends where the issue to be determined begins, so that 2:14 is in principle the issue in Galatians. So, Wilckens, Freiheit, p. 87, and Betz, "Composition," p. 361.

3On Ἰουδαίες, see above, p. 142.

4On the subtle change from ἀμαρτωλὸς in 2:17 to παραβάτης in 2:18, see below, p. 162.
Here again, the Galatians' own past experience is essential to the discussion of δικαιοσύνη, but instead of "How were you justified?" the question becomes τούτο μόνον θελώ μαθεῖν ἃφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; (3:2). This is probably a reference to the Galatians' baptism and its eschatological significance. But the shift from δικαιοσύνη in 2:21 to reception of the πνεῦμα in 3:2-3 to δικαιοσύνη in 3:6 shows that the two are in essence the same question. The debate in Galatians concerns the life of justification, how the beginning point of Christianity radically determines the rest of space-time existence—the life of sharing in the new creation of God.

---

1 See above, p. 113 on 3:1-5 as an interrogatio, an examination of the witnesses, so that the Galatians' past experience, and the language in which it is referred to (πνεῦμα and δόναμις), is essential to the case.

2 On the reception of the Spirit at baptism, see Acts 2:38 (where it has eschatological significance), 10:44-48 (where the order of the Spirit and baptism is reversed), and 11:17, 18, 19:1-7 (where the significance of the reception of the Spirit by the Gentiles for their admission to the church is indicated). See Bultmann, Theology, 1:311 on the Spirit conferred at baptism and its eschatological consequences; Oepke, "Βάπτισμα," TDNT, 1:529-45; Schrenk, "δίκαιος," TDNT, 2:206, on 1 Cor 6:11 and the synonymity of justification, baptism, and reception of the Spirit; and Brandenburger, Fleisch, p. 49, on Gal 3:27, 1 Cor 10:1-11, and 1 Cor 12:12, where baptism is connected with pneumatic existence.

3 This underlies the way δικαιοσύνη is an eschatological doctrine in Galatians.

4 So, Schrenk, "δίκαιος," TDNT, 2:205: "It is because this impartation determines the whole life of
The restatements of the *causa* so far make more precise the abandonment, the beginning one way and ending another way, of 1:6-10. This essential pattern appears again in 3:15 (διως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὖθε εἰς ἐπιστάσεσεται; there is no adding or subtracting after a covenant is ratified), and again in 4:9 (νῦν, ... γνώντες θεόν, μάλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄσθενη καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα). Following the line of the development of the argument, this is only a restatement of 1:6-10 and the turning from Paul's gospel to the false gospel.

The *refutatio* begins with a thrust at the same scheme of abandonment (5:2). The specific term of abandonment here is circumcision. So Paul continues, ἔτρεχετε καλῶς. τὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν [τῇ] ἁλθεὶς μὴ πελάθεσθαι; (5:7). And he makes another reference to the reason for the letter in 5:12, δεσδον καὶ ἀποκάτατοντες ὑμᾶς. Finally, 5:24 puts the double catalog of 5:19-23 into terms of beginning with the crucifixion of the flesh (οὶ ... τοῦ Χριστοῦ ... τὴν σάρκα ἐσταθώσαν) and ending by living in terms of the flesh (ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς ὃς μὴ τελέσητε).

Words such as abandonment (μετατιθέναι, 1:6)

"faith that one can speak of a state of justification." See also pp. 208-10 on Gal 3:2, compared to Rom 3:28, showing the equivalence of the reception of the Spirit and justification. In Romans, the believer is justified apart from works of law; in Galatians, he receives the Spirit apart from works of law.
and expressions such as beginning and ending (ἐναρχεῖσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν, 3:3), turning back (ἐπιστρέφειν, 4:9), building up what was torn down (καταλύειν and οἰκοδομεῖν, 2:18), ceasing to obey (μὴ πεἰθεῖν, 5:7), and crucifying the flesh and then fulfilling the desires of the flesh (ἤ σῶρες σταυροῦν and ἐπιθυμία σαρκὸς τελεῖν, 5:24, 16), on the part of the Galatians, and words such as to trouble (ταράσσειν, 1:17), bewitch (βασκαίνειν, 3:1), persuade (ἤ πείσομαι, 5:8) and unsettle (οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς, 5:12) on the part of the opponents, appear in every section of the letter, tying together the various items that these words and expressions refer to (εὐαγγέλιον, δικαίοσύνη, Ἰουδαία, σῶμα and πνεῦμα, νόμος, διαθήκη, στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, περιτέμνειν) into the one causa that lies behind the letter, the treacherous embracing by the Galatians of the opponents' theology. This tends to confirm the suggestion that 1:6-10 is a rhetorical causa. The Galatians are in an important sense the offending party, and the whole letter is written because of their espousal of an offending theology. It also confirms the suggested unity of the letter. There is no division into heresies of the intruders and heresies of the Galatians. The causa and its restatements are typically in the second person plural,¹ and there is never any suggestion

¹The second person plural is not used in 2:18, 3:15, and 5:24, but Paul is here arguing in general terms.
that they refer to only part of the Galatian congregation. The whole community is addressed in both chapters 1-4 and the ethical portion of the letter (5:1, 13, 16).\(^1\)

**The Propositio, 2:15-21**

There is here a substantiation of the claim that 2:15-21 sets forth the precise terms of agreement and disagreement in the whole debate; though it is the movement of the whole argument, from prescript to postscript, which indicates more precisely how these terms are to be understood.\(^2\)

The *narratio* is brought to a climax in 2:14. The issue in Galatia is apparently that some who are Jews by race are forcing Gentiles to live like Jews.\(^3\) The beginning of the *propositio*\(^4\) continues the debate in the same terms: ήμεῖς φόβου Ιουδαίου καὶ οὐκ εξ ἐθνῶν

---

\(^1\)This homogeneity of the Galatian churches compares strikingly with, for example, 1 Cor 1:10-17, 5:1, 2 (let him who has done this be removed, etc.), 7:10-12 (to the married--to the unmarried), 8:7-13 (weak and strong), etc.

\(^2\)Rather than defining the meaning of the terms here from Paul's other letters, especially Romans, and then interpreting the rest of the debate in Galatians by these defined terms, as done by Wilckens, Freiheit, Robert C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967), and others.

\(^3\)See above, p. 111. The *narratio* ends where the issue at hand is taken up.

\(^4\)See above, p. 111, on the change of tone in 2:15 which indicates the beginning of a new section.
\[\text{duapxcoXoC} (2:15)\]. The meaning of \text{duapxcoXoC} here is evidently national and cultic, not ethical. It refers to one who by race stands outside the Jewish covenant and all its provisions.\(^1\) The term \text{φόσει 'Ιουδαίοι} is probably applicable to the Galatian opponents themselves.\(^2\)

Chapter 2:16 introduces the issue of justification by faith in Christ without the works of the law, here a particularly polemical doctrine.\(^3\) Only the verb form \text{δικαίων} is used in this verse, where it has "declaratory force," referring to acceptance or acquittal that is undeserved.\(^4\)

It has been suggested that this verse states a

\(^1\)This is especially apparent from the use of \text{ίουδαίζεται} in 2:14. See above, p. 142. Rengstorf, "\text{δικαίων}," TDNT, 1:324, notes that Israel was conscious of being \text{δικαίος} on the basis of election, which made her essentially different from the Gentiles, who were equated simply with \text{δικαίων}. The same sense of \text{δικαίων} is used in 4 Ezra 3:26-36, 7:22-24 etc., where the wicked are those outside the covenant. The Qumran sectaries were also aware of themselves as the righteous elect (1QS 4:5, 1QpHab 7:10-12, etc.). See Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 96, who notes the strong sociological connotation in the word \text{δικαίων}. Hengel, Judaism, 1:73 illustrates the seriousness with which Judaism viewed any "attempt to do away with the result of five hundred years of Israelite and Jewish history," by adopting non-Jewish life and removing those marks which particularly distinguished Jews from non-Jews.

\(^2\)Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 113. Paul's opponents elsewhere were clearly of Jewish extraction (2 Cor 11:22). See Georgi, Gegner, pp. 51-52.


\(^4\)Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 172.
point of agreement between Paul and the opponents. But can the intruders really accept a justification \( \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \rho \gamma \omega \nu \nu \mu \omicron \upsilon \) ?

Several have noted the existence of a common formula in 2:16, which, from the way it is used here, is widely accepted among Jewish Christians. The verse begins with \( \varepsilon \delta \delta \tau \varepsilon \zeta \ldots \delta \tau \zeta \), a "Glaubenswissen" in Paul's letters, introducing a "dogmatic proposition as something commonly known." Paul substantiates the first part of the verse with a quotation from the Old Testament with his own significantly apocalyptic modification.

\[1\] See above, p. 111, on the analysis of 2:15-21 according to the rhetorical genre.

\[2\] Jürgen Becker, in Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Philipp, Kolosse, Thessalonicher und Philemon, von Jürgen Becker, Hans Conzelmann, und Gerhard Friedrich, NTD 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976), p. 29, notes that there is no disagreement at this point between Peter and Paul (pointing to the use of "we"). But as this dialogue is a "front" for the dialogue between Paul and the opponents (see above, p. 111), there is probably no disagreement between the latter here either. Both sides can use the formula. Becker's reasons for seeing a formula here are syntactical (the complicated structure of the sentence in 2:16) and comparative (the comparison with Rom 3:28 and perhaps with 3:25-26), as well as being based on the introductory formula used (see below). Others who see a formula here are Mussner, Galater, p. 168; Munck, Paul, p. 127; and Wilckens, Freiheit, p. 88.

\[3\] Munck, Paul, p. 126, referring to \( \varepsilon \delta \delta \tau \varepsilon \zeta \delta \tau \zeta \) or \( \varepsilon \delta \delta \tau \varepsilon \zeta \delta \tau \zeta \) in Rom 2:2, 3:19, 5:3, 6:9, 7:14, 8:22, 28, 1 Cor 6:2, 3, 9, 8:1, 4; 2 Cor 1:7, 4:14, 5:1, 6; Col 3:24, etc. Many give the impression of "crystallized traditional material" (Mussner, Galater, p. 168).

\[4\] Quoting Ps 143:2. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 115, asserts that the second \( \delta \tau \zeta \) must have the function of introducing a substantiation, otherwise 2:16c is a mean-
tion— as elsewhere he substantiates his doctrine of justification by faith, without works of law, from the Old Testament. So far, then, there are indications in the text of agreement between the intruders and Paul.

Further, the language of the verse is not strange to Judaism and pre-Pauline Christianity. The Qumran literature taught that righteousness comes from God, who justifies the sinner out of pure grace: "It is by Thy goodness alone that a man is justified and by the immensity of Thy mercy" (1 QH 13:16); "If I stumble because of the sin of my flesh, my justification is in the righteousness of God . . . by His immense goodness He will pardon all my iniquities" (1 QS 11:13-15). The Qumran sectaries knew of a "justification without the works of the law."*

**ingless repetition. This means, though, that even 2:16c cannot be taken as a uniquely Pauline expression, or it would not function as a substantiation.**

*The words ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου are not in the psalm; but the footnote above suggests that these are not the unique Pauline addition. He himself has used πᾶσα σάρξ instead of πᾶς ζῶν, closely paralleling 1 Enoch 81:5, "No flesh is righteous in the sight of the Lord." It should be noted that in 2:16 ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου does not function to belittle νόμος, but in fact exalts it. It stands as the equivalent of "before Thee" or "in the sight of the Lord." This meshes poorly with Paul's later argument in Galatians, especially 3:19 and 4:1-11—suggesting further that Paul is here using a formula the opponents themselves have introduced.

For instance, Rom 4:6-8, quoting Ps 32:1-2.

There is an abundance of further material. For instance, 1 QS 1:26, 2:1, 10:11, 11:3, CD 2:4, 1 QH 4:30, 36, 1:6-26, 14:15, 16:11, 7:28, 9:14. Becker, Galater,
As for early Christianity, many Pauline texts speaking of justification also reflect Christian tradition (i.e., Rom 3:24-26, 4:25, 1 Cor 6:11), and some at the same time have close parallels in the Qumran scrolls.

In this light, the force of οὖν . . . δὲ

p. 30, remarks that the coincidence with the language of Galatians is "no accident." See also Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Viking Press, 1955), p. 334, who notes especially the parallel between Paul's language and 1 QS 11:13 (referred to below, p. 279); Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (New York: Scribner, 1961), p. 128, who assesses the Qumran teaching on righteousness as a continuation of the piety of the psalms and prophets, and a praeparatio evangelica; Dahl, Paul, pp. 96-99; Ziesler, Righteousness, pp. 85-102; Sanders, Paul, pp. 305-12. Wilckens' comment, Freiheit, p. 88, that Qumran saw justifying efficacy in the law, passes over the strong similarity between Qumran and Paul. There were different senses in which justification was spoken of. Righteousness meant behavior that remained within the covenant (Sanders, Paul, p. 312; Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 85). But there was also a sense in which righteousness could never be on the basis of man's work, but only on the gracious work of God (Sanders, ibid., p. 311; see below, p. 314). Dahl, ibid., p. 99, seems to be correct when he says that the essential difference is that Paul has found God's justifying grace revealed eschatologically in Christ. Justification is "now;" it is "in Christ;" and it is in Christ alone.


2 Dahl, Paul, pp. 100-1, compares 1 QS 3:3-6, "... justified ... absolved by atonement ... purified by lustral waters ... sanctified ... cleansed ..." and 1 Cor 6:11, "But you were washed ... sanctified ... justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ ..."—itself an "un-Pauline" verse. See also David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," Scripta Hierosolymitana (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1955), 4:215-66.
should be allowed to stand as introducing a point of common agreement.¹ In fact, for a Jew to become a Christian² he would have to profess a belief that there was a justification without the works of the law.³ Various circles believed in the justifying grace of God. The Christian kerygma demanded that one see that grace eschatologically displayed in Christ. So throughout the passage the reference is not merely to justification by faith without the works of the law, but to justification by faith in Christ without works of law. The last is a controversy-statement, with meaning only because of what it is against.⁴ The whole verse is looking forward to the future debate, as is suggested further by the change in 2:16 from διὰ πίστεως to ἐκ πίστεως, due probably to the anticipatory force of Hab 2:4.⁵

¹It should be noted again that the opponents are gospel-preachers; see above, p. 93. They have an important place for Jesus and probably even speak of faith in Jesus, Georgi, Geschichte, pp. 34-35; Stoike, "Christ," pp. 95-97.

²Duncan, Galatians, p. 66, points to the force of ἐπιστεύσασιν in 2:16. The subject is Jews who have come to believe in Christ.

³Becker, Galater, p. 30. Paul is saying in 2:15–16, if justification were by the law, we would have remained Jews: we accepted Christ because we knew that there is no justification by means of law.

⁴Mussner, Galater, p. 170. Justifying faith is not "allerweltsglaube," but faith in Jesus Christ.

⁵Hab 2:4 is used in the probatio in 3:11, and it has ἐκ πίστεως, which is unusual in Pauline language. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 115, says the expression is
Then the opponents accept a justification by faith without the works of the law. But it is also clear that they believe in a justification by works of law (2:21, 5:4, etc.). The argument in 2:15-21 evidently moves from an antithesis between faith and works which is acceptable to the Judaisers (2:16) to one which is unacceptable (2:21). It is in this development between 2:16 and 2:21 that the points at issue become sharply defined.

The debate is intensified in 2:17. It is perhaps easiest to exegete this difficult text backwards. μὴ γῆνοιτο is used by Paul as a strong negation, usually after a rhetorical question.² It functions "where a hypothetical opponent takes a principle of Pauline Christianity and develops it to a completely unacceptable almost heretical, making faith a meritorious work, as did Judaism. See StrB, 3:186-202.

¹In the light of the teachings of Qumran, this is understandable. The sectaries believed in a righteousness without works of law, on the basis of God's grace alone (above); but the only way to remain righteous was to do the commandments of God as specified in the covenant. Human righteousness was by works of law (1 QS 11:17, 1 QH 7:28-31, etc.), and the man who was justified by grace was then justified by law-obedience, the condition of remaining elect. See below, p. 271; Sanders, Paul, p. 312; and Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 85. Paul and the opponents can agree about the initiation of the Christian life, but disagree about the covenant laws under which the Christian is then bound.

²BAG 157, with references to Epictetus, as well as to Rom 3:4, 5, 31, 6:2, 15, 7:7, 13, 9:14, 11:1, etc.
conclusion. If Paul is using the terms of the passage consistently, he means by ἄριστος in this verse what he means in 2:15—one who nationally and sociologically stands outside Israel. The beginning of 2:17 then follows from what has been agreed on in 2:16. When a Jew becomes a Christian, he acknowledges that the Jew is a sinner—as is a heathen—so that, in terms of δικαιοσύνη before God or before the law, there is in fact no distinction between them. The structure of the verse does not conform to a contrary-to-fact condition, which would imply that 2:17a was in fact not the case. Rather, "Paul and those with him must have actually been found sinners

---

1 Duncan, Galatians, p. 68; see also Becker, Galater, p. 30.
2 Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 116.
3 Paul is not importing a meaning into the passage from Romans 2-3 etc., i.e., that Christ by justifying declares a man to be a sinner in an ethical sense, as in Jewett, "Intruders," p. 200, who agrees here with Mussner, Tannehill, and Lightfoot.
4 Becker, Galater, p. 30. That is, 2:17a picks up the conclusion of this process of reasoning, not the premise—that the definition of "sinner" in terms of the historic distinction between Jew and Gentile is no longer valid.
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in someone's eyes,"\(^1\) and, in terms of the definition of αμαρτώλας here, Paul accepts that estimation.\(^2\)

Paul has shifted from the aorist ἐπιστέασας of 2:16, the moment of coming to belief in Christ, to the present participle ζητοῦντες (with a continuous sense)—referring to the life of faith—and to εὑρεθηκεν, with the sense of the sustained experience in time of being a Christian. The discussion has now moved to justification by faith as a process.\(^3\) This also changes the meaning of the verb δικαίων, so that in 2:17 it comes to signify the relational/moral as well as the forensic.\(^4\)

Then Paul and the opponents agree that there is a justification by faith in Christ. But the disagreement is over whether or not this justification removes the historic distinctions between Jew and Gentile; and, if it does, whether this constitutes Christ an "agent of sin."

For Paul, 2:17b is an illogical conclusion from a correct

\(^1\)Tannehill, Dying, p. 55.

\(^2\)Ziesler, Righteousness, pp. 172-73: "... the whole debate... is not about the relative moral achievements of Jew and Gentiles, but about the fulfillment of the law in ritual and technical matters... If you take the law as your standard, Christians are sinners."

\(^3\)Ziesler, ibid., p. 173.

\(^4\)Ziesler, ibid., p. 174. He admits that this verse contradicts his general thesis that the verb form δικαίων signifies forensic justification, while the nominal and adjectival forms signify relational/moral righteousness. The word in 2:17 comes to have this latter sense, because of the other verbs with which it is used and because of its local reference, ἐν Χριστῷ. For
premise.\(^1\) It is not true to say, using a play on the word \(\delta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\delta\zeta\), that, in extending the principle of justification (or righteousness) in Christ through time in the same direction, Christ is made an agent of sin and His followers become nothing but enemies of God. So the debate is sharpened by extending the question of \(\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\omicron\omicron\nu\eta\) through time.

2:18 apparently continues Paul's \(\mu\heta\  \gamma\varepsilon\nu\eta\iota\tau\omicron\)\(^2\) and takes up the opponents' play on \(\delta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\delta\zeta\) by suddenly introducing the word \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\). "... conduct such as he now describes is a more direct and more serious violation of God's law than that which the Judaisers call 'sin.'"\(^3\) By continuing to live in time on the basis of justification by faith in Christ without the deeds of the law, one could perhaps be called \(\delta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\delta\zeta\); but if one revoked this principle and returned to a nomistic basis

---

\(^1\) Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 117. This gives \(\mu\heta\  \gamma\varepsilon\nu\eta\iota\tau\omicron\) its usual force.

\(^2\) Lightfoot, ibid., p. 117, notes the grammatical difficulties posed by \(\gamma\alpha\omicron\varrho\) in 2:18 but gives reasons for treating it here as an emphatic particle. See also Dana and Mantey, Grammar, pp. 243-44, especially on Acts 19:35, where \(\gamma\alpha\omicron\varrho\) must be translated "indeed." Another possibility is that \(\gamma\alpha\omicron\varrho\) here refers back to 2:17a. Herbert Weir Smyth, Greek Grammar (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 637-42, notes that, if \(\gamma\alpha\omicron\varrho\) is attached to \(\mu\heta\  \gamma\varepsilon\nu\eta\iota\tau\omicron\), the expression can be translated "If on the other hand . . . ."

\(^3\) Duncan, Galatians, p. 69.
for living, one could only be called παραβάτης. ¹ This understanding of the verse grows directly out of the climax of the narratio in 2:14 and the definitions of 2:14-15. It also shows the precise issue: "The guilt is not in abandoning the law, but in seeking it again when abandoned."² In 2:17-18 the principle of δικαιοσύνη ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is only a Christian heresy, a way of seeking justification (or righteousness) through time which sets aside the eschatological finality of Christ and the eschatological significance of being ἐν Χριστῷ.³

The propositio, as it develops, is in perfect accord with the causa and its restatements, where the issue is beginning and ending. The debate has shifted from an antithesis between faith and works which the opponents could accept, to an antithesis which they can now not accept. As attention shifts from a point in time (2:16) to a process through time (2:17-18), the debate

¹Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 173, who gives other authorities.
²Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 115.
³Mussner, Galater, pp. 169-70. He goes on to say, p. 186, "Paulus hat seine Gesetztheologie nicht gegen das Judentum entwickelt, sondern gegen seine "judaistischen" Gegner aus den Reihen der Christen! Er kämpft im Ga. gegen ein christliches Pseudo-evangelium!" That is, Paul is not writing against Jewish merit-theology (Oepke, Wilckens), the impossibility of fulfilling the law (which Paul as a Jew never held to, Philippians 3), etc. "The real sin is not in infringing the law, but in disloyalty to Christ," Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 173. Paul here gives an assessment of non-Christian religion only as post-Christian religion.
centers as much on the meaning of πίστις as on the meaning of δικαιοσύνη. Paul here defines πίστις in such a way that it is impossible to speak of justification through faith in Christ and justification by works of law at the same time.

Verses 19 and 20 should be examined together. Both use a new vocabulary (ἀποδύναμος and ζην) which shifts the debate from forensic to existential and relational terms. And both share a particular pattern of construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dying</th>
<th>Living</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέδαινον</td>
<td>ἵνα θεῷ ζῆσῃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστῷ συνεσταθῶμαι</td>
<td>ζῶ δὲ οὐκετὶ ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοί Χριστῷς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σάρκι, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ οὐλοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first dying/living construction makes anthropological assertions, whereas the second centers in Christological assertions.

This language and construction appear to reaffirm the heart of the argument and the sharpened issue established in 2:17-18. There is much to suggest that Paul

---

1 Note that the opponents have their own understanding of πίστις, above, p. 158, referring to Georgi, Geschichte, pp. 34-35, who suggests that, for them, πίστις amounts to a deepened understanding of the law. They probably also understood faith as a meritorious work, as this is the sense in which it was used to speak of the justification of Abraham. See below pp. 248-49.
is sharpening the issue further by introducing the subject of baptism.¹

Firstly, both the verbs used in these verses, and their construction, suggest baptism. Paul characteristically refers to the death and life of the baptized in different tenses.² Here he uses the aorist (ἀνέσκοψαν) and perfect (συνεσταθομαῖ) for the Christian's dying, just as he used the aorist (ἐπιστεθομαῖ) to refer to the beginning of the Christian life; and the life that follows the dying is in different tenses.³ The pattern of anthropological and Christological assertion has a close parallel in the baptism-passage in Rom 6:5-10.⁴


³In 2:19 he uses ζησεω, probably an aorist subjunctive; and in 2:20 he uses the present ζω. But the life here is qualified: οὐκέτι ἔγω, ζησεω δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός, etc. The life that follows identification with Christ is an "I, yet not I," contrasting with the finality of the death of Christ.

⁴In this last, 6:8-10 repeats a pattern established in 6:5-7, the one pattern giving the Christological foundation for the anthropological assertions of the other, as the significance of baptism for Christian experience is developed. See Bornkamm, Experience, pp. 74-76; and Franz J. Leenhardt, L'Epître de saint Paul aux Romains (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Nestlé, 1969), pp. 159-62.
It is through the medium of baptism that Paul draws on the experience of Christ to speak of the present experience of the Christian; and it is because of incorporation into Christ's death that Paul is able to say "I died." \(^2\)

Secondly, there is in the New Testament a typical association of baptism with justification, especially in the pre-Pauline material. \(^3\) It is baptism which is sacramentally effective in bringing about a union between the believer and Christ; \(^4\) and it is "in Christ" or in the "body of Christ" that justification becomes a reality. \(^5\)

In this passage, too, Paul is arguing out of the implications of being "in Christ" (ζητοῦντες δικαιώματα ἐν

---

1. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 74, 75: "The baptism-event and the Christ-event are not only related to each other in terms of analogy, but are identical with each other."

2. Ibid., p. 76: "The death which the baptized and Christ die is only one death, that is, the death of Christ Himself, and through baptism this death becomes the death of the believer."


5. Bultmann, ibid., p. 311; and Lohse, Einheit, p. 241. Righteousness and life are only to be found where God's righteousness in Christ is entered into and man as believer stands in a right relation to God.
Xριστῶ . . . , 2:17), as he is in one of his final arguments against circumcision.  

Thirdly, there are recurring baptismal statements throughout Galatians which are closely linked to the sharpening of the argument here in the propositio. The discussion of the Spirit in 3:1-5 presupposes baptism. The function of the passage as an interrogatio links it directly with the issue elaborated in 2:15-21. Paul brings forth the evidence of the Galatians' own experience to establish his proposition about justification.  

3:27-29 is of course a baptism-passage. The question is whether or not it belongs in the stream of Paul's arg-

---

1 That is, 5:6. See the comments above, p. 141.

On reception of the Spirit at baptism, see above, p. 150, note 2.

See above, pp. 110, 148 on the significance of 3:1-5 as an interrogatio for the debate about justification. It is important that the experience of the Spirit here is a "public fact" (Lütgert, cited in Stoike, "Christ," p. 76), not merely a private experience—a community-experience which cannot be denied; see Becker, Galater, pp. 32-33.

It has been noticed above that the language of an interrogatio was to be most relevant to the case being established. See above, pp. 112, 150. So the language of ἐνεργεῖ and ἔννομεῖς is another way of speaking about justification. Thus the progress in the discussion from justification (2:15-21) to the Spirit (3:1-5) to justification (3:6-14) is still the one discussion. Paul's stress on the present experience of the Spirit among the Galatians is an assertion that justification, in the sense of eschatological deliverance, has already been realized. See Duncan, Galatians, p. xliii. Baptism is seen to be involved here by Lohse, Einheit, p. 243; Brandenburger, Fliesch, p. 49; Lagrange, Galates, pp. 56-57, etc.
ment. The way Paul uses it suggests that it does. The very rhetorical nature of Galatians, and its unity as a carefully structured argument, suggests that it does; and the way it naturally brings a sequence of argument to a conclusion (if 2:15-21 revolves around baptism) suggests that it does. This suggests that, in these last verses, Paul has not suddenly shifted his argument. Baptism has been in his thinking all along. Others have seen 4:5-6, referring to the reception of sonship and the cry "Abba" at the coming of the Spirit, as a baptism-passage. If so, it would be a return to the interroga-tio and the evidence of the Galatians' own reception of the Spirit and so would logically belong in the argument. There may be a reference to baptism in 5:6. And 5:24 also appears to be a reference to baptism, itself

1Stählin, "Galaterbrief," p. 1189, notes that, in 3:6-22, all the lines of salvation-history end in the death of Christ; but by the end of the chapter, they now end in baptism.

2If 2:15-21 develops the significance of baptism to refute the opponents' system of beginning and ending, faith then works. Then it would be natural to end a pas-sage on justification by faith, not works of law, with a return to the subject of baptism.

3If 3:1-5 is a baptism-passage, this is more evi-dent.

4Lagrange, Galates, pp. 92-93. The theme of union of adopted sons and the natural Son occurs also in Rom 8:10-15. The Aramaic formula "Abba" also suggests a Christian ritual.

5Lohse, Einheit, p. 235.

6See Jervell, Imago Dei, p. 234, and many others,
having important links with the earlier baptism-passages.\(^1\)

In rhetorical terms, then, 2:19-20, as a baptismal statement,\(^2\) clarifies the point of the debate, which is to be elaborated in the following sections of the argument. In this case, the recurrence of baptism throughout the letter is no coincidence. The later statements grow naturally out of the place of baptism here at the head of the argument in the divisio.

Paul expounds the meaning of baptism in 2:19-20 to counter the opponents' teaching of justification by works. He usually uses baptism to clarify the meaning of the new life in Christ.\(^3\) Here he uses it to clarify justification. The two must then, in Galatians, come to mean the same thing. We must speak of the life of justifi-

cited below (p. 355). Paul here proclaims the eschatologically new ethic of Christianity, which is typically rooted in the indicative brought about by baptism. See also Bultmann, Theology, 1:312-13. Others point out the parallels to other baptism-passages such as 1 Cor 6:11.

\(^1\)It speaks of οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, reminiscence of εἰ . . . ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ (3:29); and τὴν οἴκον ἑσταθρωσαν is reminiscent of Χριστῷ συνεσταθρωμα (2:19).

\(^2\)Thyen, Der Stil, p. 67, notes that Paul's use of ἐγὼ here is probably not biographical, but (as in Romans 7 and 1 Corinthians 13) refers to some common experience that can be used as the basis for an argument. This is understandable if Paul is referring to the common experience of baptism.

\(^3\)l Cor 6:11, 10:1-13, Rom 6:1-12 and, functioning in the same way, Colossians 3-4.
fication, the course of the justified life—and this is the center of the debate.¹

Further, Paul introduces the subject of Christ's death to settle the question of the believer's relation to the law. The phrase "died to the law" should be understood in accordance with the context. Because in the death of Christ law and life are revealed as opposites,² then the one who has died with Christ has closed the door to law as a life principle.³ By bringing baptism into the debate, Paul gives a sacramental answer to the opponents, a sacramental answer that lays a Christological foundation for his rejection of law as a life principle,⁴ and of the Judaisers' suggestion that the Christ-event confirms the covenant of law by implementing a δικαιοσύνη εξ ἐργῶν νόμου that places us where we must

¹Which accords with the causa and its restatements in terms of beginning and ending; and the shift from δικαιοσύνη with a declarative sense in 2:16 to δικαιοσύνη as an ethical/relational process in 2:17.

²Tannehill, Dying pp. 54-61. Dying to the law takes place through crucifixion with Christ; so the essential question becomes the function of the law in the crucifixion of Christ. Sanders, Paul, pp. 483-85, stresses the Christological-dogmatic basis for the rejection of the law in 3:21 and 2:21. The fact that Christ died reveals that law was never intended as a way of salvation. The argument in 3:10-14 hangs on the dogmatic use of Hab 2:4—righteousness cannot be by law, since it is by faith.

³Mussner, p. 179.

⁴Bornkamm, Experience, p. 77, notes how Paul uses baptism as a sacramental presentation of the Christ-event, in order to lay a basis for Christian existence.
maintain this relationship by ἐργῶν νῦν. He now poses the antithesis of faith and works in Christological and existential terms: νῦν ἀπεθανοῦ Ἰνα θεῷ ζησοῦ.

Chapter 2:20 follows the same trajectory. That which is signified in baptism, at the beginning of the Christian life, is constitutive for the whole of life thereafter—that is, for justification. Baptism is not one step among many, and neither, therefore, is justification by faith in Christ. Justification is here expressed in terms of the eschatological finality of the Christ-event and of the believer's incorporation into Christ. It conforms to the present lordship of Christ, and is as comprehensive as that lordship. Because nothing can be added to the lordship of Christ, nothing can be added to the believer's justification. Here the eschatological and cosmological motifs of the letter begin to be taken up into the central debate of justification in a way that effectively refutes the false

1 This is consistent with the importance of Christology and eschatology in the prescript and postscript.

2 Bornkamm, Experience, pp. 79-81. There is a finality in baptism. It can only be once, because it unites with the once-for-all death of Christ. Thereafter it becomes the subject of proclamation. The believer's life is the constant appropriation of what has been made true for him in baptism, and he is not initiated into further means of perfection, but is reminded of what his baptism means.

3 See above, pp. 129-47, on Christology and eschatology in the prescript and postscript; and a summary on p. 148.
gospel with its pattern of beginning and ending, made clear in the causa and its restatements. Justification is a life which, because of its Christological basis, can only be understood as the life of the new age.

In 2:21, Paul returns to the possibility of justification by law. This is evidently what he has been wrestling against in 2:19-20. Seeking righteousness by law is the opposite of dying to the law and living to Christ. Justification by law is that which denies the grace of God: it is a reversion to one way of life after commencing with another. Christ died in vain, not only if the declaration of justification comes in some way other than the cross (2:16), but also if justification (or righteousness) as a process through time, the life that naturally follows that declaration (2:17, then 2:19-20), is founded on anything other than God's deed in Christ and the eschatological newness of the age to come. Justification by law is only a Christian heresy.

The way in which 2:16-21 makes precise the terms of agreement and disagreement and elaborates the causa of beginning one way and ending in another can be analyzed in two ways. The first analysis is in terms of the linguistic and verbal breaks in the pericope:

16 Agreed: the antithesis of being justified by faith and being justified by works (declarative) acceptable to both parties

17-18 The point of dispute: the life of being justified (moral/relational) which follows the
declaration of acceptance in Christ. The true παράσκευας as the one who builds up what was torn down

19–20 The point of dispute put into the language of baptism: anthropological statements out of a Christological base. Justification accords to the lordship of Christ

21 Precise statements of the antithesis unaccept­able to the opponents (summarizing 17–20): justification by faith excludes justification by works

The second analysis is in terms of the major antithesis in the pericope and its repetitions:

16 Agreed: Being justified by faith as a point in time
17 Being justified in Christ extended through time (A)
18 Justification by law as beginning and ending, a system which contradicts A (B)
19–20 Being justified in Christ as life, that is, extended through time (A)
21 Justification by law rejected as a system which contradicts A (B)

Thus the structure of the pericope, as it unfolds, conforms to the rhetorical pattern expected of a proposi­tio— a making more precise of that which is agreed upon and that which is disputed. It is also seen to be functioning as a propositio in that it forms a transition from the narratio to the main argument, the probatio, by putting the dispute into the most appropriate terms— terms which are consistent with the Christology and
eschatology of the prescript and postscript. Thirdly, it functions in this expected way when it is seen that it sharpens the debate by introducing the language of baptism: for after this pericope, baptismal statements run like a thread throughout the epistle, appearing at crucial places in the argument (3:1-5, 3:27-29, 4:6, 5:6, 5:24). The rest of the letter then develops these terms of dispute as set out in 2:19-20. Baptism also links the two major sections of the letter, the dogmatic (3:1-5), 3:27-29, 4:6) and the paraenetic (5:6, 5:24). The whole letter grows out of the polemical statement of justification in baptismal terms. In both sections, Paul expounds the significance of the new creation as an answer to a nomistic system.

This detailed analysis has been necessary for a further reason. It has been consistently difficult to relate the doctrine of "justification by faith in Christ" to the whole of the letter. Those who stress its place in the dogmatic argument usually link the intruders with "normative" nomistic Judaism and, thereby unable to maintain the unity of the letter, resort to some sort of two-front theory.¹ It is believed that the nomistic opponents are countered only in parts of the letter.

¹ See above, pp. 27-32, on Lütgert, Ropes, Bruce, Jewett, Hawkins, etc. The basic assumption is that there is a "libertine" problem in Galatia--and a "legalist" cannot be a "libertine." There is a tendency to understand the doctrine in Galatians in terms of Romans.
Suggestions of speculative cosmology, ethical deviations, et cetera, are not part of the argument concerning justification by faith. On the other hand, those who see a unity in the letter, or stress the polemical nature of the last two chapters, see the opponents as something other than nomistic; and then the argument of justification by faith could not possibly answer them.  

However, as 2:15-21 is analyzed in terms of a rhetorical propositio, the central place of justification in the argument is retained (because of the function of a propositio), and the doctrine itself is seen to develop in a way in which it stands at the head of the whole book. The opponents themselves must have a real concern for justification and its meaning. The stress of this passage, as it sharpens the difference between the two meanings of justification, comes to fall on the life of faith, so that justification is consistent with the contexts of Christology, cosmology, and eschatology provided by the rest of the book. The question becomes, Under what law-requirements is the believer placed when he is justified? What is left yet to accomplish for his deliverance? This is really a Christological question,  

1For instance, above, pp. 32-36, on Schmithals, whose gnostic reconstruction makes Galatians 3-4 a misunderstanding on Paul's part, and Marxsen, who follows him closely. Gunther, Opponents, p. 61, stressing the cosmology of the opponents, says that they are not at all answered by justification by faith, and that Paul corrects the oversight in Colossians, which is a much better argument against the opponents' theology.
and the concerns of the rest of the letter—freedom, the cosmic powers, the two ages, et cetera—now become relevant. And as justification is developed in baptismal terms, as the life of faith, the pericope comes to stand at the head of both the dogmatic and ethical portions of the letter. Each is exploring the consequences of the eschatological deliverance brought about ἐν Χριστῷ (2:17; compare 3:28 [ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]; 5:6 [ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]; and 5:24 [οί ... τοῦ Χριστοῦ]).

The Interrogatio, 3:1-5

This passage begins the probatio, or main argument against the intruders; and rhetorically, is to be directly related to the partitio. Here the witnesses to the case, the Galatians themselves, are brought to the stand, and the evidence of their own experience is presented in language most relevant to the argument against the system of justification by works of law.¹ Paul here uses direct address, which he has not used since 1:11, indicating a return to the same subject as 1:6-10, the Galatians' apostasy,² though now with the added force of the intervening partitio. The object here will be, firstly, to examine the language in which this experience is referred to, as a clue to determining the nature of the experience the opponents themselves are offering, and the

¹See above, pp. 113, 150.
form of the apostasy of beginning and ending; and, secondly, to note the way the evidence of this experience, and the language in which it is referred to, is used throughout the rest of the argument.

Paul begins, τίς ὡμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν: The word ἐβάσκανεν means to bewitch by words, to exercise a harmful magic independent of the subject.1 The Galatians have yielded to magicians without realizing the nature of the powers to whom they have surrendered. This word indicates strongly the complete mastery of the opponents over the Galatians. It may also indicate a mystical, even magical, form of mastery.

In 3:3 Paul uses together the verbs ἐναρχεσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν (ἐναρχήμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖ­σθε). ἐναρχεσθαι often has the meaning of an act of initiation;2 ἐπιτελεῖν commonly means a performance of ritual or ceremony which brings to completion or perfection.3 The two verbs also appear in the same sequence

1Delling, "βασκαλω," TDNT, 1:594-95; BAG, "βασκαλω." This is the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament. A power of falsehood (γόνης) has been exercised to do harm to the voug of the Galatians (they are ἄνδηποι).

2Schlier, Galater, p. 83, referring to Polux 8:83, Eurip Iph Aul 1470, 955. BAG notes that Euripides makes it a sacrificial terminus technicus.

3BAG 302 gives sources where it means to perform a λειτουργία: Philo Som 1. 214, Hdt., Dit., Syll.11109, 111; or to offer a δοσις, Ep. Arist. 186, Philo Ebr 129, Som 1. 215 etc., Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 134, refers to Herod 2. 63 (δοσις) and 4. 186 (νηστείας και ὀρτας) and
in 2 Cor 8:6 and Phil 1:61 and may comprise a technical formula for progress in a religious mystery from a lower to higher stage.2 They may even belong to the opponents' propaganda. They have told the Galatians that their earlier experience was only the primary stage of religion, but they are now, in the program of works of law, offered the stage of perfection.3 These terms suit perfectly the elaboration of the heresy as a program of beginning one way and ending another way;4 and their mystical connotations must be taken into account in the theological assessment of the program.

But the opponents' propaganda is turned on its head with the introduction of the antithesis σαφές and τελείωμα. The Spirit, received at baptism (3:2),5 is a gift and sign of the new age, bringing the order of the new age, the eschatological age (3:3). τελείωμα comes

Schlier, Galater, p. 83, notes its meaning of completion or perfection in religion.

1See Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 134.

2Lightfoot, ibid.; Ramsay, Galatians, p. 324, sees them as mystery terms denoting progress from a lower to higher stage. Similarly, Lagrange, Galates p. 60, and Schlier, Galater, p. 83.

3Lagrange, ibid., pp. 59-60; Schlier, ibid., p. 83.

4See above, pp. 149-53, on the causa (1:6-10), and its restatements (2:15-21, 3:1-5, 4:8-11, 5:2-12, 5:16-24) elaborating the one pattern of beginning and ending.

5See above, p. 150, on reception of the Spirit at baptism.
to stand for an order of existence, the life of the new age. Similarly, ὁ ὅπερ has moved here from the neutral sense it had at the beginning of the letter to the sense of the world of the flesh, the sphere of this age, invested even with demonic qualities. Used together in this way, ὁ ὅπερ and πνεῦμα stand for the two apocalyptic ages, two antithetical spheres or powers, and two ways of existence as conceived from the angle of the world to which one belongs. They are absolutely exclusive of each other; man must live in one order or the other, the old age or the new, last age (1:4).

These antithetical terms are reinterpreting the two opposing programs elaborated in the propositio. The experience of ὁ ὅπερ is the equivalent of justification by works of law, and the experience of πνεῦμα is the equivalent of justification by faith in Christ. The Galatians were justified by faith in Christ at their baptism. They

1 Bultmann, Theology, 1:332-35; Brandenburger, Fleisch, p. 45; Mussner, Galater, p. 209.

2 Bultman, ibid., p. 332. See the place played in the debate by the terms αἰών (1:4) and κόσμος (6:14), above pp. 128-47. See Becker, Galater, p. 32, on the development in Galatians from a neutral (1:16, 2:16-20) to an actively malevolent sense of ὁ ὅπερ.

3 Käsemann, Paul, p. 26. ὁ ὅπερ in this apocalyptic sense is a hostile, active power.


cannot deny that this was an experience of the Spirit.\footnote{It was noted above, p. 167, that the experience of the Spirit referred to here was a "public fact," a community experience which cannot be denied.}

Therefore the gospel which brought them justification in Christ brought them the Spirit (3:2) and brought them into the age of the Spirit (3:3). Then that which the opponents refer to by the verb ἐνδοξευσαί, their own past experience of the Pauline gospel, was in fact the highest level of religious experience possible. There can be no talk of perfecting it further. If the intruders are offering a program of ὑπερελήσις, it cannot be a part with the religion they entered at baptism—which was the religion of the new age. It must be a perfection in a different religion—which can therefore only be a religion of the old age, the ὁδὸς. Their undeniable experience of the Spirit shows that, in this program of initiation and perfection offered by the opponents, they are only making progress—backwards.\footnote{Mussner, Galater, p. 209; Lagrange, Galates, pp. 59-60.}

This adds poignancy to Paul's question, τοσάντα ἐπάθετε εἰκή; εἴ γε καὶ εἰκή;(3:4). If the Spirit should come, bringing the ultimate religious experience, and find the recipients so "unreligious" that they should fail entirely to appreciate its significance, even turning afterwards to continue their religious quest in new directions, could anything at all be done for such
people? The question rings of eternal doom. As Paul twice laments that the coming of the last age may have been for the Galatians εἰκόνιον, so he twice calls them ἄνόητος (3:1, 3). In a religious context the word can mean one who is blind to religious realities, "deficient in an understanding of salvation."\(^1\) By calling their first experience a beginning initiation and seeking now to perfect it, they are so perverting the sense of that first experience as to render it void. They are ἄνόητος in the sense of uninitiated.\(^2\) Their attempt at perfection is "fleshy" (3:3).

Two conclusions about this language stand out. Firstly, the mystical and even magical vocabulary (βασκαίλειν, ἐνάρχεσθαι, ἐπιτελεῖν, σαρξ, πνεῦμα, ἄνοητος) strongly indicates that these are the terms in which the opponents themselves present their program. Secondly, the strong antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in this pericope, and the way it is used to reinterpret the Galatians' apostasy of beginning and ending, must be kept in view throughout the book. νόμος and σάρξ are powers of

\(^1\)See BAG 70, with references to the expression, frequent in religious homilies, ὁ ἄνοητος. See 1 Clem 23:4, 2 Clem 11:3, Herm Man 10. 2. 1 etc. Behm, "νοέω," TDNT, 9:961, interprets the word in Gal 3:3 as "deficient in an understanding of salvation."

\(^2\)The word has this meaning in Phil Som 2. 181 (ὁ ἄνοητε), and in Corp Herm 1. 23 (τοῖς δὲ ἄνοητοῖς καὶ κακοῖς καὶ πονηροῖς). The ἄνοητοι are stood over against those who respond to the call to religious perfection. Also in Tit 3:3, it is used of men before becoming Christians.
the present age and the present state of bondage; πίστις and πνεῦμα are signs of the new age and of freedom. These two ways of existence come to epitomize the whole debate.1

The antithesis, in terms of which 3:1-5 redefines the debate, recurs throughout the book. Though the terms σάρξ and πνεῦμα are not used in 4:8-11, the pericope turns around the same ironic contrast: the Galatians, knowing God, yet turn to the powers of the old age (νῦν δὲ γνῶντες θεόν, μάλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενή καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, 4:9). This suggests again that the pericope is a restatement of the causa.

The same antithesis is used in 4:21-31. The present Jerusalem has come into existence κατὰ σάρκα (4:29) in contrast to the one κατὰ πνεῦμα (4:29).2 So the probatio begins and ends with the antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα.

There is good evidence that, in chapters 5 and 6, Paul takes up further aspects of the problems dealt with in chapters 3 and 4, because of the continued use of this same antithesis. Law, Spirit, and flesh function in the

1 Brandenburger, Fleisch, pp. 45-48, notes the way the antitheses are developed in Galatians, so that ἐν σαρκί, σάρκις, and οἱ σαρκικοί are implied as standing out over against ἐν πνεύματι, πνευματικός, and οἱ πνευματικοί.

2 Bo Reicke, "The Law and This World According to Paul," JBL 70 (1951):266.
same way in 5:13-24 and 6:1, 2, 7-8 as they do in 3:1-5.\(^1\)

In 5:16-24 οὐρά and πνεῦμα are again personified powers; οὐρά does works (5:19), and πνεῦμα plays the role of leader or teacher (5:18). They are cosmic spheres which do not merely exclude one another, but struggle against each other. Man must live under one power or the other.\(^2\)

In 5:18 the life θυμὸς stands over against the life κατὰ πνεῦμα, as it does in 3:1-5. One of the fruits of the Spirit is πίστις. Thus οὐρά and πνεῦμα still stand in the same relationship to θυμὸς and πίστις.

It appears, then, that the same two apocalyptic spheres, and the same two life possibilities, as in 3:1-5, are in view here. In 3:1-5, behavior characterized by works of law was sarkic; here, behavior characterized by departure from the commandment to love is sarkic.

"Paul moves intentionally from the contrast of Spirit and law to the contrast of Spirit and flesh. In each instance, he is dealing with the one human predicament."\(^3\)

This is the more apparent in that 5:24 reveals that, in the ethical portion as in the dogmatic portion, Paul is

\(^1\)Käsemann, Paul, pp. 24-26: οὐρά and πνεῦμα are in the later passages the same two antithetical apocalyptic powers.

\(^2\)Brandenburger, Fleisch, p. 45, especially on Gal 5:17.

\(^3\)Sanders, "Patterns," p. 468. Grundmann, "ἀμαρτία," TDNT, 1:311 notes that the demonic character of sin uses law to express itself and increase its power. Brandenburger, Fleisch, p. 45, commenting on the vice-
filling out the significance of baptism for the believer.¹

The Probatio, Chapters 3 and 4

This central argument of the epistle, to which every section and facet of the letter is related, will be examined more closely below. The particular concern here is to explore the relationship of 4:8-11 to the rest of the argument.²

Analysis reveals that Paul uses the literary device of the "mot crochet" to hold the argument together between 3:1 and 4:11. The passage is broken up into smaller pericopes, each of which does not use a particular list of Galatians 5 and Romans 7, points to the radical connection between law, flesh, and sin.

¹See above, p. 168, on 5:24 as a baptismal passage, and p. 176, on the way both dogma and ethics grow out of 2:15-21. The saying in 6:8 (ὅ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἐαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, etc.) is also accommodated with this interpretation, rather than that of Jewett, "Intruders," pp. 202-5, who uses this verse to say that in Galatia were some Hellenistic enthusiasts who believed they would not face the judgment. It has already been seen that Paul's eschatology is more enthusiastic than the opponents'; and if the Galatians themselves were enthusiasts, it was imprudent of Paul to answer the opponents in this way. Mussner, Galater, p. 403, notes that μὴ πλανάσθε (6:7) announces something well-known; and σάρξ has by now developed the connotation of failure to live out agape towards other members of the community (5:13-14, 6:2, 9, 10). The one who is trying to deceive God (6:7) is the one who calls himself ἐνενεκτείνα (3:1-5), but does not live towards his brother in love. See below, p. 405, on the imperative force of the dual catalog (5:19-23).

²In the light of the theorists of Jewett and Hawkins. See above, pp. 59-63.
word, or uses it infrequently, until the last phrase. This suddenly appearing "mot crochet" will then occur in the first phrase of the next pericope, where it will become a key word used several times. In the last phrase a new word will appear again, which becomes the key word in the next pericope, et cetera. Thus, 3:1-5 only uses πίστις once apart from 3:5 (ἡ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως). However, the word is picked up in 3:6 (Ἅραδμ επίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ); and πίστις or πιστεύειν is used eight times in 3:6-14. Then in 3:14, at the end of the pericope, ἐπαγγελλα suddenly appears. This word is picked up in 3:16, and 3:15-22 uses it seven times, whereas πίστις is not used at all—until 3:22 (ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελλα ἐν πίστεως . . . δοθῇ). Chapter 3:23 again picks up πίστις, and 3:23-29 uses it five times, whereas ἐπαγγελλα is not used at all, except at the very end of the pericope. Then 3:29 introduces a new word, κληρονόμος (although used before in 3:18). This word is picked up in 4:1, and appears again in 4:7, evidently functioning here as a bracket.¹ In 4:7, κληρονόμος is associated with

---

¹Mussner, Galater, p. 244, has posited the unity of 3:19-29 and 4:1-7 on the ground of the themes and the use of κληρονόμος:

3:19 δοξηγος σὸν θεὸν το σπέρμα δ' ἐπηγγελται
4:4 ἔξπληστειλεν δ' θεὸς τον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ
3:26 πάντες γὰρ υἱὸν θεοῦ ἐστε
4:5 ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν
3:23 4:3ff )slavery under the law
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and 4:8 begins with the question of the believer's relation to ἸΣΩζ, so that this word becomes the "mot crochet" tying 4:8-11 into the argument. Moreover, the whole sequence is bound together with the word εἰκή (τοσαύτα ἐπάθετε εἰκή; εἰ γε καὶ εἰκή [3:4]; φοβοῦμαι ὄμας μὴ πώς εἰκή κεκοπίακα εἰς ὄμας [4:11]). The poignant meaning of εἰκή in 3:4 has been elaborated above; and it comes to have the same meaning here in 4:11, as 4:8-11 is based on the same pathetic contrast as the earlier pericope. It has been noted, too, that both 3:1-5 and 4:8-11 are reaffirmations of the causa (1:6-10). Now it is evident that they have been carefully placed at the beginning and end of a sequence of argument. Both immediately after the first statement of the causa and immediately before the second, the issue is that of sonship (οἱ ἐν πίστεως, οὐτοὶ νόι έίσιν 'Αβραάμ [3:7]; δότε ἐστε νόι [4:6]; οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος ἄλλα νόις [4:7].

1 Although there is a contested reading here, it is not the noun ἸΣΩζ itself that is contested by most variants.

2 Above, p. 180.

3 In both pericopes, the Galatians, once having known God (4:9) or having entered the sphere of πνεύμα (3:3), are now turning to the powers of the old κόσμος (4:9) or the sphere of σάρξ (3:3).

4 Above pp. 151-53.
Thus the structure of the argument looks something like this:

3:1-5  εἰκόνισμον  restatement of causa
3:6-14  sonship
3:15-22
3:23-29
4:1-7  sonship
4:8-11  εἰκόνισμον  restatement of causa

It seems clear that 4:8-11 has not fallen out of the argument but is intimately bound up with the attack on the offending theology.

It has already been noticed how 4:12-20 has a function in the overall structure of chapters 3 and 4 and how Paul ties the two chapters together by a particular use of σάρξ and πνεῦμα. It also becomes evident that Abraham has an essential function in the argument. He does not appear before chapter 3 or after chapter 4, but holds the whole section together from 3:6, and the issue of sons of Abraham, to 4:21-32, and the two τέκνα (or sons) of Abraham, as paradigms of the two spheres of σάρξ and πνεῦμα. Abraham, and the assurance of being

---

1See above, pp. 114, 127-28 on 4:12-20 as a passage περὶ φιλίας, concerned with the way the opponents have taken over as community-apostles.

2See above, pp. 181-82 on the way chapters 3 and 4 begin and end with the contrast of these two antithetical spheres. In both 3:1-5 and 4:21-31, νόμος becomes an instrument of the sphere of σάρξ.
sons of Abraham, has a central place in the opponents' propaganda.

The way Paul has heightened Abraham's role is only evident from a comparison with the way he has negated almost all other elements in Jewish salvation-history. The preeminence is given to Abraham and promise\(^1\) and to Abraham's salvation in terms of "faith alone" rather than faith and obedience.\(^2\) Moses and Israel have dropped in prominence.\(^3\) Moses has become a

---

1. Galatians is different.\(^4\) A. Conzelmann, Theology of the New Testament, from Abraham to Paul, p. 11. The preeminence of promise is evident from Galatians 3. Abraham is placed alongside other law to the law of the faith, and Rom 4:16

2. Compare Romans 9-11, where Israel is a part of salvation-history and the oracles of God are part of its treasure, to Gal 4:21-31, where Israel is a Hagar-bondage, brought about by the enslaving Sinai covenant. Rom 4:16 can speak of the "seed" of both the law and faith; but in Gal 3:16, 19 there is only one seed, the seed of faith.
symbol of slavery (3:19, 4:24), and thereby stands along-
side a whole series of enslaving powers (νόμος [3:24];
ἐπιτρόποι καὶ οἰκονόμοι [4:2]; στοιχεῖα του κόσμου
[4:3]; οἱ φύσει μὴ ἀντές θεοί [4:8]; and οἱ ἄγγελοι
through whom the law is given [3:19]). This identifica-
tion by Paul of Moses with a series of enslaving powers
is made credible by certain Jewish literature which
asserted that the law of Moses was the law of nature and
the cosmos and that Moses himself was a divinized
revealer of the secrets of cosmic law and order. But
because, in Paul's eschatological scheme, the cosmos is
identified with the present evil age, such cosmic laws
could only bring bondage. It would seem that this
rather un-Pauline belittling of Moses and Israel is in
response to the particular way the opponents have of
attaching them to the cosmos and the present age.

see below, pp. 268-69, for further differences between
Galatians and Romans regarding law and Israel.

1 Schlier, Galater, p. 134; and Duncan, Galatians,
is an identification between the στοιχεῖα του κόσμου and
the angels who give the law; and existence under the
στοιχεῖα του κόσμου is existence under the law (4:5,
3:13, 23).

2 See for instance, Josephus Ant 3. 180, and
Philo, Vit Mos 1. 155-59. Other sources, such as Eupo-
lemus, Artapanus, and apocalyptic literature are cited
below (pp. 253-58). On the literature itself, see
below, pp. 200-201.

3 Josephus Ant 3. 83, Philo De Opif Mundi, etc.
The ten words from Sinai are bound up with order in
nature and make possible the σύναξιων βίος. See
Josephus Ant 3. 75, 77, etc. See below pp. 253-58.
sons of Abraham, has a central place in the opponents' propaganda.

The way Paul has heightened Abraham's role is only evident from a comparison with the way he has negated almost all other elements in Jewish salvation-history. The preeminence is given to Abraham and promise\(^1\) and to Abraham's salvation in terms of "faith alone" rather than faith and obedience.\(^2\) Moses and Israel have dropped out completely.\(^3\) Moses has become a

\(^1\) The scheme of salvation-history in Galatians is different from the one Paul uses elsewhere: Conzelmann, Theology, p. 225. In Galatians 3, the period from Abraham to Moses is missing, to heighten the preeminence of promise. In Romans 5, there is a sweep from Adam to Moses, and no Abraham (and in Romans 4, Abraham is placed alongside David to illustrate the witness of the law to the gospel). Galatians 3 contrasts law and promise, and Romans 5 contrasts law and sin.

\(^2\) There is a difference in Galatians from both Romans and Jewish tradition. In Galatians, Abraham is justified by faith, and there is no mention of his later circumcision; the covenant is confirmed with the promise, Gal 3:15-22, not with circumcision. But in Romans 4, Abraham first believes, and then is circumcised (and his circumcision is the seal of righteousness [4:11]), to prove that righteousness is by faith and not works. See below, pp. 322-24. Late Judaism used Abraham as an example of obedience to God's will. He kept the law in anticipation, and his faith was a meritorious work. See Jub 23:10, or Man 9, 2 Bar 57:2, 58:1. In 1 Macc 2:52, Gen 15:6 is attached to Gen 22:15-18 as in James, to show that Abraham's righteousness was his obedience to God's will. See StrB, 3:188-94. So Judaism stresses faith as obedience; Romans stresses faith and obedience, in that order; and Galatians stresses "faith alone."

\(^3\) Compare Romans 9-11, where Israel is a part of salvation-history and the oracles of God are part of its treasure, to Gal 4:21-31, where Israel is a Hagar-bondage, brought about by the enslaving Sinai covenant. Rom 4:16 can speak of the "seed" of both the law and faith; but in Gal 3:16, 19 there is only one seed, the seed of faith;
symbol of slavery (3:19, 4:24), and thereby stands along­side a whole series of enslaving powers (νόμος [3:24]; ἐπιτρόποι καὶ οἰκονόμοι [4:2]; στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου [4:3]; οἱ φόβει μὴ ὄντες θεοὶ [4:8]; and οἱ ἄγγελοι through whom the law is given [3:19]).

This identification by Paul of Moses with a series of enslaving powers is made credible by certain Jewish literature which asserted that the law of Moses was the law of nature and the cosmos and that Moses himself was a divinized revealer of the secrets of cosmic law and order. But because, in Paul's eschatological scheme, the cosmos is identified with the present evil age, such cosmic laws could only bring bondage. It would seem that this rather un-Pauline belittling of Moses and Israel is in response to the particular way the opponents have of attaching them to the cosmos and the present age.

see below, pp. 268-69, for further differences between Galatians and Romans regarding law and Israel.

1 Schlier, Galater, p. 134; and Duncan, Galatians, p. 21. Bornkamm, "Colossians," p. 124, notes that there is an identification between the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and the angels who give the law; and existence under the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου is existence under the law (4:5, 3:13, 23).

2 See for instance, Josephus Ant 3. 180, and Philo, Vit Mos 1. 155-59. Other sources, such as Eupolemus, Artapanus, and apocalyptic literature are cited below (pp. 253-58). On the literature itself, see below, pp. 200-201.

3 Josephus Ant 3. 83, Philo De Opif Mundi, etc. The ten words from Sinai are bound up with order in nature and make possible the τύδασίων βίος. See Josephus Ant 3. 75, 77, etc. See below pp. 253-58.
Because these terms and motifs are held so closely together by the careful structure of the argument, the sense in which Paul uses any one of them is lost when it is treated in isolation from the others. The question becomes, How can he hold all these terms together in a particular way? It is the holistic picture that Paul here creates that must be accounted for.

There are suggestions that the argument in this chapter fits well into the context suggested for it in the pages above. The parallel of 3:1-5 and 4:8-11, their particular meaning, and their place in the argument against justification by law, reveals the importance of cosmology. Law is seen only in terms of enslavement; and justification is in terms of deliverance from law and all the enslaving powers associated with it. Eschatology is central to the whole argument. Chapter 3 is built around a particular time-sequence, and the argument climaxes in the eschatological statement of 4:4. This last text grounds eschatology in Christology—particularly a Christology which stresses the humanness and humiliation of the Christ-event. The law is evaluated particularly in terms of its role in the death of Christ (3:10-14).

1 There is an evident equivalence of αἵν and κόσμος (themselves equivalents, as shown above, pp. 129-31) and ὁδὸς, when used in the sense of an apocalyptic power. In 6:14, the believer is crucified to the κόσμος; and in 5:24, those who are Christ's have crucified the ὁδὸς. This further strengthens the suggested connection between 3:1-5 and 4:8-11.
Concern for the will of God is evident in the way Paul asserts that the line of God's will as promise runs directly from Abraham to Christ. And Paul's careful but unusual treatment of Abraham, Moses, law, covenant, Israel, Jerusalem, et cetera, agrees with the picture of the intruders as efficient missionaries who at the same time claim an immediate, revelatory source for their gospel and the absolute authority of their traditions.

Above all, the central antithesis of slavery and freedom, the tyrannical powers associated with the law and the deliverance of the gospel, and the experience of the Spirit as the equivalent of justification, indicate that justification (or righteousness) is being discussed in terms of life, a continued existence through time.

Conclusions

In conclusion, it is suggested that this chapter has accomplished two things in particular. Firstly, it has elaborated the essential unity of the whole argument of Galatians in a way that tends to confirm the rhetorical analysis of the book. Indications of this essential unity are:

1. The nature and significance of apostleship and the stress on the relationship between apostleship and doctrine which appears at the beginning and the end of the book. The opponents are now community-apostles in
Galatia, thorough propagandists who have bewitched the communities

2. The continued restatement throughout the book of the reason for the debate—not only the intruders' theology but the Galatians' acceptance of it. This experience of the Galatians of beginning (πνεύμα) and ending (αἰών) is evidence essential to the debate concerning justification.

3. The eschatology at both the beginning and the end of the book, which is also directly related to the question of justification.

4. The stress throughout the book on Christology, which is the basis of the eschatology and cosmology, and which appears at the climax of the central argument.

5. The polemical interpretation of justification as life through space and time, so that both justification and ethics are different sides of identification with Christ and the cross. Justification takes the "shape" of Christology and the eschatology which derives from it; and it is against the circumcision program that Paul proclaims the life of the "new creation" (6:14).

6. The evident importance throughout the letter of baptism and the Spirit, revealed in the way the two sections of the letter (dogmatic and ethical) grow from the baptism-language of 2:19-20.

7. The function of "mots crochets" and other unifying devices in chapters 3 and 4, and the unifying
The various antitheses that run throughout the book, functioning in the typical diatribe pattern of expressing the central nature of an argument. These antitheses are slavery and freedom, law and faith, law and promise, and flesh and spirit as two ways of existence.

Secondly, as these unifying strands were developed, and as a limited exegesis of certain passages was necessary in order to understand these strands, the theology of the opponents was further elaborated.

1. The intruders are Christians, and their heresy is essentially a Christian heresy. They are evidently also of Jewish origin.

2. They have a strong sense of their missionary call, their teaching office, and the importance of their own traditions, especially law, Moses, circumcision, calendrical observances, revelations from angels, Jerusalem, et cetera.

3. Cosmology is important for them, and law has a particular place in their understanding of cosmology. What must be explained is the holistic picture that results from the terms and expressions of chapters 3 and 4.

4. The intruders have a particular Christology.
which minimises the significance of the cross and its eschatological consequences

5. The opponents are concerned about consistency in the revelation of the will of God, especially the consistency of Abraham, Moses, and Jesus. Their propaganda leads Paul to reinterpret the traditional Jewish understanding of Abraham and righteousness and to belittle Moses, probably in response to the way the opponents have related the two.

6. They have a real interest in justification (or righteousness), the meanings of the term, and the relationship between those meanings. The debate comes to center on righteousness as life, that is, the covenant relationship of righteousness into which one is brought when one is "rightwised" without works of law.

7. The language of φθορά and νεύμα, so important in the *interrogatio*, probably has a significant place in the propaganda of the opponents. These and other mystical/religious words such as ἐνδόχεοςαί and ἐπιτελείν may reveal the way in which the opponents themselves present their program.

8. They do not keep all the law. The sense in which this is true becomes evident as the debate about law as a principle moves to the particular terms of circumcision, days and months, et cetera. In rebutting them, Paul appears more Pharisaic than they, and they apparently stand in a stream which is critical of
"orthodox" Jerusalem traditions, Jewish and Christian.
PART THREE

THE TRADITIONS OF THE OPPONENTS
CHAPTER FIVE

INTRODUCTION

This part of the thesis is an attempt to avoid the suggestion of "vague combinations and hypotheses"\(^1\) by testing the above conclusions regarding the opponents, their theology, and their traditions against the "contextual evidence" of the wider literature of the Pauline period.\(^2\) The method to be used in the following chapters will in each case involve two principal steps. To begin with, the evidence internal to Galatians itself will be considered, using as much as possible the results of genre analysis and the analysis of the structure of the argument. These results will then be applied to specific theologoumena in an attempt to determine, in a preliminary way, how they are functioning in the argument. As a part of this step, and in order more fully to elucidate the "historical singularity" of the function of the theologoumena in Galatians, there will be a comparison with the way the same theologoumena are used in

\(^1\)See Bornkamm, quoted above, p. 67.

Paul's other letters, or letters belonging to the Pauline tradition.

Secondly, relevant external evidence will be assembled, and the ways in which this evidence relates to the theologoumena in Galatians and their function will be proposed and tested. It is important not only that a parallel theologoumenon be found but that it be found to be working as it is in Galatians.¹

As the external evidence is assembled, it may appear that the stones of the opponents' theological building are coming from a variety of quarries, or circles of literature.² Is this reasonable or likely?

Scholarship is becoming more and more aware that the traditional categories for the literature of the New Testament world more often impede research than assist it.³ One is able to speak less and less of "normative" Judaism or to identify Judaism of the New Testament era with the Judaism of the Mishnah.⁴ Not only is the dis-

¹In keeping with the method used by Flusser, "Dead Sea Sect," 215-66.

²To again use an analogy from Flusser, ibid., p. 217.

³So, Robinson, "Kerygma," p. 114: "The traditional categories, such as normative Judaism, Hellenistic Judaism, apocalyptic, gnostic, cultic, etc., are only blinds that cut out the fresh light. . . . " He goes on to state the need for the dismantling and resassembling of categories.

⁴Even Samuel Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1956), fond of the term "Normative Judaism," would admit to this dis-
tinction between "Palestinian" and "Hellinistic" Judaism now unacceptable or, to say the least, blurred:¹ but so also are the distinctions between "Rabbinic" and "apocalyptic" Judaism,² "Hellinistic" and "apocalyptic" literature,³ and even between Philonic, apocalyptic, and

¹See Davies, Paul, pp. 6-16; Flusser, "Dead Sea Sect," pp. 215-66, now finds the "Hellenistic Christianity" of Bultmann to be closer to Qumran, and similarly, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10," NTS 4 (1957-58):48-58, finds that even a "hellenistic" passage in Paul such as 1 Corinthians 11 shows the influence of Qumran theology. Moses Hadas and Morton Smith, Heroes and Gods (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), pp. 48-50, point out that such "anti-hellenistic" literature as the Maccabees use hellenistic literary techniques. Hengel, Judaism, 1:103-6, calls for a reassessment of the categories "Hellinistic" and "Palestinian:" from the middle of the third century BCE, all Judaism must be designated "Hellenistic Judaism" in the strict sense. Goodenough, Symbols, 12:6-9, even suggests that Palestinian Judaism was as syncretistic as Hellenistic Judaism.


Rabbinic Judaism\(^1\) and "apocalyptic" and "gnostic" literature.\(^2\) Even though one is able to speak of Jewish "apologetic" literature,\(^3\) who was this apologetic for, and

and inner-Jewish phenomenon but is a manifestation of Hellenistic-oriental syncretism. Thus apocalyptic has affinities with Hellenistic oracle-literature (Betz, "Problem," p. 138; Hengel, Judaism, 1:193, suggests only a casual relationship between Jewish apocalyptic and Iranian religion, as all extant Iranian apocalypses are rather late, and a closer relationship between Egyptian and Palestinian apocalyptic), and there are close affinities between Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom literature and Jewish apocalyptic (P. Vielhauer, NTA, 2:597-601 speaks of "undeniable connections" between wisdom literature and apocalyptic, although, against von Rad, the eschatology of apocalyptic is not in the wisdom literature; and Hengel, Judaism, 1:228, speaks of the "Hasidic apocalyptic wisdom tradition," and the three stages in the apocalyptic understanding of wisdom [207]), and between wisdom literature and the Qumran scrolls (W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," in Krister Stendahl, ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament [New York: Harper, 1957], pp. 157-82; Davies, Paul, p. 169; and Hengel, Judaism, 1:228, who notes that Qumran shares in the Hasidic wisdom tradition, and therefore stands in the religious stream of the Hellenistic world because of its understanding of "wisdom through revelation").

\(^1\)See Reicke, "The Law," p. 259, on the similar law-tradition in Philo and in apocalyptic; Betz, "Problem," pp. 155-56 on the great interest of both Philo and Josephus in the Essenes--probably because the latter belong within Hellenistic piety. Both Davies, Paul, p. 8, and Hengel, Judaism, 1:228, note the extent to which Philo and the Rabbis share cosmologies and other traditions.

\(^2\)U. Wilckens, "οοφαϊα," TDNT, 6:498-511; Davies, Scrolls, pp. 167-69; and Hengel, Judaism, 1:228-32 on the place of οοφαϊα in pseudepigraphical apocalyptic literature, Qumran literature, and Gnosticism. This is to be expected if apocalyptic and Gnosticism both belong to Hellenistic syncretism. Robinson, NHL, p. 7, notes that the latest of the dead sea scrolls meet in time and space the earliest of the Nag Hammadi texts, the Apocalypse of Adam. We can now, in the Nag Hammadi library, see the heavy influence of Jewish apocalyptic on Gnosticism.

\(^3\)Georgi, Gegner, pp. 42-54, lists as "apologe-
should it be thought of merely as "Hellenistic"? The motifs, and treatment of such motifs, commonly labelled "apologetic," have appeared even in Qumran literature,  

1 Hengel, Judaism, 1:70, notes that this literature "served only exceptionally . . . to defend Judaism to the outside world; rather, it met the particular needs of a Greek-speaking Jewish readership with an intellectual interest." See also V. Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," Eros 48 (3, 1956):169-93. On whether it should be called "Hellenistic," note how the "apologetic" Abraham appears in a similar way in the Samaritan Eupolemus, the Genesis Apocryphon (see below), Josephus, and in certain Rabbinic traditions. See authorities in Hengel, ibid., 2:61. Tcherikover, ibid., p. 87, remarks that "not everything that is termed 'Jewish Alexandrian literature' need come from Alexandria:" the literature itself was supplemented with an abundance of popular Palestinian traditions.

2 In, for instance, the Genesis Apocryphon: see Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (New York:
just as Essenes feature so prominently in so-called "apologetic" literature.¹

One further source should be stressed. Though the opponents are Jewish, and their dependence on various Jewish traditions is apparent, they are also Christians. In fact, their heresy is a peculiarly Christian one, that of seeking the law again when it has been abandoned.² Paul's polemical doctrine of righteousness by faith, without the deeds of the law, stands here not against any form of Judaism in itself, but against a merging of Christ and Judaism. Therefore some of the intruders' traditions will be Christian ones, to be illuminated from other Christian sources—though they have been found to be congruous with Judaism for an evident reason.

It does not therefore seem to be methodologically unsound to cross the traditional literary "frontiers" in pursuing the use and meaning of various theologoumena; and an opponent who should turn out to be "syncretistic" in these traditional terms is perhaps exactly what is to be expected.

¹See above, p. 200, note 1, on the place of the Essenes in Philo and Josephus. Their piety has a great appeal to "Hellenists."

²See above, p. 163 (quoting Lightfoot, Mussner, etc.).

---

CHAPTER SIX

THE TRADITION OF APOSTLE

There is a particular reason for starting with the opponents' tradition of apostleship. This tradition, perhaps more than any other, will reveal the opponents' self-understanding: and self-understanding is an important clue to one's theology and the nature of the traditions used to authenticate that theology.¹

The Function of the Tradition in Galatians

From Gal 1:1-2 "... the accusation is clear: Paul is said to have received his apostolate, not immedi-

¹Because the deity is held to be present in the emissary from God, the emissary himself is part of the "message" about God. Rengsdorf, "ἀναπτομενος," TDNT, 1:398-448, shows that, in Hellenistic usage, ἀποστέλλειν is used to unite the sender and the sent: the emissary from Rome is an impressive concretion of the Empire; the cynic, with his sense of divine authorisation, becomes, in terms of the Greek concept of the divinity of the true philosopher, a ἀνθρωπος. In Jewish tradition, too, the one sent, the משלות, embodies the one who sends him. Thus the Rabbinic saying, שותיהן של אבות צדק כמרי. Georgi, Gegner, pp. 140-70, demonstrates how Hellenistic-Jewish missionaries took for themselves a large share of the glory of the tradition-heroes they proclaimed: both became ἀνθρωπος. Furthermore, traditions about past heroic emissaries of God were used to authenticate a present emissary, so that self-understanding became a focus for traditions. See below pp. 238-41, on the "Platonic precedent" in both pagan and Jewish tradition. Again, p. 252. In Jewish apocalyptic and wisdom circles, with which this chapter is particularly interested, "the continuity of the tradition, like the idea of inspiration,
ately from God, as befits an apostle, but from men."¹ He
is charged with having received his gospel as an academic
tradition from the "pillar apostles,"² making his apos-
tolicity suspect. In the face, no doubt, of the intru-
ders' own self-claims, he must assert his independence by
pointing to his commission by ἀποκάλυψις (1:11, 12).³
It is clear that his defense of his pneumatic apostolate
is intricately bound up with his defense of the gospel.⁴
In the apostolic tradition against which Paul struggles,
an authentic proclamation must be received in a particu-
lar way, unmediated on the human level. "Purity of the
gospel and the nonmediated character of the apostolate
are inseparable."⁵
Further, the opponents must, in their absolute
rejection of Paul and the gospel (1:6-9, 4:16, 6:12), make

¹Schmithals, Paul, p. 19.

²Drane, Paul, p. 13. This in itself was not a
"heretical" position. The anti-agnostic and pro-Pauline
Acts of Paul has Paul say, "I delivered to you in the
beginning what I received from the holy apostles who were
before me, who at all times were together with the Lord
Jesus Christ" (3:4; NTA, 2:375); see also Epistula
Apostolorum 31-33, where the twelve initiate Paul into
the teachings which they received from the Lord (NTA,
2:213).

³So, correctly, Schmithals, Paul, pp. 19-20.

⁴See above, pp. 124-27.

⁵Schmithals, ibid., p. 20.
apostolic claims for themselves. Where such a view of the relation between apostle and gospel is operating, the "other gospel" could only be a real competitor to Paul's gospel if there were other apostles preaching it. These apostles must lay claim to the unmediated type of apostolate which they deny to Paul.

The very charge of Paul's dependence on the Jerusalem apostles implies a criticism of the Jerusalem apostolate too. There is a subtlety in the opposing apostolic tradition. It sets great store by Jerusalem and a particular estimate of the Jerusalem church and leadership; and yet, in the light of the charge against Paul of dependence and, even further, of the very

16:3 (εἰ γάρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι, and its proximity to the reference to οἱ δοκοῦντες in 2:6-9), suggests that the opponents apply to themselves the claims they make for the Pillars. The opponents' boasting of the winning of the Galatians in 6:12-13 also suggests that the principle of 1 Cor 9:1-2 is at work, that is, converts are a φωταγός of an effective apostleship. The same principle is at work even more forcefully in 2 Corinthians 10-13. See Georgi, Gegner, pp. 40-53; Gunther, Opponents, p. 302; Ernst Käsemann, Die Legitimität des Apostels (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956), pp. 23-30, and Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 107.

2 Schmithals, Paul, p. 20. What is more, it must be apostles who have a weighty claim to authority. See Käsemann, Legitimität, pp. 29-30. See also above, pp. 114, 127-28 on the intruders as "community apostles," based on 4:12-20. There were no numerical limits to the office of apostle in the earliest texts, see 1 Thess 2:7, 1 Cor 4:9, 9:5-6, 12:28, Rom 16:7; Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 107-9; and Georgi, Gegner, pp. 44-45.

3 See above, pp. 109-10, 124-27.

4 See the effort on Paul's part to prove that he has the authentication of the "Pillars" (2:6-9). The
circumcising activity of the opponents, despite the decision reported in 2:6-9, it can only hold a "gospel" which is in contempt of the Jerusalem pillars.¹

The opposing tradition is further highlighted by examining Schoeps' claim that it is "utilized and preserved" in the Kerygmata Petrou.² It is claimed that the document is Ebionite in theology and a witness for a direct succession from the Pharisaic ζηλωταί τοῦ νόμου of Acts 15:5 and 21:20, the τίνες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου of Gal 2:12, the παρεισάκτοι ψευδάξεις of Gal 2:4, and the opponents Paul encounters in 1 and 2 Corinthians, to the later Ebionites.³ The document's three major objections to Paul's apostleship are therefore the same as the attack in Galatia: firstly, that the apostolic office is

peculiar references to οἱ δοκοῦντες are probably to be accounted for by Paul's encounter with extravagant claims for the Pillars set up by the Judaisers—an "extravagandised" doctrine of the Jerusalem apostles, Lightfoot (Galatians, p. 107)—which are then exploited against Paul, and on the opponents' own behalf. See Käsemann, Legitimität, pp. 23-30; and Gunther, Opponents, p. 302.

¹Ramsay, Galatians, pp. 258, 326-71. The Jerusalem council reached a decision that the intruders must now be holding in contempt by conducting their circumcising mission. From 2:6-9 it is clear that Paul's commission to the Gentiles is already past history (even if this passage does not refer to the Jerusalem council), and the Judaisers, though great advocates of the Pillars, have ignored it. Also Lagrange, Galatians, pp. lxiv, 18.

²See Schoeps, Paul, pp. 82-84. For literature on the Kerygmata Petrou, see Strecker in NTA, 2:102-27.

³Schoeps, ibid., p. 68.
limited to the twelve; \(^1\) secondly, that a true apostle is authenticated by his teaching and that "Paul,\(^2\) by his attack on Peter (referring to Gal 2:11) has shown himself untrue; \(^3\) and thirdly, that a charismatic apostolate, based on a vision of the risen Lord, is quite unacceptable. \(^4\) In fact, the document plays down charismatic gifts among believers. \(^5\)

Great doubts remain as to whether the document is simply of Pharisaic descent. \(^6\) But laying this question

\(^1\)Rec 4:35. A thirteenth apostle is as unthinkable as a thirteenth month of the year. Schoeps, ibid., p. 70.

\(^2\)In the account in Hom 1:13-16, the attack is on Simon Magus, probably a veiled Paul. See Strecker in NTA, 2:103.

\(^3\)Hom 17. 19. 4-7: "But if you were visited by him for the space of an hour and were instructed by him and thereby have become an apostle, then proclaim his words, expound what he has taught, be a friend to his apostles, and do not contend with me."

\(^4\)Visions can be and usually are the work of demons, but God talks with friends "mouth to mouth." So, Hom 17. 18. 1-6.

\(^5\)Schoeps, Paul, p. 74 (referring to the Ebionite veneration of James and other members of Jesus' family as the authentic channel of tradition, which appears in Rec 1. 68, 3. 74).

\(^6\)Correctly, Strecker, in NTA, 2:103-11, who notes for instance the gnostic influence of the syzygy-doctrine of the True Prophet and the anti-Pharisaic exaltation of oral over written tradition. Other objections could be added, such as the distaste for sacrifices and the Temple (Hom 2. 44. 1-2, 15. 2.). The document is not Essene either. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and Their Literature," in K. Stendahl, ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament (New York: Harper, 1957), pp. 208-31.
aside, its objections to Paul's apostolate are not those of the Galatian opponents. For the latter, the twelve are not an authoritative group, for Paul only claims the blessing of the Pillars.\(^1\) If they were, the opponents could make no claim to apostolic authority, and would cut the ground from under their own feet.\(^2\) Further, Schmithals appears to be correct in saying that, for the opponents, the authenticity of the message is measured by the apostolate of the messenger: hence the demand for authentication by ἀμοικαλῳγεῖς (Gal 1:7-8, 11-12). This is exactly the opposite of the apostolic tradition held in Jerusalem--and in the Kerygmata Petrou.\(^3\) Thirdly, the latter document flatly rejects an apostolate based on a vision, whereas the very demand made of Paul in Galatians

---

\(^1\)Gal 2:6-10. Paul can say specifically that he saw no apostle besides Peter and James (1:18-20); see Bauer in NTA, 2:28-29. There is no concern for the Twelve here as in Acts 1-2 and later Catholic documents such as the Didache, the Churcher Order of Hippolytus, the Syriac Didascalia, the Apostolic Constitutions, etc. See Georgi, Gegner, pp. 44-45.

\(^2\)Only by such an extension of office could any footing be found for the pretensions of the false apostles. See Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 97. There seems to be a close relationship between the intruders of Galatia and those of 2 Corinthians, the ὑπερβλατον ἀμοικαλῳγεῖς (11:5) where again it is a question of strong apostolic claims. See Gunther, Opponents, p. 302. Paul finds his opponents so difficult to counter simply because there is no fixed concept of apostle in the Christian church. So, Georgi, Gegner, against Walter Schmithals, The Office of Apostle in the Early Church, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), pp. 28-56.

\(^3\)The opponents would not be likely to use the argument of Hom 17. 4-7: If you are a good apostle,
is that he give proof of his ἀποκαλύψεις.¹

Schoeps' association of the Galatian opponents with both the Pharisaic Christians of Acts 15 and the later Ebionites, by way of the pseudo-Clementines, must be questioned. But further, three characteristics of the opponents' tradition of apostle now stand out more clearly. The authentic apostolate is not the circle of the twelve, but interest centers instead in the στόλοι.² Further, the opponents make a programmatic demand for ἀποκαλύψεις and an apostolate received immediately from heaven, which guarantees the truth of the gospel. This is not merely the ἵππος ὑλή of later Rabbinism.³

Though Schmithals has in some respects assessed the opponents' apostolic tradition more correctly than Schoeps, he, too, must be questioned when he says

The Gnostic apostle is not identified by means of a chain of tradition, by the apostolic succession, but by direct pneumatic vocation. When Paul says, "Am I
don't argue with Peter. Their own mission suggests that they have done just that. See above, p. 205.

¹The logic of the pseudo-Clementines, that God only speaks face to face, leaves no alternative but to receive tradition from the original apostles. But Gal 1:6-9, with its belittling of a message received by angels, seems to have the opponents' claims in view. See Schmithals, Paul, p. 29.

²This is the only use of the term in the major Pauline epistles. See below.

³See R. Meyer, "προφητής," TDNT, 6:817-20, and 825, on the way in which this phenomenon became "strange" in the program of nomistic rationalism which eliminated all movements which did not correspond to the Pharisaic norm.
not an apostle? Have I not seen our Lord?" (1 Cor 9:1), this combination, which represents an equation, is in origin typically Gnostic.1

Schmithals' case rests partly on a distinction between "chain of tradition" and "direct pneumatic vocation." But, in the first place, Paul seems aware of no incompatibility between these two.2 In 1 Corinthians, with its stress on παράδοσις, Schmithals finds his "gnostic" formula (1 Cor 9:1; see also 1 Cor 11:23: ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου . . . ); and even in 1 Corinthians 15, it is the risen Lord who deems Paul an apostle (ἐσχάτον δὲ πάντων ὄσπερ τῷ ἐκτρόματι φθηνάμοι [1 Cor 15:8]).3 In both Galatians and 1 Corinthians, chain of tradition and pneumatic vocation are functioning dynamically together, as they did in many Jewish circles.4

1See Schmithals, Paul, p. 29.

2See above, p. 126, and references to Sanders and Drane. It was noted there too that the Galatian opponents themselves, who have set up the criterion of ἀποκαλύψεις, are extremely interested in tradition. They pay great attention to scripture and its interpretation, and the traditions of Abraham, Moses, law, etc. If ἀποκαλύψεις and tradition are not contradictory for them, we should not make them so for Paul. In fact, the essence of the charge against Paul is that he is holding a particular set of Jerusalem traditions in contempt.

3See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 251. Having quoted the tradition, he goes on to explain how he himself is involved in it--through Christ's appearing to him. Even Schmithals, Apostle, p. 25, notes that the resurrected Lord appeared to all the apostles at the time of their call (1 Cor 15:7-8).

4Hengel, Judaism, 1:136, notes that, in Jewish circles holding to doctrines of vertical revelation and inspiration, there was also a cherishing of traditions of succession. See below. Drane, Paul, pp. 61-62, claims
Secondly, Gnosticism, while undeniably exalting "direct pneumatic vocation," was also concerned with "chain of tradition." The term διαδοχή may have come into being to counter Gnostics, but it soon became the common property of Gnostics too. Schmithals' distinction breaks down within the Gnostic texts themselves.

On the other side, the Great Church showed a remarkable that, in the Corinthian context, there is respect for tradition, while in Galatia it is of no consequence. However, this could be turned around. It could be said that the problem in Corinth was a flouting of tradition (1 Cor 1:18-2:5, etc.), and that in Galatia it was an embracing of it.

This last is the source of apostolic authority and kerygma in countless Gnostic texts, which nonetheless take the form of revelatory discourse, i.e., the Apocryphon of James, Apocryphon of John, the Book of Thomas the Contender, the Dialog of the Saviour, etc. Hornschuh, in NTA, 2:86, notes that there was equal interest in παραδοσίας and διαδοχή in both the Great Church and Gnosticism.


The Gospel of Philip refers to two orders of what is διαδοχή: that held by the Great Church (55. 25-35, NHL, 134) and that held by the Gnostics ("For the Father has anointed the Son, and the Son has anointed the apostles, and the apostles have anointed us" [74. 15-20, NHL, 144]). This Gnostic claim appears specifically in Clement: "They say that Valentinus was a hearer of Theudas, and Theudas, in turn, a disciple of Paul." See Stromata 7. 17 (ANF, 2:555). The Gnostic claim to inheritance of the Pauline tradition appears in the Gospel of Truth, the Epistle to Rheginos, etc. Ptolemy, the disciple of Valentinus, makes a similar claim to apostolic tradition in his Letter to Flora: " . . . the apostolic tradition which we too have
interest in immediate, pneumatic authority.\(^1\) Schmithals' distinction is worse than "anachronistic."\(^2\) The ancient world saw no contradiction between vertical revelations and horizontal transmission of tradition,\(^3\) and it is quite invalid to isolate one from the other and call it "Gnostic."\(^4\) In Galatians there is a programmatic demand for \(\delta \pi \omega \alpha \lambda \psi \varepsilon \iota \varsigma\) and a cherishing of traditions; in fact, it received by succession. We too are able to prove all our points by the teaching of the Saviour." See ANF, 2:86. The Gospel of Philip claims to stand in the Pauline exegetical tradition (67. 9-14 [NHL, 140]).

1Papias can say, "I did not think that what was taken from books would profit me so much as what came from the living and abiding voice." See Eusebius, HE, 3. 39. 4. Hornschuh, NTA, 2:82-84 cites similar references in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, noting that Clement sometimes even called it \(\pi \alpha \rho \delta \delta \sigma \varsigma\).

2So labelled by Georgi, Gegner, p. 40.

3From a different circle again, see the opening of the Mithras liturgy, where \(\delta \pi \omega \alpha \lambda \psi \varepsilon \iota \varsigma\) is juxtaposed with \(\pi \alpha \rho \delta \delta \sigma \varsigma\).

4Schmithals has presented his case more fully in his book *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church* (see above, p. 206). He first denies a direct connection between \(\alpha \pi \delta \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron \alpha \varsigma\) and \(\pi \rho \omicron \omicron \tau \iota \tau \omicron \varsigma\) (pp. 105-9), to discredit any supposed connection between "orthodox" Jewish tradition and the Christian office. Then he asserts that the title and office of \(\alpha \pi \delta \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron \alpha \varsigma\) must be traced back directly to Gnosticism. However, in all the Gnostic materials he presents, there is no use of the term \(\alpha \pi \delta \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron \alpha \varsigma\); and in all Christian Gnostic materials, there is no apostle of the New Testament era other than the twelve. It was quite characteristic of both the Great Church and Gnosticism to single out some disciples as preeminent (W. Bauer, NTA, 2:42). But within Gnostic literature there is apostolic authority given only to those within the circle of the twelve (plus Paul). Further, in the Gnostic tractates Pistis Sophia and the Books of Jeu, the twelve as a body are extremely highly regarded (Bauer, ibid., p. 40)—as they are not in Galatians. Schmithals rests heavily on the assumption that
appears that vertical revelations make tradition a live issue.

Further characteristics of this demand for ἀποκάλυψεις in Galatians should now be examined. Schmithals appears correct in positing that the same widely held criteria of apostleship which are functioning in Corinth (the demonstration of religious power and authority by gaining a large following [1 Cor 9:1-2]; the σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα which signify an apostle [2 Cor 12:11-12]; and the experience of ὀπτασία καὶ ἀποκάλυψεις which divulge hidden, heavenly secrets [2 Cor 12:1-11]) are also at issue in Galatians. This is evident from the concept of the twelve apostles originated in Antioch (unproven); and he ignores the great amount of evidence linking Gnosticism to apocalyptic Judaism (see above, p. 200).

The wide distribution and significance of these criteria are evident from the way they are applied to Paul in order to authenticate him as an apostle in Acts 14:8-18, 28:6, and especially 19:11-20, which describe his healing miracles and his competition with Jewish exorcists. See Elizabeth Schüsser Fiorenza, "Miracles, Mission, and Apologetics," in Elizabeth Schüsser Fiorenza, ed., Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), pp. 9-11. See also Richard E. Oster, "A Historical Commentary on the Missionary Success Stories in Acts 19:11-40" (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1974), pp. 39-40, referring to the traditional picture of the Jewish wonder-worker in Josephus Ant 8. 2. 5, 20. 5. 1, 20. 8. 6 (the last two references are to apocalyptists); Juvenal Satire 6. 547, and Lucian Traj 1173.

Schmithals, Paul, p. 30; also Gunther, Opponents, pp. 300-2. There are several close parallels between the intruding theologies of Galatians and 2 Corinthians: both exalt the Mosaic covenant; both make powerful apo-
6:12-13 (the opponents' boast of the winning of the Galatians),
3:5 (the criteria of the presence of the Spirit and the working of miracles),
and 1:8 (the opponents' apparent boast of angelic revelations). This would explain why it is that the revelatory source of Paul's apostolate, which must have been widely known and of which even the opponents must have been aware, has not been accepted in Galatia. 2 Corinthians 12 makes it clear that this same tradition of apostle demanded that the recipient of the authenticating vision should preach himself as a pneuma-self and recount his visionary experiences. The simple claim to have seen the Lord stolic claims; both proclaim "another gospel" (2 Cor 11:4), and both set store by ἀποκαλύψεις.

1 To be placed alongside the opponents' claims as "community-apostles." See above, pp. 114, 128.

2 Probably the opponents' criteria. See Mussner, Galater, p. 29, and above, p. 114.

3 So Paul begins the narratio with Ἡχούσατε . . . (1:13). See above on the significance of this, in conjunction with the expected function of a rhetorical narratio (pp. 106-7). Paul is here giving no new information. This is confirmed by a form analysis of the accounts of Paul's "call." Munck points out the use of the one literary form, an Old Testament prophetic call (particularly modelled on the calls of Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah), in Acts 9:15-19, 22:6-11, and 26:12-18, on the one hand, and Gal 1:11-16, on the other. See Paul, pp. 13-35. This suggests that the tradition of understanding Paul's call in this way was a long and well established one. See also Mussner, Galater, p. 69. Schmithals, Apostle, p. 31, notes that, even by the time of 1 Corinthians, ἀποκαλύψεις and δόξα have become technical terms for this event, based on 1 Cor 9:1, 15:7-8.

4 Schmithals, Paul, p. 30.
(Gal 1:11-12, 15-16; 1 Cor 9:1-2) is not enough.\(^1\) In the face of the opposing apostolic tradition Paul has not authenticated himself as a true apostle until he has divulged the contents of the ἀποκάλυψις (2 Cor 12:1-10).\(^2\) The person is to be identified with his revelation, and divulging of heavenly secrets is a way of speaking about oneself as an apostle.

It seems significant that Paul should claim authentication of his apostleship, in Galatians, in terms of a prophetic call.\(^3\) The suggestion is that, for the Galatian opponents, authentication is to be in terms of a prophetic tradition. There is some evidence that, in

\(\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{1}}\)In terms of popular expectations of those who received ἀποκάλυψις, Paul pointedly revealed very little of the content of these revelations. He no doubt wishes to minimize any question of impartation of hidden knowledge in his revelations and to make this criterion irrelevant for the question of his apostolic rights. So, Munck, \textit{Paul}, p. 35; and Schmithals, \textit{Apostle}, pp. 25-27. Paul took strong steps to prevent his own extraordinary experiences from being organically linked with his apostolate. See Rengsdorf, "畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛畛RequiredMixin.

\(\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{2}}\)Schmithals, \textit{Paul}, p. 30. The apostle has to preach himself as a pneuma-self (2 Cor 4:5, 10:12), and may not withhold his ecstasy from the community (2 Cor 5:11, 13) but must produce the ecstatic σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου as proof of his apostolate. See also Schmithals, \textit{Apostle}, pp. 32-40. Paul uses ἀποκάλυψις and δραμα to refer to his "call" (Gal 1:12, 16; 1 Cor 9:1, 15:7-8), but the opponents understand something quite different by these terms and are not satisfied with the recounting of the Damascus experience. So Paul is pushed to divulge the ὅτασσαι καὶ ἀποκάλυψις κυρίου of 2 Cor 12:1-10.

\(\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{3}}\)Though Christian tradition does more frequently, Gal 1:15-16 is the only place that Paul himself refers to his apostolate in these terms. See Schmithals, \textit{Apostle}, p. 56.
early Christianity, the office of ἀπόστολος was con­
nected with that of προφήτης. Rengsdorf has noted some
relation between ΠΝΨ and ἀποστελλέων.\(^1\) The early church
connected the two titles,\(^2\) as does Eph 2:20, in a context
where there are other significant theological tenden­
cies.\(^3\) In the above tradition of apostle there is the
suggestion that visionary-revelatory experiences were
connected with prophecy.\(^4\) So Paul may have had to deal
with a tradition in which an apostle was to be validated

ΠΝΨ is often used on connection with the call of a
prophet, as in Isa 6:8. 3 βασιλεύσει 14:6 uses ἀπόστολος as a
translation of ΠΝΨ; and 1 βασιλεύσει 4:6 in Aquila equates ΠΝΨ
and ἀπόστολος, as does Symmachus' rendering of Isa 8:2.

\(^2\) Did 11:3 speaks of ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφήται and
discusses the apostle in terms of the "true prophet."
Clement Hom 11. 35 equates the two, as does Origen,
Celsus 6. 9, and Tertullian de Pudicitia 21; see Rengs­
dorf, ibid.

\(^3\) There is a vertical dualism (2:5-7), the concept
of the church as the temple of God (2:19-21), which has
significant parallels in other circles (see below), and a
democratizing of revelations (1:17-19). In Colossians,
so close in many ways to this letter, the false φιλοσοφία
shares the above tradition of revelations, claiming to
possess special παράδοσις and basing the content of its
teaching on mysterious vision. So Bornkamm, "Colossians,"
p. 126.

\(^4\) See 1 Cor 13:2 (ἐὰν ἔχω προφητείαν καὶ εἰδώ τὰ
μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνώσιν . . .). The language
used here seems to be closely related to the central
issue behind 1 Corinthians. Flusser, "Dead Sea Sect,"
p. 249, notes that Paul here takes up the language of the
opposition. This verse connects προφητεία with μυστήρια
and γνώσις: but Paul attempts to separate prophecy from
these phenomena, and to understand it in terms of procla­
mation of the word (1 Cor 14:1-5, 23-25).
by traits connected with prophecy.¹

The apostolic tradition is further revealed in the opponents' relationship with the Galatian communities. They have completely displaced Paul as the community apostle (οὐτε ἐξορθὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἄληθεύων ὑμῖν, 4:16).² The language of 4:14 (οὐκ ἔξουσεν θοντης οὐδὲ ἔξεπεσατε) suggests that they have made him scorned and despised (spat out!). No doubt they have their own counterpart of Paul's apostolic curse (1:8-9) under which Paul now stands. Their propaganda has resulted in a complete reversal of the estimation of him; he is a "weak" apostle, an imperfect physical specimen, and therefore is no longer fit company for those who fellowship with angels (4:14), as the opponents evidently claim to do (1:7, 3:19).

The opposing tradition is revealed further in 4:17, ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν. . . . Several meanings have been suggested for the phrase,³ which may not be exclusive of each

²It is interesting that Acts, which portrays Paul's apostleship somewhat in terms of the opposing criteria, also portrays Paul especially as one who makes prophetic predictions (20:22-23, 21:10-13, 27:22-26 etc.). In his letters, he claims the prophetic gift, but with a different understanding of prophecy— as proclamation of the word (1 Cor 14:6, etc.). See R. Meyer, "προφητείας," TDNT, 6:848.


³That the opponents seek to exclude the Galatians from the law-free gospel (Burton), from Paul and the Gentile church (Zahn, Lietzmann, Oepke), from Christ...
other. Paul sees a vital relationship between Christ, the church, and the apostles of the church, and exclusion from one would imply exclusion from all. In that the intruders are apologists for certain Jerusalem traditions, at the same time rejecting the Jerusalem leadership in important senses, the verb ἐκκλείειν probably refers to their separatist, exclusivist program and self-understanding. Further, they are hierarchical separatists, demanding positions of honor and separation from the common members of the sect itself (ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς ἡλύουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ἠλούτε [4:17]; ἡλύουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῆσονται [6:13]). Their "extravagandising" of the office of the Pillars (2:6) is probably accompanied by an "extravagandising" of themselves.3

This self-understanding lends weight to the suggestion that in 4:26 (ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα

and His grace (Lightfoot, Schlier), from fellowship with the original community (Lagrange), or from fellowship with the apostle (Mussner, Galater, pp. 310-11).

1 Paul vigorously fights against a view that would fragment this relationship (1 Corinthians 3 and 9). Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 71-72, 151-53.

2 Schmithals, Apostle, p. 83, notes how often Jerusalem occurs in Paul's alibi: 1:17 (he did not go up to Jerusalem); 1:18 (after three years he went up to Jerusalem); 2:1 (fourteen years later he again went up to Jerusalem); 2:6-10 (he received a commendation in Jerusalem). Apparently, for the intruders, Jerusalem is the center of the true gospel.

3 See above, p. 205.
Paul has picked up a slogan of the intruders and twisted it against them. Such a slogan would be appropriate for those who extravagandize themselves as superlative apostles of Jerusalem traditions, to such an exalted state that they are above human weakness and suffering, and accords well with the other aspects of the tradition that are at work: the concern for proofs of an apostle that demonstrate an impressive presence of God, such as visions, converts, and magical or miraculous powers. There seems to be a consistency between self-understanding and theology.

In looking for possible sources of such a tradition, it will be essential to hold these and other facets together, such as concern for the στόλοι and interest in prophetic authentication. Further, the most likely sources will be those in which the tradition is being used in the same way as in Galatians.

Possible Sources of the Tradition of Apostle

The opponents' demand for the heavenly vision should have first attention. Interest in both the experience and the content of ἄποκαλύψεις, in Hellenistic times, appears even in non-Jewish literature. But the later

---

1 For instance, Mussner, Galater, p. 327: "Damit entreisst der Apostel den Gegnern ihr Schlagwort und reklamiert es für die ohne Werke des Gesetzes Glaubenden." Also Schlier, Galater, 159-61.

2 For a brief summary, see Hengel, Judaism, 1:84, referring especially to Menippus in the fourth century.
examples in the apocalyptic New Testament apocrypha, the Fathers, and even in Gnosticism all have features suggesting that they are drawing on common origins in Jewish apocalyptic literature. Apocalyptic insisted that an authentic message must come by revelation, for written revelation had hardened, and any new word had to come by

and Alexandrian literature in the third BCE. He posits that Jewish apocalyptic literature largely took over this genre of heavenly and hellish journeys.

1For instance, the Ascension of Isaiah, Hermes Vis 1.1.3-4, etc.

2For instance, in Irenaeus, Demonstratio 9, the Epistle of the Apostles 6, and Clement of Alexandria, Strom 4 (ANF, 2:508-13).

3As well as the more Gnostic versions of this tradition in, for example, the Apocryphon of John, On the Origin of the World, etc., Gnosticism has produced apocalypses which show a heavy dependence on Jewish apocalypses, such as the Apocalypse of Paul, two apocalypses in the name of Jesus, and the Dialog of the Saviour. George W. MacRae, commenting on the Apocalypse of Adam, notes that it not only depends heavily on Jewish apocalyptic tradition. It also has no explicitly Christian themes and may be a transition document between Judaism and Gnostic apocalyptic (NHL, 256). Further on the close connection between apocalyptic Judaism and Gnosticism, see George W. MacRae, "The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth," NovT 12 (1970):97-112, and James M. Robinson, NHL, 7 (quoted above, p. 200).

4For examples of the heavenly vision, see 1 Enoch chaps. 12, 17, 36, 71; and Test Lev chap. 2. Jean Danielou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, trans. John A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1964), has demonstrated that many theologoumena that appear in the Fathers, in Gnosticism, and in the apocalyptic New Testament apocrypha can be traced back to apocalyptic Judaism. See especially chaps. 1 and 2, and pages 173-78. Hengel, Judaism, 1:204-5, comments on the importance of the heavenly journey in apocalyptic. There is a need to stress the spatial as well as the temporal elements of the literature.
The new "prophetic self-awareness" was at work now in "inspired" interpretations of prophetic writings. The one difference to the Galatian tradition is the characteristic of pseudonymity. This rule was broken in favor of contemporaneity of the visionary experience—as it was in Galatians—in Qumran and the early church.

The content of validation required by the opposing tradition also appears close to apocalyptic Judaism. 2 Cor 12:1-4 refers to only three heavens, typical for apocalyptic Judaism. The later Christian apocrypha

1 Hengel, ibid., 1:202: "The apocalyptic Hasidim ground their "wisdom" in a claim to direct divine revelations." Also Oepke, "καλότος," TDNT, 3:563-92; Russell, Method, p. 84.


3 Russell, Method, pp. 127-37, has argued that this characteristic does not mean the apocalyptist has a lesser sense of being a visionary. Pseudonymity was probably used because the apocalyptist wrote with an overwhelming sense of identification with the seer himself; because the apocalyptist had a sense of contemporaneity with the seer, sharing the same visionary experiences; and because the appropriation of a name was understood as an extension of personality.

4 Hengel, Judaism, 1:205, suggests that, in each of these cases, this was because of the "collective authority" of the Spirit at work in the community.

5 Danielou, Theology, p. 174. 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch know of only three heavens: the multiplication to seven heavens seems to belong to later Christian modification of Jewish apocalypses. 2 Enoch 8 speaks of paradise in the third heaven, although in chaps. 11-36 Enoch travels on to the tenth heaven. Paradise is in the third heaven in Apoc Mos 37:5. In the α-rescension of Test Lev 3:1-4
commonly speaks of seven heavens, the early Fathers speak mostly of eight, and Gnosticism multiplies the process even further.

As well as in apocalyptic literature, the phenomenon of visions and journeys appeared in other quarters in Judaism. But the community in which these experiences were both programmatic and contemporaneous was that there are only three heavens, but in the Resurrection there are seven.

As well as the Christian portions of 2 Enoch and Test Lev, see Ascension of Isaiah, the Gospel of Peter, and the Apocalypse of Peter.

For instance, Irenaeus, Demonstration 12. 761, Clem Alex Stromata 4. 25. 159, and the Epistle of the Apostles chapter 17, referring to the Ogdoad, which is the ッブロツッ. Danielou, Theology, p. 176, proposes that this suggests a dependence on Plato, Republic, 11. 616b, which speaks of seven heavens and an eighth, and other Hellenistic literature.

The Origin of the World and the Sophia of Jesus Christ both refer to the Ogdoad, probably using the same Hellenistic traditions as the Fathers. See Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 43. Valentinian Gnosticism is fond of ten heavens, perhaps showing Stoic influence (i.e., the Apocryphon of John). The Gospel of the Egyptians has twelve heavens, Eugnostos the Blessed refers to 360, and Basilides refers to 365. Jonas, ibid., p. 44. It is interesting that the Nag Hammadi tractate the Apocalypse of Paul (NHL, 239-41) combines and takes up Gal 1:15-16 and 2 Cor 12:1-4, building on Jewish apocalyptic, and has Paul journey on from the third heaven to the fourth, and then to the tenth.

The rabbis speak of the four who entered Paradise: Ben Azzai, Ben Zoma, Aher, and R. Aquiba (Hahigah 14b). On the third heaven as paradise, see StrB, 3:531-33. Philo took his heavenly journeys. See Spec 3. 1-3, "I had no base or abject thoughts . . . but seemed always to be borne aloft into the heights with a soul possessed by some God-sent inspiration, a fellow-traveller with the sun and moon and the whole heaven and the universe. . . ."
of the Qumran sectaries.\(^1\) This is evidenced firstly in the "Pesher," the community's particular way of "knowing" Scripture.\(^2\) The "Pesher" is a way of predicting what is "presaged" in Scripture so as to corroborate that the "latter days" have set in. Its affinities are not with Rabbinic literature but with apocalyptic.\(^3\) In the Qumran community, scripture is "known" particularly in an apocalyptic sense. Secondly, "knowledge" was of central importance to the sectaries.\(^4\) Here it was entirely a gift of God to the elect, a result of divine revelation.\(^5\)

\(^1\)Hengel, Judaism, 1:205. He notes, ibid., pp. 228-32, that the Qumran community shared the "Hasidic wisdom tradition" of apocalyptic literature, as well as showing a great interest in collecting apocalyptic literature.

\(^2\)See Isaac Rabinowitz, ""PESHER/PITTARON": Its Biblical Meaning and Its Significance in the Qumran Literature," RQ 8 (1972-75):219-32, who has demonstrated, from an examination of six principal "Peshers" of the community (1 QpHab 12:1-10, 6:8-12, 5:1-8, 4 QpHos\(^a\) 2:8-14, 4 QpNah 3-4, 2:1-2, and 4QPss\(^a\) 37:1-2, 2:4-5), that the title does not simply mean "interpretation" or "commentary," but a presaging of an emergent reality, tightly closed up in scripture, which requires disclosure by one endowed with special "revelatory" skills.

\(^3\)Rabinowitz, "PESHER/PITTARON," p. 231.


\(^5\)For instance, CD 11:3, "For He from the well-spring of knowledge has made His light to burst forth, and mine eyes have gazed on His wonders; and the light
It was only the Spirit who brought the knowledge of these mysteries and insights, which included insights into the cosmos, its order and organization, and the powers which rule over it. This revelatory "knowledge" was so divinely effectual that it actually lifted its participants above earthly existence and made them co-dwellers with the angels in the supernatural realms.

It appears that the intruding Galatian tradition demanded authentication of an apostle in terms associated with prophecy. Therefore circles showing an interest in prophecy in some form will now be examined.

---

1 For instance, 1 QH 12:10 refers to God as the "God of knowledge" and proclaims, "Behold, for mine own part, I have reached the inner vision, and through the Spirit Thou hast placed within me, come to know Thee, my God" (Gaster).

2 1 QH 1:1016. See below on understanding law in Qumran.

3 For instance, 1 QS 11:6-9, "Through His mysterious wonder light is come into my heart . . . a virtue hidden from man, a knowledge and subtle lore . . . these has God bestowed on them He has chosen, . . . He has given them an inheritance in the lot of holy beings, and joined them in communion with the sons of heaven (ὅσιες ἡγεῖτε; note the similarity to Eph 1:3, and 2:19 [συμπολίται τῶν ἀγγέων]). See Gaster, Scriptures, p. 235, to form on congregation, one single communion, a fabric of holiness. . . ." Supernatural knowledge also brings communion with the δυνάμεις and a share in the lot of the Spirits of knowledge, in 1 QH 3:19-24. In 1 QH 6:12-14 they need no intermediary between themselves and God and are answered directly out of His mouth. See further, Meyer, "προφητής," TDNT, 6:823.

4 See above, p. 215.
Prophecy was not as absent from inter-testamental Judaism as is sometimes suggested, although Rabbinism as it is now known does not seem to be representative in this respect. For Philo, all the great religious figures of Israel’s past were prophets, and he believed himself to have had prophetic/ecstatic experiences. Josephus too, by his reporting of prophetic activity in Palestine, indicates the great interest of Hellenistic Judaism in prophecy. Besides the reference to the

1Meyer, "προφητεία " TDNT, 6:813-14. Zech 13:6 may in fact suggest lively ecstatic-prophetic activity; Psalm 74 may be dated at the time of the Exile, and have nothing to say about postexilic prophecy; 2 Bar 85:3-4 is probably referring to the dogma of a canonical period of salvation, as in Josephus Apion 1. 41, and in fact 2 Bar 48:34-37 suggests charismatic phenomena at the destruction of the Temple. 1 Macc 4:46, 9:27, 14:41 can be read to understand that prophecy was active again in Israel under the leadership of John Hyrcanus—just as Josephus, Ant 13:299 attributes to him "the rule of the nation, the office of high priest, and the gift of prophecy."

2Ibid., p. 816. The Rabbinic tradition "aimed at restricting the rise of legitimate prophecy to an ideal classical period in the past" and managed to hold together with difficulty two opposing remnants of the continuation of prophecy, the ἐπίσκοπος (StrB, 1:127, 133) and the "wise men."

3For instance, Heres 295-365 on the patriarchs as prophets.

4He describes prophecy as an ἐκστάσεις of the ἐνθουσιασμόν and θεоφόρησις which can even be called a μανία, where the divine presence of God must entirely displace the rational (Heres 265). Though this suggests Platonic concepts of inspiration, there are Jewish elements, such as connection of prophecy with contemplation of scripture (Som 2. 252), and veneration of the exegete as the true prophet.
prophetic office of Hyrcanus,¹ and even to Pharisaic prophets,² it is among the Essenes that he reports the greatest prophetic activity. As well as Manoemus³ and Simon,⁴ there was Judas, evidently head of a whole prophetic school.⁵ These prophets have predictive prowess because of their "virtue,"⁶ their purificatory rites,⁷ and their ceaseless study of the "prophets," the "holy books," and the "ancients."⁸ Their gift of prediction was probably a sign of the possession of the "prophetic spirit."⁹ Josephus himself had his own prophetic vision, fulfilled miraculously in the career of Vespasian.¹⁰

¹Ant 13. 299.
²Ant 17. 41-44. There are other ecstatic-prophetic manifestations in earliest Rabbinic Judaism, such as the activities of Gamaliel 2, Samuel R. Akiba, R. Meir, R. Simon b. Jochai: see Meyer, "προφητίας," TDNT, 6:823-24. However, by the end of the century such activity was becoming "strange" to official Judaism, ibid., p. 825.
³Ant 15. 373-75.
⁴Ibid., 17. 346-47.
⁵Ant 13. 311-12.
⁶Ant 15. 379.
⁷Bell 2. 159. Hengel, Judaism, 1:240, suggests that this makes Essene prophecy differ considerably from that of the Old Testament.
⁸Bell 2. 159, 136. This literature may not have been completely "orthodox," as the last reference links this prophecy with miraculous healing based on inquiry into the secret properties of roots and stones. The "holy books" may have at least included apocalyptic writings, and perhaps astrological and magical writings too. Some aspects of this description are reminiscent of Philo's Ἐπάθευται in De Vita Contemplativa.
⁹Hengel, Judaism, 1:240.
¹⁰Bell 3. 350-51.
An even wider form of "prophetic" activity was the literature produced by the "Hasidic apocalyptic wisdom tradition," especially the Jewish apocalyptic literature.¹ This "new prophecy" now took the form of inspired interpretations of prophetic writings.² There is often a clear imitation of Old Testament prophetic models and authentication in Old Testament prophetic terms.³ Here wisdom and prophetic consciousness are intertwined: wise men acquire prophetic features, prophets become wise men, and the scribe and the prophet are no longer distinct.⁴ What is even more interesting about this prophetic tradition is its authentication of itself in terms of a succession of heroic personalities of the past.⁵

¹Ibid., 1:228-32; and 217, Jewish apocalyptic was a part of a larger Hellenistic movement of higher wisdom by revelation.

²Ibid., pp. 134, 206. See also Russell, Method, pp. 187-94.

³Russell, ibid., p. 187. Munck, Paul, p. 31, notes the way the new prophetic message is authenticated in 1 Enoch 14:8-16:4—there is a bright light, the sight of the Lord on the throne, divulgence of heavenly secrets, and the command to prophesy, in clear imitation of Old Testament models. There is also a striking contrast to Paul, in that there is much more attention to the divulgence of what was seen on the heavenly journey.

⁴Hengel, ibid., pp. 206, 136. Georgi, Gegner, pp. 122-23, notes that, in the New Testament period, apocalypticist and prophet were associated together. Essenes, Zealots, and Pharisees all had their prophets. On the Zealot prophets, see Josephus Bell 2. 258, Ant 20. 97, 168. These apparently were messianic prophets who promised to work wonders and signs, always analogous to the great events of Israel's past salvation history.

⁵See Hengel, Judaism, 1:136; and below, pp. 238-41.
In the light of Josephus' portrayal of the Essenes, and of the "prophetic" characteristics of the apocalyptic wisdom tradition (in which the Qumran community shared)^1 it is interesting to examine the role of prophecy in Qumran. The community had a messianic expectation, probably at least partly in terms of a messianic prophet, though the question is complicated.\(^2\) The Teacher of Righteousness also had the prophetic task of explaining the words of the prophets.\(^4\) In this sense, the prophet has again become a contemporary figure.\(^5\) Further, 1 QM 11:7-8 speaks of "Thine anointed, the men who had vision of things foreordained," a group evidently

^1See Hengel, ibid., pp. 229-32, and below.

^2While exercising certain cautions. There is the undecided relationship between the Qumran community and the Essenes (see Fitzmyer, in Schechter, Sectaries, pp. 15-16. The description of the Essenes in Philo, Josephus, and Hippolytus is not always easy to square with the Qumran texts. Milik has proposed as a solution four different kinds of Essenes--those in Qumran, the "mother community," those in Damascus (CD: though the name may be metaphorical), those in the towns and villages of Palestine, and the ᾲθανατοι of Egypt. And there is the difficulty of the general question of prophecy in Qumran. See Meyer, "προφήτης," TDNT, 6:826 (but now see Hengel, Judaism, 1:207).

^3See, for example, Ringgren, Qumran, pp. 197-98, and the discussion of the messiah(s) in Qumran. Gaster, Scriptures, p. 63, suggests that 1 QS 9:8-11, "Until the coming of the Prophet and of both the priestly and lay messiah" may refer to the prophet of Deut 18:18, the forerunner of the two messiahs.

^4Ibid., p. 183. See 1 QpHab 2:8, 7:4. He, like Paul, sees himself as chosen from the womb in analogy to Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah (LQH 9:29-32).

^5Ringgren, Qumran, p. 168.
designated as prophets, reminiscent of Josephus' Essene prophets.\(^1\) CD 2:12 also refers to "the anointed" in the plural, men to whom God has "revealed His Holy Spirit" and "disclosed the truth," that is, men with a prophetic function.\(^2\)

The community has a prophetic self-consciousness further in that it shares in the apocalyptic wisdom tradition, in which knowledge and insight come by direct revelation and inspiration.\(^3\) There is great interest in contemplation and exposition of scripture,\(^4\) reminiscent of Josephus' Essene prophets.\(^5\) But it must be remembered that exposition of scripture is a mystical/apocalyptic task.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Ringgren, *Qumran*, p. 168.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 167.

\(^3\) In Essenism, Hasidic wisdom becomes saving knowledge, eschatological saving knowledge for both the individual and the community. See Hengel, *Judaism*, 1:228. Here "revelation" is direct inspiration (ibid., p. 222).

\(^4\) Wherever ten members are present, there shall be a "man who searches in the law" to inform the group of what he has found (1 QS 6:6-7, 8:11-12). The whole community exists for the task of safeguarding the true exposition of the law (CD 6:1-11). See Gaster, *Scriptures*, p. 6.

\(^5\) Gaster, ibid., p. 299. See the references in Josephus above, p. 226.

\(^6\) So, divine revelation is needed, even if one is to know the mysteries of the divine revelation in scripture (1 QH 12:11-13). קְנֵי is in fact a correlative of תֵל. See Rabinowitz, above, p. 221, and Gaster, *Scriptures*, p. 299. There is a close association of such terms as "knowledge" and "understanding" with "reveal," "enlighten," "appear," and, above all, קְנֵי and תֵל. See Hengel, *Judaism*, 1:223.
The exegete is the "wise man,"\(^1\) the "wise man" is the "prophet,"\(^2\) and vision and ecstasy are the confirmation of the "prophetic wise man."\(^3\) In this sense, in particular, the prophet has become a contemporary figure in Qumran.\(^4\)

Thus there were circles in first-century Judaism which showed great interest in a contemporary prophetic manifestation that has affinities to the demands the opponents apparently make on Paul's apostleship. The Qumran sectaries, in particular, maintained the apocalyptic traditions of Judaism, insisted on a "knowledge" that could only be attained through immediate access to God and that authenticated one as being in contact with God, saw themselves as the ultimate expositors of scripture, and had a self-understanding in terms of which they were on the one hand separated from the rest of mankind and even Israel and, on the other, lifted into the company of the divine and other-worldly powers and made one community with angelic beings.

\(^1\)See the association of wisdom, knowledge, the secret, etc., above.

\(^2\)Hengel, Judaism, 1:136 notes that a collection of psalms from 2 Q makes even David a soper filled with "an understanding and enlightened spirit" who composed all his 4050 psalms "in prophetic inspiration."

\(^3\)Hengel, ibid., 1:207; Russell, Method, pp. 164-73.

\(^4\)In distinction from other Jewish apocalyptic tradition. See above, p. 222.
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Possible parallels to the self-understanding of the Galatian opponents will now be sought in two respects: in terms of a self-designation such as "heavenly Jerusalem" and of an understanding of the community that could lead to interest in the στὺλος.

The Rabbis spoke of a heavenly city called Jerusalem,¹ as did Philo, though he used the expression in his own particular way.² But apocalyptic literature seems to provide the most relevant parallels. It spoke of a heavenly, eschatological city, a counterpart of the earthly Jerusalem,³ though having a strong continuity with earthly and historical Jerusalem.⁴ The traditional,  

¹StrB, 3:22, 532, 573, 796. These seem often to be lingering traces of more apocalyptic language. See Strathmann, "πόλις," TDNT, 6:528-29.

²It belongs with his view of the religious man as the κοσμοπολίτης and his state as the original world (Opif 142-44). Any sense of history and eschatology is weakened. See H. Braun, "Das Himmlische Vaterland bei Philo und im Hebräerbrief," in Otto Böcher and Klaus Haacker, eds., Verborum Veritas (Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), pp. 319-27. Jerusalem is the soul of man in whom God moves about ὡς ἐν πόλει (Som 2. 248), and one seeks the "true city" within his soul (ibid., 2. 250).

³The material is conveniently summarized in Schlier, Galater, pp. 157-58; Moore, Judaism, 2:341-43; Strathmann, "πόλις," TDNT, 6:525, Mussner, Galater, pp. 325-27. See 2 Bar 4:3-5, 5:1-4, 32:2-4, 1 Enoch 90:28-29 ("... a new house greater and loftier than the first..."), 4 Ezra 7:26 ("... the city that is now invisible..."), 10:27, 13:36 (Sion shall come . . . ").

⁴Moore, Judaism, 2:342-43, the new Jerusalem takes the place of the old and is in many ways old Jerusalem.
national hopes of Judaism still win out.¹

Because of the way apocalyptic sees a dynamic relationship between things on earth and things in heaven,² and because of its doctrines of predestination and the remnant,³ the apocalyptic visionary, or wise man, in effect participates already in the future redemption.⁴

¹Russell, Method, pp. 297-300, summarizes the attitude of apocalyptic to the other nations and to Israel. Its eschatological hopes are on the whole nationalistic. The righteous equal Israel, the wicked equal the Gentiles. There is a generous attitude to Gentiles in the Sibylline Oracles 3, Test Benj, Lev, and Naph; but the attitude is harsh in 2 Baruch, most of 1 Enoch and especially the Similitudes, the Psalms of Solomon, Jubilees, the Assumption of Moses, and 4 Ezra.


³See Koch, ibid., pp. 30-31; and Gerhard von Rad, Wisdom in Israel, trans. (R. McL. Wilson) (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), p. 273, on the way the idea of determinism, God's control over history, and pessimism concerning the future, is bound up with the remnant: "Even the concept Israel begins to disintegrate."

⁴On the apocalyptist as the "wise man," see above, pp. 227-28, and references; and von Rad, Wisdom, p. 277. Participation in God's plan and control of the cosmos now takes a new form, the gaining of secret wisdom; and it is the "wise" who now come through the final crisis. See Dan 2:20-22, 12:3, etc. See the "wise man" and his predestined future glory in 1 Enoch 100:6, 105:1—the "wise" have future security assured. In 4 Ezra 7:43 Israel (or the remnant), already chosen of God, in a sense anticipates her eternal destiny: "I will rejoice over the few that shall be saved, inasmuch as they it is that make my glory prevail now already. . . . " So God comforts Ezra with the slogan, "Things present (match) them of the present, things future them of the future" (8:46; see also 7:15-16 and 1 En 104:1-4), and assures him, "For you is opened paradise, planted the tree of life," etc. (8:52).
The remnant can be called the "children of heaven," who understand themselves in the present better by contemplating future certainties than by contemplating common human mortality. They are already, in a vital sense, "children of Jerusalem above."

This is no "realized eschatology" in the sense of removal of the tension between this age and the age to come; rather, it intensifies the tension between the ages and assures the righteous that they are on the verge of the regeneration of all things.

The Qumran literature seems to make no mention of a heavenly city called Jerusalem. Jerusalem at present is the abode of the wicked, is to be the center of the final eschatological war, and is to be afterwards restored to paradisal conditions. But in the present the community sees itself as a supramundane dwelling

---

1 Enoch 101:1, "Observe the heaven, ye children of heaven."

2 4 Ezra 7:15-16, "Why disquietest thyself that thou art corruptible? .. . mortal? Why hast thou not considered what is to come, rather than what is now present?"

3 There is no question about the intense future expectations of the apocalyptists. See von Rad, Wisdom, p. 276. As noted above, p. 220, apocalyptic had spatial and vertical as well as horizontal elements.

4 A good summary of secondary material is in Mussner, Galater, pp. 324-27. Hengel, Judaism, 1:223, refers to the idea of heavenly Jerusalem in Qumran, but this writer has not been able to find it there in the strict sense.

5 QpIsa a.

place of the holy angels and God, having real though invisible communion with the heavenly world. And the community sees itself as, in a sense, "Jerusalem."\(^2\) This again does not seem far from the self-designation, "Heavenly Jerusalem."\(^3\) And again, this consciousness of a realization already of heavenly citizenship does not reduce the intensity of future hope.\(^4\)

This self-understanding of the Qumran community may have a further parallel with the self-understanding of the Galatian intruders. Gal 4:12-20 suggests that they have introduced a profound change in attitude to Paul in his weakness and infirmity. Now one with a physical defect cannot be accepted as a genuine apostle.\(^5\) The Qumran community, too, excluded any with bodily

\(^1\)See the above references to 1 QS 11:6-9, 1 QH 3:19-24, etc. 1 QH 6:14 concludes, "They are thy courtiers, sharing the high estate of [all the heavenly beings]" (Gaster).

\(^2\)1 QpMic 1:5, commenting on "High places of Jewry, that is, Jerusalem," says, "This . . . refers to those who expound the law correctly, . . . and to all who are willing to join His elect . . . when the latter meet together in the communal council."

\(^3\)This is in keeping too with the strong sense of being the remnant. For instance, in 1 QS 2:25 they are the "ideal society of God" who have separated themselves from apostate Israel. This is not just one feature of their ideology among many, but lies at the very heart of it. See Flusser, "Dead Sea Sect," pp. 215-66.

\(^4\)Though the eschatological gifts of salvation were already in the community, they were only so incompletely, and "this did not exclude a future expectation," Hengel, Judaism, 1:223.

\(^5\)See above, pp. 146-47, 217.
defects—because of the presence of angels in the congregation.\(^1\) Perhaps the opponents' preoccupation with angels has given them another reason for rejecting (spitting out!) Paul.

Sources such as the literature of apocalyptic Judaism and Qumran do reveal a self-awareness that could coincide with the opponents' claim to be "heavenly Jerusalem;" and these are the same sources that have a great interest in apocalyptic-mystical revelations and present manifestations of prophecy. In both these sources, the awareness of being the companions of the celestial beings is accompanied by a strong sense of being a "remnant."\(^2\) At the same time, there is a strong sense of continuity between earthly and heavenly Jerusalem, Jerusalem of the past and Jerusalem of the future. The opponents, too, see

\(^1\)See 1 QSa 2:3-11, "No one who is afflicted with a bodily defect or injured in feet or hands, or who is lame or blind or deaf or dumb, or who has a visible blemish in his body, or who is an old man, tottering and unable to stand firm in the midst of the congregation of the men of renown, for holy angels are (present) in their [congregation] . . . ." Also in 1 QM 6:4-6, and two other more recently published MSS reported in J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10," NTS 4 (1957-58):58 (provisionally designated 4 QDb and 4 QMa), bodily defects are to be excluded from the presence of angels, and therefore from the congregation of the elect. It is interesting that, in Gal 4:12-20, Paul was once accepted as an angel, but no longer.

\(^2\)For further material on the "remnant" concept in late Judaism, see Gerhard F. Hasel, "Remnant," IDBS, 736. He notes the Qumran covenanters' fondness for this self-designation. On the other hand, "In Rabbinic thought the remnant idea recedes, and all Israel has part in the future world."
Jerusalem still as the center of holy mysteries and zealously maintain certain religious traditions of the past associated with Jerusalem (Abraham, Moses, the law, circumcision, etc.). In these circles, as among the intruders, Jerusalem of the past and Jerusalem of the future, the world above and the world below, are being held together; and it is the community of the elect that holds them together.

But for Paul, in Gal 4:21-31, the new aeon has come, and is manifested "in Christ,"¹ and in such a way that there is only discontinuity between the earthly and heavenly, Jerusalem past and present (i.e., future).² If his opponents were Gnostics, then he has here badly misunderstood them, for this is similar to the way in which they presented their own system of the two Jerusalems.³

¹Schlier, Galater, p. 159. For Paul, as for apocalyptic Judaism, heavenly Jerusalem represents the new aeon. The startling thing about his language is that the new aeon is now present. This accords with his stress elsewhere in Galatians on "realized" eschatology. See above, pp. 129-31, etc.

²This is not a Platonic dualism, but a salvation-historical dualism resulting from the stress on Christ's death in history. See Schlier, ibid., pp. 159-60.

³Gnosticism's two Jerusalems, earthly and heavenly, are opposite aeons standing over against each other in the typical dualistic pattern of syzygies. So, Schlier, Galater, p. 160; Mussner, Galater, p. 327; Pagels, Paul, p. 110. Instances belong mainly to Valentinian or Naasene Gnosticism. The doctrine is part of a cosmic-material dualism which extends to φύσις and becomes the basis for an attack on Judaism (Gos Phil 69. 30-35 [NHL, 142]) or the "psychic" Christians of the Great Church (Origen, Comm Joh 13:16, 19, 60, etc.).
Paul is here almost a "Gnostic apostle." But over against the self-designations of apocalyptic circles, the dialogical force of his language makes perfect sense. He has taken up the very designation of the opponents in order to break the continuity between the traditions associated with earthly or present Jerusalem and heavenly Jerusalem.

Finally, possibilities arising from the use of στόλος in Galatians should be considered. Only three more times is the word used in the New Testament, none of them in Paul's major epistles. Barrett and Wilckens have suggested that the concept of the apostle as Pillar comes from an apocalyptic context in which the church or community is seen as the Temple of God. Early Christianity saw the community in this light, as did the Qumran community, with its strong sense of sharing in the ναός.

Pagels, Paul, pp. 9-10. It is for this reason that the opponents cannot hold a position similar to that of Philo or Gnosticism, where the two Jerusalems are contrasted: Paul's antithesis would be no polemic against them. See Mussner, Galater, p. 327.

στόλος is used in Gal 2:9, 1 Tim 3:15, Rev 3:12, 10:1. The use is clearly apocalyptic in Rev 3:12; and 1 Timothy uses it in connection with the community as God's temple.


The church is the temple of God in 1 Cor 3:16 and Eph 2:21; and the Qumran community is seen in this way in 1 QS 5:5-6, 8:5-6, 9:6, 11:8, 1 QH 1:34, 2:24, etc.
Moreover, the Qumran community was ruled over by an inner group of twelve laymen and three priests, reminiscent of three Pillars of Galatians. Thus the terminology and its function suggest that Paul is authenticating himself in the terms of a group that is close to apocalyptic circles.

Self-understanding and Tradition

From the above analysis, the probable demands made of an apostle by the Galatian intruders can be filled out. He must meet a programmatic demand for revelations and for the esoteric preaching of the content of those revelations. He must be one who can give evidence that he has communed directly with God, since "knowledge," that is, understanding of scripture, comes only in this way. He must manifest certain characteristics of the prophet. His message must embody the traditions associated with historical Jerusalem, and he must represent the community which is the link between past and future Jerusalem, the remnant, who are in a sense already an angelic community. He must be a "prophetic wise man," in keeping with the "Hasidic apocalyptic

\footnote{Which is a synonym for God Himself. See 1 QH 1:34, 2:24 etc.}

\footnote{1 QS 8:1. The parallel to Gal 2:9 has been pointed out by Sherman E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," in Stendahl, Scrolls, pp. 133-34; and Gaster, Scriptures, p. 39.}
wisdom tradition" and its understanding of revelation and inspiration.

This chapter began by pointing out that there is a general consistency, in religious propaganda, between the messenger and the message, and the self-understanding of the emissaries and the religious traditions used to maintain that self-understanding.  Those who spoke of God's δόξα present through men in a certain way (that is, in themselves) maintained careful traditions of past heroes, divine men in whose lives the divine was manifested in a congruous way.

This phenomenon is demonstrated by the way Socrates, especially as portrayed in Plato's Apology, became a pattern for various forms of religious propaganda for centuries.  This method of "proclamation by

1 More recent works devoted to this phenomenon are Georgi, Gegner; Hadas and Smith, Heroes; Tiede, Charismatic; and Fiorenza, ed., Religious Propaganda.

2 Tiede, Charismatic, p. 52. The reason for aretalogical propaganda is the focus on the personality of the hero because of an understanding of the nature of the divine presence and style of religious life. And put more simply by Hadas and Smith, Heroes, p. 9, an aretalogy is "a hagiography for a cult."

3 See Hadas and Smith, ibid., p. 17, on the importance of the Platonic image of Socrates. Tiede, Charismatic, pp. 55-99, traces the way two different "Socrates" developed, to authenticate two different ideas of the ὁρμός: the miracle-working Socrates appears in Xenophon, etc., while Diogenes Laertius' Socrates preserves the rationalist image. Following their models, Lucian of Samosata's Appolonius of Tyana was a ὁρμός because of his miracles, whereas Philostratus' Appolonius of Tyana was a ὁρμός because of his wisdom as a philosopher.
aretalogy" was widely used in Judaism as well.¹ In fact, there was even a use here of the "Socratic tradition."² The "Hasidic apocalyptic wisdom tradition," with its particular understanding of revelation and inspiration, had its own version of "aretalogy." There was the "praise of the Fathers,"³ a hagiographic way of writing history,⁴ and the presentation of wise men and prophets

¹Hengel, Judaism, 1:111, notes that the word ἀρεταλογία appears for the first time in Jewish literature in Sirach 36:13. Tiede, Charismatic, pp. 101, 237-40, has examined the different "aretalogical" portrayals of Moses and Abraham in "apologetic" Jewish literature. Since there are different ideas of miracle and presence of God in Judaism, just as there are in Paganism, there is a different Abraham and Moses in Philo, Josephus, and Artapanus. Holladay, Theios Aner, covers much of the material dealt with by Tiede and concurs with him on this point (p. 19). He seems to be correct in asserting that the term ἰερος θεός ἀνήρ is too ambiguous to be the basis for Christological discussion (pp. 236-42). But both he and Tiede may be in error in assuming that the central question in the discussion of the term is authentication of claims to divinity by miracle. The main concern behind the Jewish use of ἰερος θεός ἀνήρ may be to point to extraordinary manifestations of the presence of God, especially in terms of knowledge of the secrets of nature and control over nature. Whether this control is to be called "miracle" may be beside the point. Hengel, ibid., p. 111, sees typical aretalogies in the legend of Heli- odorus in 2 Macc 3 and in the Prayer of Nabonidus from Cave 4 at Qumran.

²See Hadas and Smith, Heroes, p. 88, on the portrayal of Eleazar in 4 Macc in terms of the suffering Socrates; and Haenchen, Acts, p. 517, on Paul in terms of Socrates in Acts 17:22-31 (see above, p. 99).

³Hengel, Judaism, 1:136, notes that the "praise of the fathers" in Sirach "is reminiscent of the glorification of the heroes in Hellenistic times with its biographical genre de virus illustribus."

⁴See Hengel, ibid., p. 99, where he notes that apocalyptic, too, shares this way of viewing history. He gives references (2:61) to the Genesis Apocryphon etc.
as heroic personalities who authenticated themselves by an unusual demonstration of the presence of God.\textsuperscript{1} Perhaps the favorite character in these hagiographic histories was Abraham, who brings to civilization the oldest of all wisdom.\textsuperscript{2}

It is for this reason that the opponents' self-understanding, as reflected in the tradition of apostle, looks forward to further theologoumena to be considered. Heroes of Israel's past figure prominently in the debate in Galatians; and the tradition of apostle and the self-understanding of the opponents stands close to circles which cherished particular images of these heroes, and for particular theological reasons.

\textsuperscript{1}See Hengel, ibid., 1:136; and on Abraham and Moses in these presentations, below, pp. 253-57.

\textsuperscript{2}Hengel, ibid., pp. 89-90; see below, pp. 253-56.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE TRADITION OF ABRAHAM AND SEED OF ABRAHAM

The Function of the Tradition in Galatians

It has been noticed above that the Stichwort "Abraham" dominates chapters 3 and 4.\(^1\) This must be for polemical reasons. It is no doubt the opponents who have made Abraham a central figure in the debate.\(^2\)

The opponents use a tradition in which Abraham reveals the way to God for Gentiles. To the question, πῶς ὁ θεὸς διαλαλεῖ τὰ ἔδωκε; comes the answer, "As He did Abraham" (3:8).\(^3\) There must be a real concern for the conversion of Gentiles, even though Paul belittles the motives behind the concern (4:17, 6:12, 13).\(^4\) As noted

\(^1\)Mussner, Galater, p. 216; see above, pp. 187-88.
\(^2\)Mussner, ibid., p. 217.
\(^3\)Bligh, Galatians, p. 167.
\(^4\)Against Jewett, "Agitators," pp. 200-201, who argues that the opponents were motivated not by missionary concerns but by Zealot pressure against Christians in Judea in the forties and fifties. They hoped that, by circumcision Gentiles, they would remove charges that they were a threat to the Jewish state and avoid persecution for the cross of Christ. He thus makes the opponents teach circumcision for expediency. But Galatians shows that they taught it as an essential for salvation. See above, pp. 140-44. Jewett's argument might explain the circumcision activities of Gal 2:1-5, but why a circumcision mission in Galatia? There are records of circumcision campaigns in Judea (below, p. 335), but not
above, the opponents are vigorous and effective missionaries. Abraham apparently provides a model for their prospective converts, and for themselves.

The way of δικαιοσύνη that Abraham demonstrates for Gentiles is the way of obedience to the law, and the εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ is to be received by works (3:10-14). When, in 3:15-18, Paul asserts that God gave Abraham the κληρονομία by ἐπαγγελία, and not by νόμος, it must be because the opponents have asserted the opposite. Abraham to them is the one who demonstrates perfect obedience to the law¹ and therefore demonstrates that Gentiles must keep the law.

This model of Abraham as the one who perfectly obeys the law suggests that the opponents assert a close relationship between Abraham and Moses. To the question, "Who are the sons of Abraham?" comes the answer, "Those who follow Moses."² It may be for this reason that, when Paul separates Abraham from Moses in 3:15-18, he must then go on to answer the question, τί οὖν ὁ νόμος, in 3:19-25. His separation of the two has created a problem elsewhere. Even if the opponents were placating another party, circumcision of Gentiles would satisfy that party only if there were some sort of mission-consciousness. Jewett finds no way of relating the opponents to other missionary but anti-Pauline Christian movements.

¹Mussner, Galater, p. 317.

²Bligh, Galatians, p. 166. They may have taught that the Mosaic law is the explication of the demand to walk before God and be perfect.
where none existed before.¹ This same polemical intent shows through in 4:21-31, where Sinai is made a mountain in Arabia which only engenders bondage—a rather un-Pauline assessment of the Mosaic covenant.² Sinai has an important part in the argument in which Abraham is at the centre.

The opposing tradition evidently asserts that those who follow Abraham and keep the law, even Gentiles, are σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ or υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ.³ These terms play such a central part in the debate (3:7, 16, 29, 4:5, 22, 26, 31) that they cannot have been casually introduced. They are bound up with interest in the κληρονομία which is the legitimate property of the σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ (3:18, 29; 4:1, 7), perhaps the glories of the age to come.⁴

The polemical nature of this title is evident from the way its use differs in Romans.⁵ There the term

¹ Paul refers to Moses only as the μεσίτης, (3:19). This reluctance to even name him may indicate even more his important place in the debate. See below, pp. 263-64.

² Compare Rom 9:4-5, 10:5-13, 7:12. See below, pp. 279-81.

³ Mussner, Galater, p. 221. In these terms Paul is taking up the claims of the opponents, not only for their converts to circumcision, but for themselves. See Georgi, Gegner, pp. 51-82, on the use of the title by the Corinthian opponents; and also Barrett, 2 Corinthians, pp. 293-94.

⁴ See Ridderbos, Paul, p. 273. Paul gives an eschatological answer to his opponents in 3:16, 28-29. See also Foerster, "κληρονομία," TDNT, 3:784. He who belongs to the Messiah is the true σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ.

⁵ Mussner, Galater, pp. 216, 221, has noticed this.
is used in the context of the Jewish claim of physical
descent from Abraham and exclusiveness of salvation as
the privilege of the Jew. So Paul asserts in Rom 4:16,
εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιῶν τὴν ἐπαγγέλλαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι,
οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραὰμ.
Here there is some seed of Abraham ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, an
impossible suggestion in Galatians, and one which would
destroy Paul's schematic salvation-historical argument.¹
In Romans 9 the argument of the "children of promise"
(9:8) is used to validate the principle of the remnant
(9:27)—there has always been a people of promise, a
nation within the nation. But in Galatians Christ is the
promised seed (3:16) who comes at a fixed point in time
(3:19, 24), and only after that time does the collective
σπέρμα come into existence (3:29; 3:23, 24). Before
Christ the people of Israel were νήπιοι, under ἐπιτρόποι
καὶ οἰκονόμοι or the στοιχεῖα τοῦ νόμου (4:1-3).
Before the coming of the Son (4:4), there was no sonship
in the sense of σπέρμα that receives the κληρονομία (4:5,
Ἰνα τὴν υἱοθετήσαν ἀπολάβωμεν).² Only in the present time
of redemption in Christ will Paul speak of σπέρμα, νίκες,
and entrance into the κληρονομία. Evidently, in Romans,
¹On the different salvation-historical schemes in
Galatians and Romans, see above, pp. 188-89.
²Whereas, in Rom 9:4, "adoption as sons" was a
privilege of Israel.
Paul addresses Jews who appeal to the title ἕπωμα Ἄβραμ to exclude Gentiles from redemption. His answer is, There are two seeds, one of νόμος and one of πίστις. But in Galatians the question is not that of physical descent at all;¹ it is an appeal to Abraham as the exclusive way of salvation for both Jews and Gentiles. So Paul takes up this same exclusiveness and reinterprets it.

This suggests something about the opponents' soteriology. For them, a man is designated ἕπωμα Ἄβραμ by law-righteousness. In 2:14, the whole stress comes to fall on Ἰουδαῖος ζην and Ἰουδαίζειν,² not Ἰουδαίος ἑθνικὸς. Such stress is reminiscent of the message of John the Baptist in Luke 3:8 ("Do not . . . say . . . 'We have Abraham as our father;' for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham") and of some circles within Judaism which saw themselves as a "purified" Israel. It is not far from saying that one a Jew by descent is not one of the ἕπωμα Ἄβραμ to saying a Gentile is one of the ἕπωμα Ἄβραμ, if he lives as a "true" Jew and meets all the requirements of the covenant of Abraham.³ Such a

¹Mussner, Galater, pp. 221-22, makes this contrast.
²On Ἰουδαίζειν, see above, p. 142.
³That Paul in Romans may actually use an Abraham-argument close to the one used by the opponents in Galatia, see below, pp. 322-26.
soteriology would be consistent with the reform mentality of the opponents, their separatism, and their upholding of the traditions of Jerusalem, while flouting the leadership of the Jerusalem church.

The propaganda regarding Abraham and the law is intensely appealing to the Galatians, Gentiles though they are. Under its spell they have apostatised ῥαξεως (1:6) and are in grave danger of submitting to circumcision wholesale. 1 This is so unusual in the Hellenistic world as to call for a particular explanation. 2 Not only must a tradition of Abraham be sought which encourages a Gentile mission. It must also be one which makes that mission particularly attractive and compelling to Gentiles.

**Possible Sources of the Tradition**

Judaism widely portrays Abraham as demonstrating the way to God for Gentiles. He is himself a ἄγιος, a proselyte, the first to come from heathenism to true religion. 3 In Philo and Josephus, as well as in other Jewish literature, Abraham is the first to know and declare the one true God, the Creator, whom he came to

1 This is the force of the way Paul always refers to the Galatians collectively. They are all equally in danger of this heresy. See above, pp. 57-58.

2 On the rarity of the full conversion of Gentiles to Judaism, see below, p. 322.

3 Gen R. 3a(246); Mekilta Mishpatim 18; StrB, 3:195.
know from the observation of natural phenomena.¹
Rabbinism declares him to be the father of proselytes,²
who leads the whole world to repentance,³ and demonstrates God's love for proselytes.⁴ He represents a
standard for all proselytes.⁵

It was also widely understood that Abraham's example was one of perfect obedience to the law. Faith
was a work or meritorious deed,⁶ and Gen 15:6 (Gal 3:6)
was linked with Gen 22:15-18 as in the book of James:
Abraham was righteous before God because he kept the law
by anticipation and was perfectly faithful in temptation.⁷

¹Philo, Virt; Josephus Ant l. 155-56; also
Artapanus, Aristobulus, and especially Eupolemus, in
Eusebius, Praep Evang 9 and 13. Sources used for this
material in Eusebius are M. Seguier de Saint-Brisson,
La Préparation Evangelique d' Eusèbe Pamphile, 2 vols.
(Paris: Gaume Freres, 1846); and Albert-Marie Denis,
ed., Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graeca
(Leiden: Brill, 1970). See also Hengel, Judaism,
1:88-95, 2:60-65; and Georgi, Gegner, pp. 79-80.

²Tanch B ג'ג stuff, 6 (32a); Jub 18:15-18, 24:11; StrB,
3:539-40.

³Gen R. 30:39.

⁴Sifre Deut 47; Moore, Judaism, 1:344-45;

⁵Georgi, Gegner, p. 81.

⁶StrB, 3:188-91; Schoeps, Paul, p. 215.

⁷1 Macc 2:52: "Was not Abraham found faithful
when tested, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness?"
See 2 Bar 57:2, 58:1-5; Abraham was justified by works,
and so also will Israel be justified, if she obeys the
law. See also Jub 18:15, 24:11; StrB, 3:186; Ziesler,
Righteousness, pp. 99-103; and Mussner, Galater, p. 218.
For Philo, too, the outstanding characteristic of Abraham was his perfect obedience.\(^1\) He had his own version of the tradition, based on Gen 26:5, that Abraham kept all the laws of Moses in anticipation.\(^2\) It was "unwritten nature," not "written words," which taught him these commands.\(^3\)

Thus Abraham demonstrated that the proselyte must take upon himself circumcision, the sign of the Abrahamic covenant, and obey all the commandments of the law.\(^4\) In all these respects there is nothing in the opponents' use of Abraham that does not accord with widely held Jewish teaching.

As well as the tradition itself, it is important to ask about the function of the tradition; and it is

---

\(^1\) Abr 60: "Abraham . . . filled with zeal for piety, the highest and greatest of virtues, was eager to follow God and be obedient to His commands."

\(^2\) Gen 26:5 is also referred to in Qid 4:14. Abraham knew the Torah and kept it perfectly. See StrB, 3:186.

\(^3\) Abr 275, referring to Gen 26:5.

\(^4\) Sifra on Lev 19:34: "As the native born is one who takes upon him all the commandments of the law, so the proselyte is one who takes upon him all the commandments of the law. Hence the rule: A proselyte who takes upon him all the commandments of the law with a single exception is not to be admitted." See Moore, Judaism, 1:345. The main texts for acceptance of proselytes are Yebamot 47a-b, and Gerim. Sanders, Paul, p. 206, notes that the requirements cannot be precisely recovered but admits that the formal definition of a true proselyte was one who intends to obey all the commandments. See also Bernard Jacob Bamberger, Proselytism in the Talmudic Period (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1968), pp. xxi-xxix.
here that some circles of Judaism may not qualify as prospective sources of the opponents' theology.

Abraham and his obedience is especially important to much of Judaism, not for his significance for Gentiles as much as for the founding of the covenant with Israel.\(^1\) God's choice of Israel is explained in terms of the meritorious actions of the ancestors, particularly Abraham,\(^2\) and the covenant that is made is unconditional.\(^3\) All Israelites have a share in the world to come because of this covenant and its meritorious founder,\(^4\) who becomes the basis of the teaching of zekut' abot, the merits of the fathers which are available to all physical descendants of Abraham.\(^5\) The interest, then, is in those who are already members of the covenant by virtue of the obedience of Abraham: Gentiles are dealt with only sporadically.

Abraham here principally serves the interests of Jewish exclusivism, as he evidently does in the Jewish arguments in Romans (see above). In keeping with this, 

\(^1\)Sanders, Paul, p. 90.

\(^2\)Sir 44:19. Because of the faithfulness of Abraham in testing, his seed was established and would rule from sea to sea, etc. See StrB, 3:187.

\(^3\)Sanders, Paul, pp. 96-97.

\(^4\)Sanh 10:1; Mekilta Mishpatim 10; and Sanders, Paul, pp. 147-51.

\(^5\)See StrB, 1:116. Sanders, Paul, pp. 183-84, disputes the idea that these merits could be transferred to others, but his argument may be a semantic one.
a proselyte is never called ἐπέρμα ᾿Αβραὰμ. He may be called a Ἁγαθὴ ἔργον,1 but he never stands in Israel on equality with native Israelites and may have no share in the merits of Abraham. Different attitudes towards the Gentiles prevailed in different circles and at different times,3 but on the whole the title ἐπέρμα ᾿Αβραὰμ was used in the service of Jewish isolation.4 Abraham bolstered the Jewish assurance of salvation5 and contributed to the very opposite of a missionary understanding.6 It is doubtful that the opponents' missionary zeal, connected with a traditional understanding of Abraham, could be derived from such sources.

Over against this exclusiveness based on Abraham there must be placed on the one hand, the interest of

1Mekilta Mishpatim 18:20; Sanders, Paul, p. 206.

2Bik 1:4, on Dt 26:3-4. The proselyte cannot say "our fathers." When he prays alone he must pray, "The God of the fathers of Israel," etc. See also Numbers Rabbah 8. The proselyte cannot claim the merits of the fathers. See StrB 1:119.

3Sanders, Paul, p. 209. See Bamberger, Proselytism, for a positive presentation of Jewish proselytism (he gives four pages of materials unfavorable to proselytism, and eight pages of favorable material. But are pages to be counted or weighed?).

4Georgi, Gegner, p. 63.

5Thus Mekilta Mishpatim 10: "For the heathen nations there will be no redemption . . . Beloved are the Israelites, for the Holy One, blessed be He, has given the heathen nations of the world as ransom for their souls. . . . " See Sanders, Paul, p. 150.

6As in 3 Macc 6:3; John 8:33, 39; Targ Ps 22:31; Georgi, Gegner, p. 82; and Mussner, Galater, p. 217.
some Jewish literature in Gentiles, and, on the other hand, a great interest of Gentiles in Judaism. The latter is probably to be accounted for at least partly by the former. It may be the treatment of Abraham in such literature that explains the opponents' zeal for both Abraham and for converts—and for the Galatians' own sudden enthusiasm for the religion of Abraham, which must certainly be accounted for.\(^2\)

This Abraham who would appeal to Gentiles is

\(^1\)Josephus Apion 2:282: "The masses have long since shown a keen desire to adopt out religious observances... as God permeates the universe, so the law has found its way among all mankind." See also Philo, Vit Mos 1:4-21, 209. Judaism appealed as a school of foreign philosophy (Moore, Judaism, 1:324); and this form of appeal is to be seen also by the way Tacitus, Suetonius, and Juvenal align Judaism with the mystery-cults. See the summary in Georgi, Gegner, pp. 102-5. Goodenough has also described the form in which Judaism was so appealing to the Hellenistic world. See Symbols, 12:3. Georgi feels that there may have been an explosive growth in Christianity, making the latter possible. See Gegner, pp. 84-86. Jean Juster, Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain: leur condition juridique economique et sociale, 2 vols. (New York: Burt Franklin, 1965), 1:209-10, estimates that there may have been four times as many Jews in the Diaspora as in Palestine, with perhaps 6-7 million Jews in the Roman empire. Georgi suggests that this large number must be largely due to conversions. Avigdor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews, trans. S. Applebaum (Philadelphia: Jewish Publishing Society of America, 1959), pp. 292-93, is more cautious, arguing that there proselytes would not have been numbered among Jews anyway. Certainly, complete conversion to Judaism was rare. See below. Tcherikover suggests that there must have been a large number of half-proselytes (God-fearers, Sabbatarians, etc.) who remained officially outside Judaism. This would satisfy Josephus' statement: it does appear that Judaism was very attractive in this semi-official form.

\(^2\)As noted by Drane, Paul, p. 82, among others. Jewett, "Agitators," p. 202, suggests that a particular
found in what is commonly called "apologetic" literature, though very little of it was probably written with the specific intention of winning converts.\(^1\) Rather, it is given its significant characteristics because it has adopted "Hellenistic" methods of propaganda and presentation, especially Hellenistic historiography.\(^2\) Further, the literature is not particularly "Hellenistic" or "Palestinian" in a geographic sense;\(^3\) its motifs and theology are common property of a wide segment of Judaism, including some apocalyptic literature.\(^4\) It is significant, too, that this way of portraying Judaism began to come to an end after CE 70;\(^5\) and as it did, so did a form of Judaism may have already appealed to the Galatians before Paul introduced them to Christianity.

\(^1\) See p. 201 above. Hengel, Judaism, 1:70, sees an apologetic aimed at outsiders only in Philo and Josephus.

\(^2\) See p. 200 above; and Hengel, ibid., 1:88, 91; and further below on the "Hellenistic" Jewish approach to history.

\(^3\) See p. 199 above, quoting Hengel to the effect that all Jewish literature of the period could be called "Hellenistic." Tiede, Charismatic, p. 107, citing Reitzenstein, points out that the aretology itself, and "divine man" propaganda, cannot be accounted for from a Greek background alone but shares in Oriental religious currents. Similarly, Hengel, ibid., 1:112.

\(^4\) See Hengel, ibid., 1:91. The "apologetic" Abraham of Josephus and Artapanus also appears in the Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran and, to a degree, in Jubilees. See below.

\(^5\) Hengel, ibid., 1:100, notes that after CE 70 Judaism broke off these historical accounts and began to concentrate instead on ahistorical halacha and haggada.
particular way of portraying its heroes.¹

There are certain reasons why this "apologetic" Abraham should be taken into account here. Firstly, there is the different attitude to history and, therefore, to the heroes of history, after AD 70;² the Abraham of the Rabbinic material may not altogether be the Abraham of Paul's day.³ Secondly, the literary circles to which the opponents' tradition of apostle has affinities shared this interest in hagiographies that authenticated a certain self-understanding.⁴ And thirdly, though missionary zeal was not characteristic of any Jewish circles in particular,⁵ a missionary impetus would be encouraged by the apologetic Abraham, and this Abraham would make the missionaries and their propaganda more appealing to Gentiles.

¹There would no longer be the same impetus to portray Abraham as the father of all culture and wisdom, etc. The suggestion of this change in the portrayal of Abraham is in Gen R. 44. 10, "You are a prophet and not an astrologer."

²See above, referring to Hengel, Judaism, 1:100.

³That is, the Abraham of Paul's time, even the Abraham of some apocalyptic circles, may now be traced more clearly by taking into account the literature of the "Hasidic wisdom tradition."

⁴See above, p. 240.

⁵It has been noticed above that, in apocalyptic literature, a Gentile mission was encouraged in Tobit 14:6-7, Test Naph 8:3, Test Asher 7:3, Test Jos 19:11, Test Benj 9:2, and Sib Or book 3; but this was by no means representative of apocalyptic attitudes to Gentiles. See above, p. 251, on the same ambivalence in the material assembled by Bamberger from Rabbinic sources.
The basis of this "apologetic" writing was the Hellenistic approach to History, now adopted by Judaism, and resulting in a New Jewish interpretation of Greek learning, cults, and mythology. Abraham was given a leading place in this interpretation. He was portrayed first as the philosopher-king, astronomer, and father of all culture. He was forced to flee Chaldea because his knowledge of cosmic phenomena, and his deduction from it of the Creator God, infuriated the Chaldeans. His journey to Egypt was in fact a religious quest, and, while there, he introduced the Egyptians to arithmetic and laws of astronomy. Thus the sciences travelled from the Chaldeans to Egypt, whence they passed on to the Greeks. He was thus the father of all cultures.

1 See above, p. 240, on these attempts to combine the biblical narratives with Babylonian-Greek mythology in order to confirm the truth of the Old Testament and to present Judaism as the most ancient and reasonable wisdom.


3 This tradition appears in Josephus, *Ant* 1. 155-60. In Philo, too, Abraham is the originator of astrology, which is part of the essential knowledge of God (*Virt* 212-19). He rules as a prophet-king in Damascus (*Ibid.* 219), and the heathen world acknowledges that he is a unique representative of the divine: "thou art a king from God among us" (*Abr* 261). In Eupolemus, too, Abraham belongs to the race of supermen, discovers astrology and art, and teaches the Phoenicians astrology and wisdom. See Eusebius, *Praep Evang* 9 (summaries in Hengel, *Judaism*, 1:88-92). In Artapanus, Abraham teaches Pharethones astrology (*Praep Evang* 9:18); and in Cleodemus Malchus, Heracles marries a granddaughter of Abraham (see Hengel, *ibid.*, 1:74).

4 See Georgi, *Gegner*, p. 64. Hengel, *ibid.*, 1:90
The portrayal also rests on a particular understanding of the relationship between natural and divine law, and law as the key to cosmic order. Because Abraham understands the secrets of the universe and God, he has remarkable control over it. This is demonstrated in his role as inventor, impressive to the Hellenistic interest in technology and technological improvement,¹ and his prowess as a wonder-worker and impressive representative of God,² who baffles the Egyptian priests and terrifies Pharoah.³

In this literature, the "apologetic" Abraham was closely linked with an "apologetic" Moses. Often the two are portrayed in parallel terms.⁴ As Abraham is portrayed

notes this role of Abraham in Eupolemus, Aristobulus, Artapanus, and Josephus. But further, this association of Abraham with astrology made its mark on apocalyptic literature, making astrology highly prized in Palestinian and Qumran apocalyptic literature (p. 91). See below.

¹ So, in Jubilees 11:23, Abraham is the inventor of the plow, and in Artapanus Abraham is placed alongside the Greek hero Heracles, the bringer of divine order and human prosperity (Eusebius, Praep Evang 9:18).

² Tiede notes that the image of wonder-worker is stressed more in Josephus and Artapanus than in Philo. However, Philo still thinks in terms of the θεῖος αὐτρι (Virt 177), but his natural theology has "taken over" miracle. See above, p. 240.

³ Josephus Ant 1. 155. In the Genesis Apocryphon, too, Abraham is the magician and wonder-worker who confounds the sages of Egypt, and who alone can heal Pharoah's plague and exorcise the spirit. See Gaster, Scriptures, pp. 366-67. A similar portrayal of Abraham is in Jubilees.

⁴ Georgi, Gegner, pp. 147-48.
in terms of Heracles, so Moses is equated with Musaeus and Hermes and is the teacher of Orpheus. As Abraham is the father of philosophy, astronomy, and culture, so Moses taught the Egyptians philosophy and cosmology. As Abraham came to understand the secrets of the cosmos and natural law, so God revealed to Moses the secrets of law and cosmic order. Both Abraham and Moses are prophets, inspired by God. Moses, like Abraham, must confront and defeat the Egyptian priests in a contest of divine powers. It may be that this "apologetic" equation of Abraham and Moses is connected with the opponents' association of the two.

This tradition may explain why the opponents should find it natural to appeal to the Galatians in terms of Abraham. It may also explain why Gentiles suddenly wish to be called "sons of Abraham." The widespread Jewish tradition of Abraham as the one who

---

1 Artapanus (in Eusebius, Praep Evang 9:18) and Cleodemus Malchus (see Hengel, Judaism, 1:74).


3 In Josephus, Moses, like Abraham, is the great inventor; in Philo, the elements obey him as their master (Vit Mos 1. 156). This tradition appears also in apocalyptic literature. In Bar 59 God reveals to Moses "the measure of fire, . . . the weight of the winds," etc. So, too, Wis Sol 13.

4 Philo Vit Mos 1. 155-56. In Virt 177, Philo makes Moses a ἄρχων ἀνθρώπων, as does Josephus, Ant 3. 181-87.

5 Josephus Ant 3. 180-82.
perfectly obeyed the law is maintained, but carried even further: "Law," in good Hellenistic fashion, becomes natural and cosmic law, the essential knowledge for the true διερηκτής and philosopher.

It was suggested above that the soteriology the opponents applied to Gentiles may have been the soteriology they applied to Jews too. In keeping with their reform mentality, they are insisting that Gentiles live as they insist that Jews live. However, in Rabbinic soteriology, the obedience of Abraham functions not as an imperative but as an indicative, inaugurating an unconditional covenant and providing a wealth of merit to ensure that a Jew remains in the covenant. This soteriology is close to John 8:38, whereas the soteriology of the opponents seems closer to Matt 3:9. Strack and Billerbeck claim some Rabbinic parallels to the Baptist's message, but they are few and unconvincing. The apocalyptic literature cited above seems much closer, especially 2 Baruch 57 and 58, in which the seer declares that Abraham was justified by works—and so will Israel be justified, if she obeys the law. Jubilees 23:10 also

1So, in Philo, Abr 60, 275, etc., Abraham still is the one who obeys all the laws of God.
2Sanders, Paul, pp. 90, 183-84.
3Comparing John 8:38, "We are Abraham's seed, and have never been in slavery . . . " to Matt 3:9, "Do not begin to say, . . . We have Abraham as our father. . . . "
4StrB, 1:121.
uses the argument that Abraham was justified by works in a similar imperative fashion, which is not typical of Rabbinism.¹ The soteriology of John the Baptist—and of the Galatian opponents—would appear to be closer to that of such "reform literature" as Jubilees, 2 Baruch, and 4 Ezra,² and of such reform movements as the Qumran sectaries, than to that of Rabbinism.³

Conclusions

In Galatians there is an important tradition about Abraham which is working in a particular way. Though there are elements of this tradition that are found widely throughout Judaism, it is more likely to be the "apologetic" Abraham who provides the impetus for the opponents' mission—and explains the Galatians' sudden enthusiasm for Abraham-sonship. This "apologetic"

¹Sanders, Paul, p. 424.

²Sanders, ibid., p. 137, also excludes this book from "Rabbinism," because of its perfectionist soteriology.

³Gunther, Opponents, among others, has suggested a connection between John the Baptist, apocalyptists such as the Qumran community, and Jewish-Christian sects. There are similarities between John and the Qumran group (asceticism, purification by water, prophecy, and eschatological expectations); and Baptist followers moved widely outside Palestine (for instance, the Baptist community at Ephesus). And of course, Jubilees is closely associated with the theology of Qumran. See Charlesworth, Pseudepigrapha, p. 143, etc. For Qumran as a reform movement, see, for instance, Fitzmyer, Ebionites, p. 222 (on criticism of the laxness of the Jerusalem priesthood in 1 QS and CD, and on Essene avoidance of the sanctuary in Josephus Ant 18. 1. 5).
Abraham is known also in apocalyptic circles: and within this apocalyptic literature is a soteriology based on Abraham which may also be owned by the Galatian opponents.

Though it cannot be proven that this "apologetic" Abraham was the Abraham of the opponents, certain factors suggest that it must be taken into account. As well as those mentioned above, there is the tradition of apostle, and the self-understanding which accompanied it, examined above. The apostle, for the Galatians, must authenticate himself as personally commissioned by God, a powerful representative of the presence of the divine. In this tradition of Abraham is "aretalogy" which would authenticate such a self-understanding. Further, there is much to suggest that the opponents present Christianity as a mystery, with degrees of perfection. The Abraham who journeys on his religious quest, and who discovers the secrets of the cosmos and God, is just the model that such a religion demands.

1Holladay, Theios Aner, p. 235.
2Above p. 254.
3Above, pp. 212-15, on the demand that the apostle preach himself as a pneuma-self, etc.
4See above, pp. 176-82, on the significance of 3:1-5 as an interrogatio, and the function played by the terms ἐνδοχεοθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν.
CHAPTER EIGHT

TRADITIONS OF LAW

Function of the Law—Traditions in Galatians

It has been suggested above that, in the total fabric of Paul's argument, δικαιοσύνη comes to mean cosmic or eschatological deliverance. In that the expression "justification by faith" stands polemically over against the opponents' "justification by works of law," they must propagate a corresponding doctrine of cosmic deliverance on the basis of a program of "works of law."

Further, Paul introduces mystery-language into his polemic on behalf of justification by faith, which, being dialogical, apparently confronts a mystical understanding of justification by law. This is reinforced by the way πνεύμα is used in what is for Paul a unique

---

1 See above, pp. 129-32, on 1:4, 4:5, and 6:13-14. δικαιοσύνη in Galatians is not just a forensic declaration, but principally life or salvation. See above, pp. 150, 161, etc., and Sanders, Paul, pp. 493-94.

2 Hence this dispute involves eschatology and, by implication, Christology. See above, pp. 129-32, and with authorities cited. Differences over eschatology were a chief cause of division in the early church, and of division between Paul and his opponents too. See Robinson, "Kerygma," pp. 122-23.

3 See above, pp. 176-82, on έναρξις and έπιτελεῖν; and below, p. 279, on the way 3:1-4 is paralleled by 4:8-11, with its own mystery-expressions.
way in 3:1-5, suggesting that he is taking up the opponents' criteria. They are self-styled πνευματικοί.\(^1\)

Thirdly, the opponents apparently have a tradition that speaks of "justification by faith (or grace)." They agree that there is a sense in which the law is ineffective, and δικαιοσύνη can only result from the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ. But once a man is justified by grace, their covenant understanding demands that a man keep the law, be justified by "works of law." There is an interplay of law, grace, and covenant, and various meanings of δικαιοσύνη.\(^2\)

Law and Abraham

Abraham reveals for the opponents that justification is by law; that promise and law are complementary, and inheritance is by law; that the Mosaic covenant is a reaffirmation of the Abrahamic covenant; and that the law provides the way for one to become σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ.\(^3\)

The opponents have a strong sense of consistency in all Israel's past saving history: each covenant is a

---

\(^1\) Schmithals, Paul, pp. 30-33, on 3:1-5.

\(^2\) See above, pp. 156-76, on 2:15-21.

\(^3\) Foerster, "κληρονομία," TDNT, 3:784, concisely states Paul's four principal arguments against the opponents: Abraham was justified by faith (3:6-9); the promise was given to Abraham before the law was given, so no one can inherit by the law (3:15-18); the two covenants, the Abrahamic and the Mosaic, are antithetical in every way (4:21-31); and he who belongs to the Messiah is the true σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ (3:26-29).
reaffirmation of past covenants.\(^1\)

It is possible that the Abraham tradition that was operating for the opponents was one that justified them in seeing themselves as exclusivist and exalted above their congregations, having fellowship with angels and heavenly powers, as well as being able to work wonders,\(^2\) demonstrate their possession of the Spirit, and lay claim to esoteric, cosmic knowledge.

**Law and Moses**

The centrality of Mosaic law for the opponents is revealed by 3:17, διαθήκην προκειμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ μετὰ τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἐτῶν γεγονός νόμος ὁ ἄκυρος, εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. Its unique function for them is revealed by Paul's unique negative attitude towards it. He cannot even bring himself to name Moses.\(^3\) The most explicit reference to him is in 3:19-20 (μεσότητος).\(^4\) And Paul even turns this into a

---

\(^1\)See the whole stress on consistency in the will of God in Paul's argument, and probably in the argument of the opponents, above, pp. 132-37. Also, see above, pp. 135-37, on the salvation-historical nature of Paul's argument: Jesus has not broken the line of salvation-history, but stands in the line of promise that runs from Abraham.

\(^2\)See διαθήκης, 3:5.

\(^3\)Duncan, Galatians, p. 114.

\(^4\)This title was commonly given to Moses in Jewish literature outside the OT: Ass Mos 1:14, 3:12; Philo Vit Mos 3:19; perhaps Heb 8:6, 9:15, 12:24. See Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, 2:415; Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 144-45.
derogatory title: the Μεσσίτης represent only angels, and not God.¹

That this is the intention of the verse is supported by the context. Law and Moses are dealt with in a careful sequence of argument that runs from 3:6 to 4:11,² and the turning point of the whole sequence appears to be in 3:15-22, which focuses on two personalities, Abraham and the Μεσσίτης. Paul evidently has his eye on the opponents' self-claims, their tradition of apostle as one who receives his gospel via unmediated διακαλωσις from God, and their tradition of Moses and Abraham. This last is in keeping with another Jewish tradition which appears in

¹ Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 68-69 suggests that Paul draws on Lev 26:46 and replaces Μωυσής with Μεσσίτης. The LXX of Deut 33:2 has angels present at the giving of the law, as does Acts 7:38, 53: Heb 2:2; Jos Ant 15. 136 (τα διασώτα των εν τοις νόμοις δι’ ἄγγελων παρά τοῦ θεοῦ μαθῶν: but some feel that ἄγγελος means prophet here, e.g., W. D. Davies, "A Note on Josephus Antiquities 15. 136," HTR 47 [1954]:135-40); Jub 1:27-2:1 (where it is particularly "calendrical" laws that the "angel of the Presence" writes for Moses); and Pesiqta Rabbati 97a. Philo also has Moses receive the law from the powers rather than from God directly: see Goodenough, Symbols, 12:57, on Som 1. 139-43. Also the Jerusalem targums on Deut 33:2 add prominence to angels. Paul's logic here is that a mediator does not represent one; so the mediator did not represent God—but the angels. This makes logical the deduction of 4:9-10: obedience rendered to the law is in fact rendered to angels. So also Duncan, Galatians pp. 114-15 (though he cautions that there are at least 300 interpretations of Gal 3:20); see also Lietzmann, on 3:19; Schoeps, Paul, p. 183; and Mussner, Galater, pp. 247-49, who notes the syllogism here: a mediator is never a mediator for one; God is one; ergo the law, which came via a mediator, is not from one (God).

² See above, pp. 184-86, on the way this passage breaks up in terms of "mots crochets."
various circles, in which Moses' ascent on Sinai is presented in "glorified" terms: Moses communes with angels, is given a crown of light, and receives all the secrets of heaven.\textsuperscript{1} The opponents probably present him as the supreme mystagogue. Then Paul appears here to be playing the opponents' claims for the Abraham-gospel against their claims for the Moses-gospel. A true prophet or apostle must have a direct message from God (agreed). Abraham was given the promise directly by God (3:16-17, the διαθήκη προκεκυριωμένη υπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), and there is no mention of a μεσίτης (agreed). But Moses was a μεσίτης, and he was therefore only spoken to by angels. So the Moses-gospel, unlike the Abraham-gospel, has not come directly from God.\textsuperscript{2} It was added (προστίθεναι), interrupting the truly heavenly Abraham-gospel or faith-gospel.\textsuperscript{3} This picks up the polemic of 1:6-9, where Paul asserts that there can be only one gospel, and that an angelic gospel can never displace that one gospel. The Abraham-gospel is of an entirely different quality from

\textsuperscript{1}See below, p. 358. This tradition appears in Philo, Rabbinic sources, and Samaritan sources.

\textsuperscript{2}Mussner, Galater, pp. 248-49, also suggests that this is the dynamic involved in 3:19-20.

\textsuperscript{3}Bligh, Galatians, p. 277. For Paul, Abraham is the great figure of the Old Testament, and Moses is an interloper. Lightfoot, Galatians, has noted the "adventitious character" of the law implied by προστίθεναι (3:19), which parallels ἐπιθέσαιςεσθαι, 3:15, and παρερχόμαι in Rom 5:20.
the Moses-gospel, and Abraham, not Moses, is the supreme mystagogue.

In keeping with this contrast of the two mystagogues in 3:15-22, and leading up to it, Paul in 3:6-14 contrasts law and faith as two ways of life.¹ His argument is really very simple. He uses Hab 2:4 in a polemical way to assert that δικαιοσύνη (life) can only be ἐκ πίστεως, therefore it cannot be by law.² It is simply not in the nature of law to be a means of δικαιοσύνη. There appears to be a contrast here between Rom 7:10 (ἡ ἐντολή ἡ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς ἁπάνταν) and Gal 3:21 (ἐὰν . . . ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, διότι ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη).³ The abruptness of this contrast is explicable in terms of the contrast of the two mystagogues.⁴

¹Anthony Tyrrel Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology (London: SPCK, 1974), p. 67, points out the particular parallel between 3:11 and 3:12. In the latter verse, referring to the "life" of the law, the stress falls on ὁ ποιήσας αὕτα ζησεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, so that in 3:11 the stress must also fall on ζησεται.

²See Sanders, Paul, p. 427, on the different way this verse is used in Romans and Galatians. Also, see above, p. 170.


⁴Paul also argues here on the basis of the Christ-event. In the death of Christ, law and life are revealed as opposites (3:10-14). Hab 2:4 is used to undergird this assertion. The cross reveals that law brings death; Hab 2:4 says that faith brings life. This argument is
In 3:15-22 itself is an unusually negative contrast of the two covenants, the Abrahamic and the Mosaic. The promise to Abraham is compared to an already ratified treaty or covenant to which nothing can be added (3:15-17). Hence law must be concerned with a completely different question (τῶν παραβάσεων χάρων, 3:19), and law and promise must be antithetical (εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἢ κληρονομία, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας [3:18], paralleling the antithesis of law and faith with respect to life in 3:11, 21). In 4:21-31 these two covenants (ἀπετέλεσεν ἀληθεροδόμησα. αὐταὶ γὰρ εἰσιν δύο διαθήκαι [4:24]) are opposites in every respect (παράδοσιν and then tied into the one concerning Abraham and Moses. The promise comes through Abraham, which Christ fulfilled by making us heirs; the law comes through Moses, which Christ fulfilled by dying.

1On the precise meaning of διαθήκη in 3:14, 17, see Burton, Galatians, pp. 501-5: Paul may move between "will," "testament," and "covenant" in the OT sense, and the term in 3:17 seems undoubtedly to mean "covenant." However, for the essential argument, the distinction is not important. 4:24 is most naturally understood as "covenant" in the OT sense.

2Behm, "διαθήκη," TDNT, 2:129. "As a valid will cannot be contested or altered by additions, so the promise of God . . . cannot be invalidated by the law which came later."

3Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 143, concludes that χάρως, (3:19) probably infers "to create transgressions;" where there is no law, there is no transgression (Rom 4:15), compared to Rom 3:20, 7:7, 13, 5:20. This meaning seems required by Gal 3:21, 22.

4Commenting on ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἑπιδιατάσσεται (3:15), Lightfoot, ibid., p. 140, observes that the doctrine of the Judaisers is presented virtually as the annulling of the promise and the violating of the covenant.
élèvthería, σόφε and ἐπαγγέλλα, δουλεία and élèvthería, σόφε and πνεύμα), which is rather strong even for Paul’s writings.¹ Again, such a contrast is explicable in terms of the particular contrast of the two personalities who epitomise the covenants.²

The next pericope (3:23-29) is also understandable in terms of this contrast. The argument against law here is a simple historical one: ὁ νόμος παίδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαίωσιμον (3:24). Law came 430 years after the promise (3:17) and functions only εἰς χριστόν (3:24). Only after this historical time period of law is faith again possible (ἐλθοῦσας δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παίδαγωγὸν ἔσμεν [3:25]). This

¹Paul refers to διαθήκη at Gal 3:15, 17, 4:24, Rom 9:4, Eph 1:27, 2:12, 1 Cor 11:25, and 2 Cor 3:6, 14. The clearest contrast of covenants outside Galatians is in 2 Cor 3:6, 14, where he refers to the "old" and the "new" covenants. But here it is the Mosaic and Christ covenants which are contrasted, and the Mosaic covenant is treated slightly differently. Moses is a mystagogue who sees God; it is implied that the stone-law comes from God; and the chief problem is with the Israelites, who are not spiritual enough, so that Moses must be veiled. There is a continuity of δόξα between the Mosaic and the Christ covenants. The Mosaic covenant is God’s διαθήκη, it has its own δόξα, and it comes from the same God as the new διαθήκη. Behm, "διαθήκη," TDNT, 2:130. In Rom 9:4-5 the διαθήκαι (plural!) are numbered among the many advantages of Israel in salvation-history and are all revelations of God and His ἐπαγγέλλαι (plural!).

²It is also explicable in terms of the opponents' eschatology, and their attachment of law to cosmology. When Paul says Christ has brought the new age and release from the old κόσμος or αἰών, this automatically makes Christ and law antithetical in the opponents' cosmological terms.
construction of salvation-history is itself unique;¹ it results in charging the negative nature of the age of law only to the law itself, the specific purpose for which it was given (3:19), and its own inherent nature (3:21).²

Again, the completely negative and "tryannical" nature is explicable from the contrast of the two

¹See Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 169-70, on the different handling of salvation-history in Galatians and Romans. In Galatians the "dark" period of history is only from Moses to Christ; and, whereas in Rom 5:12-21 the "dark" period is especially the rule of sin, in Galatians it is especially the rule of law, the παιδαγωγός, the ἐπιτρόποι καὶ σώματος, and the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. See above, pp. 188-89.

²Law itself is the παιδαγωγός, the tyrant. See Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 143, who gives four ways in which the law in its whole character and history is negative. Elsewhere law is a spiritual, holy, good gift from God (Rom 7:11-14) that has fallen into the wrong hands (Rom 7:11, law came into a situation in which sin was already "lord;" also Rom 5:12) and functions negatively not because of its inherent "nature" but because of its "context," sin, flesh (Rom 8:4). Charles Harold Dodd, New Testament Studies (New York: Scribner, 1952), pp. 123-24, writes, "Whereas, in Galatians, it (the law) is the instrument of the angelic powers for the enslavement of God's people--an enslavement which He permitted until 'the fulness of time' (3:24, 4:4) . . . In Romans it is in itself holy, spiritual, just, and good, but because of the weakness of the flesh it was incapable of effecting its true purpose, to give life (7:12, 14, 8:3)." Stoike, "Law of Christ," pp. 99-101, contrasts the positive portrayal of the law in Romans (God's [7:12, 25, 8:7]; fails because of man [7:14, 8:3-4]; is just, good, and spiritual [7:13-14]; and gives rise to Abraham's seed, just as faith does [4:15]) with the negative portrayal in Galatians (given by angels [3:19]; fails because of its inherent nature [3:3, 4:3, 9]; has a curse [3:13]; is impotent [3:21]; is temporary, [3:9, 18, 23]; is a cruel taskmaster [3:24]; and Abraham's seed springs only from faith [3:7, 8-9]). On the unique presentation of the law and justification by faith in Galatians, see Sanders, Paul, pp. 495-97, quoting a forthcoming book by Davies,
mystagogues. The revelation that each one receives reflects the nature of its source. Moses' revelation comes from angels and is therefore an enslaving revelation, which is negated when God resumes the purpose of His own life-giving revelation to Abraham in the work of the Messiah.

The historicising argument against the law climaxes in the stressing of the historical event of the death of Christ, in the next pericope (4:1-7). It may be that Paul must stress the historical nature of both law and Christ because the opponents have a tendency to mythologise both law and Christ, just as they have a tendency to eternalise the law with their dogma of covenant and reenactment.¹

This exegesis of the central argument of the probatio suggests that Paul heavily rests his case on the contrast of the two figures, Abraham and Moses. It has been suggested that the figure of Abraham which plays an important part in the opponents' propaganda is a certain "apologetic" Abraham. The traditional methods of propaganda, along with Paul's sustained attack on the person of Moses, suggests that the opponents boasted of a Moses who, like their Abraham, was a "hagiography for a cult," an Abraham-type Moses. Jewish "apologetic" did portray

1 Koester, Trajectories, pp. 147-48.
Abraham and Moses in parallel terms\(^1\)--terms that were very appealing to the Hellenistic world and Hellenistic concepts of religion and divine men.\(^2\) This appeal of the divinely powerful Moses was connected with Jewish law and was what made it appealing. Moses demonstrated such superior cosmic powers because he possessed unique insights into law--cosmic law.\(^3\) From Paul's argument, it is evident that Moses and Law are being portrayed in parallel terms. This suggests that it is a cosmic portrayal of law, accompanying an apologetic "Moses," that is partly the reason for the Galatians' apostatising (1:6).

Finally, it must be asked, What specifically is "Law" in the opponents' law tradition? It is clear that Paul asserts that the opponents observe less than the

\(^1\)See above, pp. 256-57.

\(^2\)John G. Gager, Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), has collected data on the positive images of Moses in pagan writings. His appeal was particularly as lawgiver, leader of the Exodus, and practitioner of magic. See pp. 134-61 for primary sources on Moses as a wonder-worker and the strong appeal of this image to the Hellenistic world. Moses' contest with and vanquishing of the Egyptians in the Exodus also glorified him in Pagan eyes. In this role he was especially the "leader of superior theological wisdom" (p. 132). Gager notes that these appealing images of Moses to Pagans came predominantly from the apologetics of the Jews themselves--which is borne out by studies such as that of Tiede (Charismatic), who has summarized the image of Moses in Philo (pp. 101-37), Eupolemos (138-40), Aristobulus (140-46), Artapanus (146-77), and Josephus (207-40).

\(^3\)See above, pp. 256-57.
"whole law" (6:13, 5:5). Each apparently charges the other with inconsistency. The opponents say Paul is inconsistent in his rejection of law, because he preaches circumcision. Paul says the opponents are inconsistent in their acceptance of law, because they observe some but not all of the law. "Works of law" appears to mean, in Paul's letters, a "random selection" of commandments from Israel's legal tradition, perhaps especially cultic and ceremonial commandments.

1 See above, pp. 142-44.

2 The weight of 1:10, 2:3-4, and 5:11 strongly suggests that Paul is being charged with vacillation over the question of circumcision, and the grounds are the circumcision of some of his co-workers--perhaps even Titus! See Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 62-63, Longenecker, Paul, p. 220; Weiss, Primitive Christianity, 1:271-73; Georgi, Geschichte, pp. 14-15.


4 Markus Barth, Ephesians, The Anchor Bible, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1974), 1:287-88, 244-48. He notes that "works of law" are mentioned only where imposition of legal elements on Gentiles is discussed, and the term cannot refer to a Jewish doctrine. The contexts where the phrase occurs only with selections of Jewish law are Gal 2:3-4, 12-13 and 4:10. Stoike, "Law of Christ," pp. 149-52, notes that the exact phrase occurs six times in Galatians and only twice more in the rest of Paul's epistles. This suggests that it should be defined principally out of Galatians. Furthermore, five of the six occurrences in Galatians occur in 2:16 and 3:1-5, indicating how the expression is bound up with the debate concerning the law and justification.

5 Barth, ibid., pp. 247-48, feels that there are no significant parallels to this term outside Paul's letters. However, others see some suggestive parallels in Qumran (the phrase שלמים is found in 4 Q Flor 1:7, where it is linked with cultic activity) and apocalyptic literature (similar expressions occur in 2 Bar 57:2; Test Lev 19:11; and Test Naph 2:6), where cultic or calendri-
This is consistent with the way that, in Galatians, only certain precepts of the law are singled out, these having to do with calendrical observance and circumcision.¹ But this does not mean that either Paul or his opponents think in terms of a division between moral and ceremonial law.² The opponents would admit that those things Paul says they have failed to observe are also fully "law" (6:13), and their traditions of Abraham and Moses stress law as a totality. Nor does Paul direct his attack only at specific precepts in question, but first deals with law in principle,³ law as demand.⁴ When

¹Bultmann, Theology, 1:260: "... Paul has specific occasion to speak of the ritual law ... in Galatians. ..."

²Against Bligh, Galatians, pp. 292-96, who concludes: "... the early exegetical tradition (of Justin, Irenaeus, and the Didascalia Apostolorum) was correct: in v. 19 St Paul is speaking, not about the whole of the Mosaic law, but only about the ceremonial laws added after Israel had sinned." In fact, one of the first to use this distinction was the Gnostic Ptolemy in his Letter to Flora.

³See above, pp. 22-23, and Schweitzer's observation on the difference between Acts 15 and Paul regarding law. The former attempts to deal with the issue in terms of specific precepts, but Paul deals with it in terms of theological principles.

⁴Bultmann, Theology, 1:260: "Paul, ... did not define the nature of obedience under the demand of God by contrasting the ethical demands and the cultic-ritual demands and by criticising the latter from the standpoint of the former. ... Thinking Jewishly, he does not evaluate the cultic-ritual commandments in regard to
Paul calls the law πανδαιμονικός (3:24), he is speaking of the "whole law."^1

The issue, therefore, is law as law, law in principle. But the issue of law in principle is being debated in terms of what law in principle has become in the light of the opponents' specific and selective demands—in terms of the "Tendenz" of this selectivity. This "Tendenz" is in two directions in particular: the direction of differentiation and separatism,^2 and the direction of calendrical prescriptions, of law as cosmic order. These were the terms in which Jewish law was often understood and accepted by the Hellenistic world.^3 But in their consent, but considers them only regard to the fact that they, like the ethical commandments, are demands. Nevertheless, it is apparent from the matter-of-fact way in which he names the ethical demands of the decalogue (Rom 13:8-10, Gal 5:14) as the abiding content of the law obligatory even for the Christian, that the identity of meaning in the cultic-ritual and the ethical demands exists only for the man who has not yet come to faith, and that faith itself an unconsciously working principle of criticism is provided." Barth, Ephesians, p. 288, comments: "The sharp distinction of cultic and moral laws is neither biblical nor Jewish nor true of the history of religions."^4

^1Bultmann, Theology, 1:259: "By νόμος ... Paul (usually) understands the OT law or the whole OT conceived as law. . . . " Note 3:22, ἣ γράφη. In 4:21, νόμος equals the life-ordering norm of the Ot. See Mussner, Galater, pp. 317-18.

^2Those laws which stress the difference between Jew and Gentile, and the superiority of Jews: see above on Ιουδαιων. Circumcision made Jews the elite people of God (StrB, 4:32) and promised a perfection appealing to Hellenists (Jewett, "Agitators," p. 201).

^3For instance, Josephus Apion 2. 282 on the appeal of the Jewish calendar to the Gentile world.
apocalyptic literature the law of Moses is particularly understood as the law of cosmic order.\(^1\)

**Law and the στοιχεια τοῦ κόσμου**

Attention must now be directed to the relationship between the law and the στοιχεια τοῦ κόσμου. It has been shown above that the analysis of genre and structure have implications for the place of the expression in the whole scheme of Paul's argument against justification by law: 4:8-11 is not a sudden diversion from the question of the Galatians' adoption of the program of the intruders. The unity of the letter does not allow divisions into errors of Galatians and errors of intruders. Three further considerations are now called for.

Firstly, δικαιοσύνη in Galatians comes to mean cosmic or eschatological deliverance,\(^2\) and the eschatological terms κόσμος and αἰών play an essential role in defining δικαιοσύνη in this way. Therefore the word κόσμος should not be allowed to fall out of the expression στοιχεια τοῦ κόσμου. Bandstra states correctly that the meaning and function of κόσμος is crucial in determining the meaning of this last phrase.\(^3\)

\(^1\)In Jub 1:27-2:1, and 1 Enoch 33:3 it is particularly the laws of calendrical observance that the "angel of the presence" writes for Moses. See Meinrad Limbeck, Die Ordnung des Heils (Dusseldorf: Pastmos-Verlag, 1971), p. 64.

\(^2\)See above, p. 261.

\(^3\)Andrew John Bandstra, *The Law and the Elements*
Secondly, both here and in Colossians there is a unique use of στοιχεῖαν. In Heb 5:12 and 6:1 the word is best translated "first principles" and is neither positive or negative. 2 Pet 3:10 refers by στοιχείαν to the material elements of the universe, again in a neutral sense. But the term in Galatians (and Colossians) has a decidedly negative sense. It is not enough to say that the στοιχεῖα are merely "temporary and ineffectual for salvation." They enslave (δουλοῦν [4:3]); and in the parallels between the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου of 4:3, the ἐπιτρόποι καὶ οἰκονόμοι of 4:2, and (through the parallel of στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου of 4:3 and the experience of being ὑπὸ νόμος [4:5]) the παιδαγωγὸς of 3:24, the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are equated with decidedly coercive powers. They are not "temporary or ineffectual for salvation," or neutral in the sense of Heb 5:12 and 6:1; their period of domination is one of hopeless enslavement, during which all mankind is held

of the World (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1964), pp. 48-54. There is an essential relationship between the reference to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, and Christ's defeat of the κόσμος. REICKE, "The Law," p. 265, notes that PAUL relates the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου to the fallen world. So, in Col 2:20, to die to the κόσμος is to die to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. The elements have cosmological and theological significance.

1 As does Bandstra, p. 54.

fast under lock and key by a jailor (3:23, φυμομείαν, συγκλείειν).\(^1\)

Thirdly, allowance must be made for the unique-ness of Paul's reference to historic Israel in Galatians. In 4:3 Israel was under the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and in slavery, just as in 4:24 Sinai bears children for slavery.\(^2\) But in 4:8, 9 Paul parallels οἱ φόβει μὴ δύνατις Ὑσοῦ to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. The latter become the equivalent of pagan deities, and the striking word πάλιν (used twice in 4:9) clearly relates the service of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου to the Galatians' pagan past.

But this same πάλιν reveals Paul's meaning to be that the Jews, from Moses to Christ, worshipped οἱ φόβει μὴ δύνατις Ὑσοῦ.\(^4\) Judaism and Paganism alike are nothing but "pre-Christian religion."\(^5\) Elsewhere, Paul

\(^1\) So, in Colossians 2, the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (verses 8, 20) are paralleled to ἄρχατ καὶ ἐξουσιἀτ (verse 15). See Bornkamm, ibid., pp. 123-24. Even Delling, "στοιχεῖαν," TDNT, 6:685, admits that in Galatians στοιχεῖα is a strongly negative term: "The very negative judgment of στοιχεῖα by Paul is not sufficiently brought out when a reference is seen to the first principles of human religion."

\(^2\) And in 3:24-25, Israel's experience is only one of slavery to the παιδαγωγός.

\(^3\) A term characteristic of Jewish polemic against heathen false gods. See Duncan, Galatians, pp. 114-15, and Conzelmann, Theology, p. 233.

\(^4\) See Reicke, "The Law," p. 274. This becomes the most difficult expression of the passage to account for.

\(^5\) See Duncan, Galatians, pp. 134-36; and Delling.
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says Jews have "much advantage" (Rom 3:2) because they possess the oracles of God: that adherents of law will be fellow-heirs with those who inherit by faith (Rom 14:16); and that historic Israel is blessed abundantly because to her belong ἡ νόθεσια καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διάθηκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελ·αι, ὃν οἱ πατέρες (Rom 9:4-5). Israel has priority in the history of redemption (Rom 11:17-24).¹

Paul can speak negatively of Israel's experience elsewhere, e.g., Rom 9:30-33,² but the negative stress is because of Israel's rejection of the offer of grace which was always present along with the law (Rom 9:32, 10:5-13, 1 Cor 10:1-11, etc.). However, in Galatians grace has fallen completely out of Israel's history, and there is only a stark periodization: an era of law followed by an era of grace (3:23, 24).³

It is not the expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου that creates the negative tone of the portrayal. Rather, the "στοιχεῖον," TDNT, 6:684: "Among the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Galatians 4 is on the one side the torah with its statutes (4:3-5), and then on the other side the world of false gods whom the recipients once served, 4:8-11. The expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου thus draws attention to something common to Jewish and pagan religion . . . bondage to the στοιχεῖα."

¹Noted by Bandstra, The Law, p. 124.
²Stressed by Bandstra, ibid., pp. 63-67, 100.
³See also above on the central place in the whole argument of periods of history, culminating in the cross (4:4); Koester, Trajectories, pp. 146-47; and Sanders, Paul, pp. 483-84.
expression is caught up into a particular negative fabric of argument. It seems no coincidence that Paul's only letter to speak of Israel in this fashion also speaks of her bondage to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου which becomes a bondage to φύσει μὴ δυντες θεοί. Thus there is in Galatians a uniqueness in speaking of justification as deliverance from the κόσμος; a uniquely negative use of στοιχεῖα; a unique equation of historic Israel and paganism; and a uniquely negative way of speaking of the law. This complex of expressions must be allowed their holistic force, and it is within this holistic complex that the expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου must be interpreted.\(^1\)

The place of 4:1-11 in the argument of chapters 3 and 4 should be reviewed.\(^2\) The crucial phrase here is νῦν δὲ γνώντες θεόν, μάλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄσθενη καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἀνωθὲν δουλεύειν θέλετε (4:9). By γνώντες θεόν, μάλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, Paul evidently refers to the experience he placed at the beginning of the

---

1 Bandstra notes, after an examination of the use of στοιχεῖαν in ancient writers, that it is essentially a "formal" word. In and of itself it carries no particular content but has specific meaning in terms of its immediate context (The Law, p. 33). Bussmann, Themen, pp. 58-59, agrees.

2 It has already been shown above, pp. 182-84, that 4:8-11 is tied into the whole argument of 3:6-4:11 by "mots crochets;" and that 4:8-11 is essentially a restatement of 3:1-5, the causa put into the terms of the Galatians' apostasy from Christianity to the new religion.
probatio—the Galatians' acceptance of Christianity.
There he used terms of initiation into and perfection in a mystery religion (ἔναρχεσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν, 3:3), and the suggested irony is, You were initiated into one religion, and are seeking perfection in another, and can therefore only be called ἀνώτατος, people who are imperious to the deep secrets of religion: you may have received the Spirit εἰκῆ. The same pattern recurs here in 4:9. The expression γνώντες ὡςомος, µᾶλλον δὲ γνώσθεντες ὧπο σῶορ has important parallels in Hellenistic religion, where it refers to experience of the divine through gnosis, the highest level of religious awareness.1 ἐπιστρέψαν (4:9) therefore denotes a complete apostasy from the deep things of religion, as does the sequence of beginning and ending in 3:1-5. And again, Paul laments that his labors in initiating the Galatians into the mystery of Christianity may have been εἰκῆ (4:11). So here, as in 3:1-5, are the sequence of beginning and ending, the mystery terms that add force to the sequence, and the lament, fearful to the mystes, that

1Bussmann, Themen, pp. 58-74, analyzes the τὸντε μὲν (4, 8) . . . νῦν δὲ (4:9) sequence as the antithesis of before and after conversion, using the terminology of Hellenistic-Jewish missionary propaganda (not knowing and knowing God). He has not pushed as far as Arthur Darby Nock, Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), who notes the special significance of "known by God," as in CH 10. 5, "God is not ignorant of man: He knows him thoroughly and would be known of him. For it is only knowledge of God that brings salvation to man."
all may have been εἰς. In this case, 4:8-11 returns to the primary cause of the dispute dealt with in the pro-batio—the Galatians' acceptance of an alien religion.

Paul elaborates the precise point at which this apostasy is taking place: ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μήνας καὶ καλοδικός καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς (4:10). There are striking Jewish parallels to this formulation, especially in Eth Enoch and other apocalyptic literature. In this apocalyptic law-tradition, the orders of creation become identified with the Torah, and knowledge of the former

1 Mussner, Galater, p. 297. See above on the law becoming an issue precisely at the point of calendrical observance.

2 1 Enoch shows great concern for all the laws of the luminaries of heaven (the sun [ch. 72:1], the moon [ch. 73:1], and others [ch. 74:1]) given in the heavenly revelation of Uriel, which concludes, "And he showed me all the laws for these for every day, and for every season of bearing rule, and for every year, and for its going forth, and for the order prescribed to it every month and every week ..." (79:2). The language is even closer to Galatians in 82:4, 7-10 (for the lights, months, feasts, years and days did Uriel show me ...). There is a similar calendrical concern in Jub 2:9, "And God appointed the sun to be a great sign on the earth for days and for sabbaths and for months and for feasts and for years and for sabbaths of years and for jubilees and for all seasons of the year." Also 1:10-14, 6:34-38. Davies, "Scrolls," p. 167, notes, "The phrase which appears in Gal 4:10 recalls exactly 1 QS 1:14" (which reads, "They must not deviate by a single step from carrying out the orders of God at the times appointed for them; they must neither advance the statutory times nor postpone the prescribed season." The precise calculations of the calendar were a leading issue between the sect and Jerusalem Judaism. See below). See also 1 QS 9:26-10-8, 1 QM 14:12-14, 10:15, 14:13-15, 1 QH 1:24. In Jub 1:27-2:1, the heavenly laws written down by the angel are in particular laws of calendrical observance.
safeguards the latter. These parallels tend to confirm the suggestion based on genre and structure analysis—it is because of the new religion which the Galatians have adopted, especially in terms of cultic festivals, that Paul says they are returning to the worship of the οὐρανός.

That the opponents provided the precedent for this equation is further suggested by the tradition that connects angels with the giving of the law that appears in 3:19. They used the tradition obviously to enhance the law, and Paul has turned it on its head. Therefore the way Paul stresses personal powers in connection with the law, and speaks of angels in connection with the giving of the law, seems to be directly related.

Although Reicke may move too quickly in identifying the angels of 3:19 directly with the οὐρανός, it would seem that Paul speaks of these angels as belonging to a larger

---

1 Limbeck, Ordnung, pp. 65-72. Both man and the elements of nature stand under the same rule of God, and therefore the same law. Knowledge of true cosmic order is essential for salvation (1 En 82:1-4), and there is a mystical connection between the stars, the angels and the righteousness of Israel (1 En 80:1-8, Ps Sol 18:10, Ass Mos 10:9, and 2 Bar 51:10).

2 See above pp. 218-64, and also the place of angels in the opponents' self-understanding (Gal 1:8-9).

3 Reicke, "Law," p. 262. Paul builds on certain ideas already present, but gives the angels a negative instead of a positive significance.

4 Ibid., p. 262.
class called στοιχεῖα—and that the opponents have provided him with the precedent for this language.

The relationship of Gal 4:1-11 to Colossians 2 must next be examined, as these are the only two passages in the New Testament to use the expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.¹

Christology plays an important role in the polemic against the Colossian heresy. The letter stresses that in Christ κατοικεῖ πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, at every point of His career, and particularly on the cross.² In the context, there is a confrontation of the powers of the universe (ἀρχαὶ καὶ . . . ἐκουσάν [2:10, 15]) and Christ,³ the powers competing for the worship due to Christ. This worship of the powers is referred to as θησαυρεῖα τῶν ἄγγελων in 2:18, heightening the personification of these cosmic forces.⁴ In 2:8 and 2:20 these ἀρχαὶ, ἐξουσίας, and ἄγγελοι are summed up as στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.⁵ Thus this

¹The two passages are connected by Schlier, Reicke, Bornkamm, etc. Schweizer, "Christianity of the Circumcised," pp. 245-60, correctly notes differences: the Jewish character is stronger in Galatians.

²See Col 1:19-20, 2:6-15 and the particular presentation of the cross—not a kenosis and humiliation as in Phil 2:8-11, but the climax of a life filled with all the fulness of God that triumphs in the conquest of the powers of the cosmos. See Lohse, Colossians, pp. 3, 99, 114, etc.


expression, in the Colossians debate, stands for the cosmic powers and angels who are competing for the lordship and πληρωμα that belongs only to Christ.

The opposing teaching is a φιλοσοφία (2:8), having its own παράδοσις that has been received through mysterious vision (2:18). It is this φιλοσοφία and παράδοσις that is attacked by the subordination of all στοιχεῖα to Christ. The implication, then, is that the expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου belongs to the heresy itself.

When the heretics' festivals are attacked (ζωής ή νεωμνίς ή σαββάτων [2:16]) it is because they are intimately connected with the veneration of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. As in Galatians, the sign of the periodic cycles of nature is especially related to the word κόσμος in the phrase στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.

1See how 2:9 (διὰ ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πάν τὸ πληρωμα) is polemical and antithetical, denying the claims the opponents made for the στοιχεῖα, Bornkamm, ibid., p. 124.

2Lohse, Colossians, p. 99: "στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου" must have played a special role in the teaching of the "philosophers." After adapting so many terms of the opposition to his own purposes (θρησκεία, πληρωμα, αρχαί και ἔξουσία, ἐθελοδοξία, etc; Bornkamm, "Colossians," p. 127), the author of Colossians would not be likely to crown his rebuttal with a phrase that had been suddenly introduced into the debate out of the blue.

3Bornkamm, ibid., p. 131. It is clear, in Colossians, that the festivals do belong to the heretics. The syncretistic nature of the heresy is evident from its combination of these calendrical observances, which derive from Judaism, with taboos and ascetic requirements which cannot be derived from Jewish law.
It is more than coincidental that two heresies that propagate calendrical festivals both come to attract the expression στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου.¹ In Colossians the term is clearly occasional and must belong to the heretics themselves—offering support for the contention that it does also in Galatians. This Colossian heresy of worship of the στοιχεία has its Jewish features, and its own version of veneration of the law. And the strongly personal as well as cosmic character of the στοιχεία must be significant for the meaning of the term in Galatians.

The history of religions evidence for the meaning of the term will now be examined. It should be borne in mind here what is being sought. Firstly, the Galatian opponents have evidently laid themselves open to the equation of their religion with the Galatians' pagan past because their law-tradition is bound up with an interest in the cosmic elements, cosmic order, and angels. They do not necessarily worship the elements, but this suggestion, along with that of personification of the elements and equation of them with angels, is present.

Secondly, the Galatians, as ex-pagans, are expected to immediately recognize Paul's twist of the opponents' position out of their own pagan past; they

¹Schweizer, "Christianity of the Circumcised," p. 225. It is probably no coincidence that the Stichwort appears only in connection with a legalism which expressed itself among other things in a keeping of feast-days.
must know a δουλεία to στοιχεῖα which is a worship of
θεοῦ in a real sense. Thus, two kinds of external parallels will be relevant. The Jewish parallels will be con­sidered below. They must be a complexity of all the
factors that are found together in the law-tradition as
it has been sketched so far, and need only provide the
suggestions necessary for the dialogical twist of 4:8-11
to work. However, the Pagan parallels, which will be
considered here, should reveal a real worship of the
στοιχεῖα, which provides an analogy according to which
Judaism can be represented in propaganda as devotion to
στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.

The relevant sources have already been compe­tently presented in several places and need not be
exhaustively reproduced here. However, in the light of
Delling's assertion that, on the whole, στοιχεῖαν in the
ancient texts means "basic materials," and that it is
unlikely that the terms was used in Paul's day in the
sense of "spiritual forces," some of the evidence should
be examined again.

The doctrine of the four elements, from which all
visible things proceed, goes back to Empedocles, Plato,

1See Delling, "στοιχεῖαν," TDNT, 6:672-83;
Schlier, Galater, (1962), pp. 191-92; Bandstra,
The Law, pp. 31-46; Lohse, Colossians, pp. 97-98; Stoike,

2Delling, ibid., p. 684.
and Aristotle. The stoa, too, took over the doctrine of the four στοιχεῖα from which the cosmos arises. It is evidently a development of this doctrine that becomes the speculative cosmology of the mystery religions, where men can obtain freedom from εἰμαρμένη through the power of the deity, which is greater than that of the elements or the stars.

Philo polemicizes against those who worship the elements as though they were gods, as he polemicizes against the doctrine of εἰμαρμένη. This evidence strongly suggests that the practice of worship of the στοιχεῖα was well established in the first century, as

---

1 For the texts, see Delling, "στοιχείου," TDNT, 6:672-73.


3 For instance, Apuleius, Metamorphoses, 11:5, 1: the one redeemed by Isis is no longer subject to εἰμαρμένη because she is the mother of the στοιχεῖα. See also Hans Dieter Betz, "Schöpfung und Erlösung im hermetischen Fragment 'Kore Kosmou,'" ZTK 63 (1966):177-78; and "The Mithras Inscriptions of Santa Prisca and the New Testament," NT 10 (1968):64-66. There is a strong suggestion in these sources that they are personal forces.

4 Philo, Vit Con 3; Conf 173: "Certain persons, impressed by the nature of each of the worlds, have not only deified them as wholes, but have also deified the most beautiful of their component parts, which they shamefully call gods." Alongside this must be placed the polemic against worship of natural phenomena in Wisdom 13:1-2.

5 Philo, Heres 300-2; Migr 178-79.
does the even more virulent criticism of second century writers.¹

But there is further evidence that must be considered. Bultmann has observed that the same concern for cosmology and έτυμαρμένη as in the mysteries appears in more "gnostic" systems.² Here, however, the stars and cosmic bodies establish this grip of man in fate.³ Delling admits a close connection in the texts between the elements and the stars.⁴ Stoicism since Posidonius taught that destiny is controlled by the heavenly bodies.⁵

¹Herm 4. 13. 3; Tatian Or Grace 21. 3; Aristid Apol 7. 4; Athen Suppl 10. 3; Clem Alex Prot 64., Strom 1. 5. 6; 52. 24. See Delling, "στοιχεῖον," TDNT, 6:677. Lohse, Colossians, p. 99, commenting on such references, says, "... it cannot be objected that the meaning 'stars,' 'elementary spirits,' or 'spirits of the stars' is not attested in any non-Christian text that can be dated with certainty in pre-Pauline times. ... It is quite legitimate to make conclusions about earlier traditions on the basis of later witnesses, especially in view of the fact that the combination of angels and heavenly powers is already present in Jewish apocalyptic texts. ..."

²Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, p. 154.

³Richard Reitzenstein, Poimandres (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), pp. 75-79, notes the roots of religious fatalism and concern for έτυμαρμένη in astrology, in Judaism as well as in Paganism.

⁴Delling, "στοιχεῖον," TDNT, 6:679. See the above quote from Philo, Conf 173, where the stars and their "component parts" are closely equated. See also Opif 27. Wis Sol 13:1-2 also links together the worship of the stars and the elements. In later antiquity, στοιχεῖον comes to mean a star or a constellation: see literature, Delling, p. 681; also Lohse, Colossians, p. 97.

⁵Dodd, The Bible, p. 138.
It becomes evident that these "gnostic" cosmological systems, with their own doctrine of ἐνυφίασθεν, are also a development of the stoic doctrine of the στοιχεῖον. ¹

This equation of στοιχεῖα with stars, at a time early in the first century, and criticism of the worship of stars at the same time, must be further evidence for a conception of στοιχεῖα as personalised powers, controlling man's fate, in Paul's day. The cosmological systems themselves attribute great power to these heavenly bodies. Poimandres, perhaps one of the earliest cosmologies, ² portrays man in slavery to ἐνυφίασθεν and the planetary gods. That such cosmologies must have existed very early in the first century is now strongly suggested by several of the Nag Hammadi tractates, which give evidence of a development from pre-Christian to


²On dating Poimandres, see Arthur Darby Nock and A. J. Festugière, Hermes Trismegistus. Corpus Hermeticum (Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1954-60), pp. xxxvii-xxxviii. The earliest attestation is to sections 31-32 in P. Berol. 9794, dating from the beginning of the third century. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 201-9, argues that the text was probably established about 250 AD, though much of the material in it is earlier. He notes kinship to Philo, Wisdom of Solomon, 1 Enoch, and other material dating from 50 BCE - CE 100; and the developed Gnostic systems of Valentinus, to be dated 130-140 AD, seem to be later developments of the gnosis of Poimandres, putting much of the material of the tractate in the first century.
Christian gnosticism. Thus these widespread evidences of speculation regarding the power of the stars and planets and their control of man's fate, probably leading back to the first century, supports Dodd's contention that "... in Philo's day the sun and moon and other heavenly bodies were regarded in certain circles as διοικηται των συμπάντων." There should be no objection to the position that the στοιχεῖα, in the Paganism of Paul's day, were regarded as personal, potent powers dominating the lives of men, and it is out of such a background that the Galatians probably understand Paul's dialogical twist of the opponents' own propaganda. This suggests that the opponents' own law-tradition must itself be open to such a dialogical twist.

* * *

In conclusion, the threads of this argument must

1 G. W. MacRae, "Nag Hammadi," IDBS, 618. The tractate Eugnostos, which shows no Christian influence, has been taken over and Christianized in the Sophia of Jesus Christ. Similarly, the Apocalypse of Adam, showing no Christianisms but a developed cosmology, must be dated as early as the first century CE. It may have been given a Christianized form in the Gospel of the Egyptians. The Letter of Peter which he sent to Philip also reveals a later Christianizing of an earlier, pre-Christian Gnostic cosmology. Several have seen in the Apocryphon of John, which must have existed before Irenaeus' Against Heresies (Robinson, Nag Hammadi, p. 98) a Gnostic attempt at criticism of the anthropos-myth in Poimandres (Richard Reitzenstien, Hellenistic Mystery-Religions, trans. John E. Steely [Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978], p. 62) again suggesting the very early date of the material in this last tractate.

2 Dodd, The Bible, p. 140.
be drawn together to illuminate the significance of the phrase οὐκ ἔχεια τοῦ κόσμου for the opponents' law tradition.

The phrase belongs in a pattern of argument in which Paul speaks in a unique way of justification, the στοιχεία, Israel, and the law. The phrase οὐκ ἔχεια τοῦ κόσμου does not give the argument its uniqueness, but must be taken up into this uniqueness, and must carry a connotation consistent with the argument as a whole, which is particularly negative regarding Judaism and the law. Exegetical considerations reveal how the passage (4:8-11) is an integral part of Paul's attack on the intruding theology. Chapter 4:10 reveals the precise point at which the charge of worship of the stoikeia is earned. And these religious observances have probably been introduced by the opponents (in fact, they may in particular reveal what the opponents understand by "law"). The phrase itself probably belongs to the opponents, as a comparison with Colossians suggests; and this comparison also indicates that the stoikeia are personal powers, competitors for the worship of Christ.¹

The pagan evidence of the worship of the stoikeia indicates the sort of concerns (heimarmene, stoikeia and the stars, cosmic order, etc.) that the opponents' law-tradition is open to have attached to it. When this law-

¹On the stoikeia in Galatians as personal powers, see Schlier, Duncan, Mussner, Betz, Reicke, Bruce, etc.
tradition is held up to such a mirror out of a pagan past, this is what the Galatians see. Thus Paul's use of the expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου is related in a particularly close way to his attack on the opposing law-tradition and indicates a great deal about the law-tradition itself.

Conclusions for the Law-Tradition as Functioning in Galatians

Law is seen operating as part of a program of cosmic deliverance, couched in mystery language, and especially attached to Moses, who is the supreme mystagogue (probably a Moses in the style of the apologetic Abraham) who receives the law by heavenly revelation. It is a law-tradition that calls forth an unusually negative treatment from Paul. The period of bondage under law is because of the nature of law itself. Law is dealt with in principle. But it is law in principle as indicated by the "Tendenz" of the opponents' selectivity—that is, exclusivism and calendrical observance. This, in fact, is how the Hellenistic world often understood Jewish law.

Bondage to the law is presented as bondage to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, not only in the Galatians' present apostasy, but also in Israel's past history. It is the opponents' law-tradition that makes possible this analogy of Israel's past history and Pagan worship of stocheia as gods. When the stocheia are conceived in such terms, history-of-religions evidence reveals that concerns of
fate, cosmic order, et cetera, are present—and this in itself reveals something of the intruding law-tradition.

Possible Sources of the Law-Tradition

Gnosticism

When Paul writes to the church at Corinth, in which "gnosticising" principles are at work,¹ he is able to put "gnostic" language to work,² retain an openness to the work of the Spirit, and refuse to place the church under an anomistic principle,³ but at the same time he incorporates important correctives into his teaching that prevent their being exploited by the enthusiasm for sophia and gnosis in the community.⁴ But in Galatians he also uses language that has been productive in Gnosticism (3:19-21, 4:8-11 in conjunction with 4:1-7; see below) and has used no corrective. It would be wrong, in the

¹On the degree of Gnosticism in Corinth, see Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 14-15; and R. McL. Wilson, "How Gnostic were the Corinthians?" NTS 19 (1972-73):65-74. Both agree that Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, takes an extreme position.

²See the dialogical use of Gnostic terms in 1 Cor 2:6-12, etc. The Pauline tradition can cope well with Gnosticism in Colossians. This suggests that it is unlikely that the opponents in Galatia were Gnostic.

³Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 8-9, 16, etc., and against Drane, who has misunderstood the pragmatic approach Paul takes to ethical problems in Corinth, and his refusal to recognize any fixed norm other than the norm of the cross.

⁴See 1:10-17, 3:4-15, 2:10-15, etc. Also George W. MacRae, "Anti-Dualistic Polemic in 2 Cor 4:6," Studia Evangelica 4 (1968):420-31
light of Paul's other letters and the second-century conflict between Gnosticism and the church, to assume that Paul was a Gnostic. It is much more logical to assume that Gnosticism was not present in Galatia.

The suggestion of Gal 3:19 is that the law has come, not from God, but from angels. But this is Paul's twist of the opponents' position. They have connected the giving of the law and angels in a way that exalts the law. This makes their concept of Jewish law a very un-Gnostic one. The same dynamic is involved in 4:10: Paul can equate the new religion with a return to the worship of the elements because the new religion evidently has a high view of the elements of the universe—again, very un-Gnostic.

Later Gnostic use of Paul's arguments in Galatia should also be considered. Paul in the second century became the "Gnostic apostle," and the early church never

---

1 See Pagels, *Paul*, pp. 5, 162.


3 Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:268, sees Paul's use of the myth of the giving of the law by angels as an attempt to keep the God of Israel clear of any charges against the law. This indicates how neither the opponents (who must exalt the law as a direct revelation from God) nor Paul (who absolves the OT God of any inferior revelation) could be called "Gnostic" in the second-century sense.

4 Betz, "Problem," pp. 144-45, notes the un-Gnostic character of the traditions which regard the elements of the universe positively, such as the one in CH 4, which seems to have affinities with Jewish apocalyptic. See also Dodd, *The Bible*, pp. 229, 136.
attempted to use the arguments of Galatians against Gnostics.\(^1\) Gnostic tractates themselves, such as the Valentinian Gospel of Philip\(^2\) which makes particular use of Galatians,\(^3\) reveal that it was precisely the passages of Galatians that deal with nomism that are taken up, giving Paul the reputation of the "Gnostic apostle."\(^4\) If "Gnosticism" is a useful criterion in the assessment of Galatians, it can only demonstrate that Gnosticism was not an issue in the Galatian context.\(^5\)

Jewish Law and Hellenistic Wisdom

The way in which the law-tradition is working in Galatians suggests that parallels should be sought in the literature of the "larger Hellenistic movement of higher wisdom by revelation."\(^6\) There was here a connection of

\(^1\)See above, pp. 13-15.


\(^3\)Pagels, Paul, p. 110.

\(^4\)The Gospel of Philip uses in a Gnostic way Paul's assessment of Israel in Galatians 3 and 4, combining the Gnostic demiurge, the demiurge of Greek myth, and the God of the Jews, in an exegesis of Genesis 3, 55 (NHL, 133), 63 (NHL, 138). The law becomes the tree of knowledge, given by the demiurge, to bring death to the human race.

\(^5\)Pagels, Paul, pp. 5, 162. Paul is neither Gnostic nor anti-Gnostic.

\(^6\)Hengel, Judaism, 1:217. Both Palestinian and "Hellenistic" Judaism shared in this movement. See above, pp. 197-99. For instance, Aristobulus and the Wisdom of Solomon share a concept of inspiration, ibid., 1:136. Within this movement one can speak of "gnosis," e.g., in
wisdom and the doctrine of creation, so that wisdom became the basic principle in the ordering of the cosmos.\(^1\) Further, wisdom was identified with law, a development that began perhaps with Sirach,\(^2\) so that there is a direct relationship between the laws of the cosmos and the laws of God.\(^3\) At the same time there was a tendency for God to become transcendent and abstract, with a resultant growth in "middle beings" who interposed between God and man--both in Palestine and in the Diaspora.\(^4\) Finally, this movement, with its doctrine of revelation and inspiration, was the one to which the tradition of apostle, examined above, belonged.\(^5\) Some of the circles which shared in this development, and the

---

\(^1\) As in Prov 8, Wis Sol 7, and Ecclus 24 etc. See von Rad, Wisdom, pp. 144-46. The revelation of wisdom is the revelation of the order of the universe and of the stars, and even of the course of history. Wilckens, "οὐσία," TDNT, 7:504.

\(^2\) Sirach 24:1-12. See Wilckens, "οὐσία," TDNT, 7:503; Moore, Judaism, 1:264; and Hengel, Judaism, 1:168, who notes that this makes the idea begin in Palestine.

\(^3\) See Ps Sol 17; Sirach 19:20, 21:11, 34:8, 24. Hengel, ibid., 1:157, notes that all the phenomena in the world, and their ordering, are an expression of the "wisdom of God;" and the individual who accepts the call to walk in God's way receives a share in the cosmic wisdom.

\(^4\) Hengel, ibid., 1:155.

\(^5\) The central demand of the apostle-tradition, the demand for δικαίωμας and self-proclamation as a pneuma-self, grows directly out of this doctrine of revelation and inspiration. See above, pp. 219-24.
way in which they shared in it, will now be examined.

Philo

Philo presents Abraham and Moses in terms of the same basic pattern. Moses is one of the greatest heroes of the Jewish past, to be followed and imitated by the true worshipper of God.\(^1\) He is a prophet who speaks not of himself but of God.\(^2\) He is god and king of the whole race.\(^3\) He, too, turns from paganism to worship the true God; and he, too, is a great astrologer, understanding the secrets of the cosmos.\(^4\) In fact, he is the supreme mystagogue, who receives the ultimate revelation of God's law.\(^5\)

Because the law of nature and the law of God are closely identified, so, too, are the law of God and the one who receives this revelation of the law.\(^6\) He can speak of the divine character of Moses.\(^7\) In this man there is a combination of mortal and immortal.\(^8\) There-

---

\(^1\) Vit Mos 1. 158. 
\(^2\) Praem 2. 
\(^3\) Vit Mos 1. 158-59, Virt 177. 
\(^4\) See Vit Mos 2. 118-22, 123-26, 133-35; Cong 116-21; Decal 102-5, etc., on the connection between the commandments and astrology. 
\(^5\) Opif 3. 
\(^6\) Vit Mos 1. 162 (Moses is the law personified). 
\(^7\) Praem 2. 
fore, there is an unbreakable harmony between the law and order of the cosmos and the moral law, the torah.\footnote{The master of the world is the truest lawgiver, and to follow the law is to live in accordance with the universe (\textit{Vit Mos} 2. 48, 52; \textit{Opif} 3). The enemies of the law are the enemies of nature and the universe (\textit{Vit Mos} 2. 53, 285); the observance of the Sabbath keeps man in harmony with nature (ibid., 211-12); the temple is in fact an exact reflection of the cosmos (ibid., 2. 88, \textit{Cong} 117).}

In addition, the divine-human figure, Moses, because of his identification with this law, exercises power over the cosmos—\footnote{Philos uses the Platonic doctrine of the four elements, (\textit{Opif} 52, 109, \textit{Cher} 127, etc.). They are the material from which the cosmos was compounded. In fact, they are the instruments of God (\textit{Vit Mos} 1. 155-57). Therefore, in the "miracles" of Moses, the elements are obeying the lawgiver, and Moses himself (\textit{Vit Mos} 2. 154, 267). God gave Moses a share in His sovereignty over the elements (ibid., 1. 156). Philo rejects "miracles" in a popular sense, and seeks natural causes for them. See \textit{Tiede}, \textit{Charismatic}, p. 240. But in another sense, his natural theology has removed the distinction between the ordinary and the miraculous miracle. What appears on the one hand to be a wonder, on the other is quite natural. See \textit{Georgi}, \textit{Gegner}, pp. 155-56.}

\footnote{Betz, "Problem," pp. 146-47, notes Philo's vacillation regarding the elements. He has the Chaldeans see the true harmony between heavenly and earthly; but also has Moses disagree with their divinising of fate and necessity (\textit{Migr} 178-79). In \textit{Vit Con} 3 he opposes the identification of the \textit{στοιχεῖα} as Greek deities; but on

the \textit{στοιχεῖα}, Philo seems to take an ambivalent position, on the one hand acknowledging their role in law and cosmic order, yet, on the other, warning against the worship of them.\footnote{Betz, "Problem," pp. 146-47, notes Philo's vacillation regarding the elements. He has the Chaldeans see the true harmony between heavenly and earthly; but also has Moses disagree with their divinising of fate and necessity (\textit{Migr} 178-79). In \textit{Vit Con} 3 he opposes the identification of the \textit{στοιχεῖα} as Greek deities; but on

Philos seems to take an ambivalent position, on the one hand acknowledging their role in law and cosmic order, yet, on the other, warning against the worship of them.\footnote{Betz, "Problem," pp. 146-47, notes Philo's vacillation regarding the elements. He has the Chaldeans see the true harmony between heavenly and earthly; but also has Moses disagree with their divinising of fate and necessity (\textit{Migr} 178-79). In \textit{Vit Con} 3 he opposes the identification of the \textit{στοιχεῖα} as Greek deities; but on

There is the same ambivalence in his treatment of astrology. It is an essential part of the knowledge of

---
God, and the founders of the religion of Israel were the greatest astrologers. But on the other hand he condemns any worship of the stars or fate. One gets the impression that Judaism as he presented it laid itself very much open to the charge of being nothing but adoration of the cosmos. Especially in his very favorable portrayal of the δεσπότες and their attention to the sun, the seasons, et cetera, must he emphasise that they do not do what in fact they appear to do—worship the heavenly bodies and εἴμαρμένη. Josephus has his Essenes do exactly that. In fact, there is much to suggest that, the other hand he can say that heaven is the dwelling place of the astral deities (Opif 27).

1See Abr 69, 71 on Abraham the astrologer; and Vit Mos 2. 118-22, 123-26, 133-35, etc., on Mosaic religion and astrology. He can even refer to the stars as divine beings, ὕψαλοι . . . ἀμάρατοί τε καὶ θείαι (Gig 8, Migr 263).

2Conf 173; Heres 300-12; Migr 178-75.

3Goodenough, Introduction, pp. 82-83, notes this incongruity in Philo's scheme. He does not deny the existence of lesser gods, but only denies that they should be worshipped (Decal 53).

4Vit Con 3.

5For instance, Josephus, Ant 13. 172, τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑσσηνῶν γένος πάντην τὴν εἴμαρμένην κυρίαν ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ μηδὲν ὧ μὴ κατ' ἐκείνης ψήφον ἀνυρώπως ἀπαντᾷ. See Richard Reitzenstein, Poimandres (Darmstadt: Wissenschaf tliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), p. 75. Hengel, Judaism, 1:236, commenting on a parallel report in Josephus Bell 2. 128, says, "the symbolic significance of the sun in Esseneism could at least be understood by the Jewish observer." Perhaps he could have better said, "misunderstood."
on the popular level, Israel's religion was practised in terms of magic and astrology.¹

Thus these traditions of Moses, cosmos, and law, as they are found in Philo, could possible account for some aspects of the opponents' "law-heresy." With the Therapeutai is the suggestion of a bridge between Philo and Palestinian piety; and, in fact, it will become evident that much of this law-tradition does not only belong to Philo, but is found in other bodies of Jewish literature.²

Josephus

Josephus also identifies Abraham and Moses closely, as has been seen above. Perhaps more than in Philo, Moses is the impressive representative of God who can overcome all opposition by his miraculous prowess.³

This impressiveness in the natural order is intricately

¹See Goodenough, Symbols, 2:168-69, 203 (commenting on Wis Sol 13:1-2, 4 Macc 14:7, 17:5). Jews were wearing magic amulets as early as 2 Macc 12:32-45. In volume 12, p. 164, he comments on the four portraits of Moses at Dura-Europos: in the last, Moses stands under the arch of heaven in which are the sun, the moon, and the seven stars. He summarizes some magical material on pp. 62-63. Note that it is not only Essenes who do homage to ἐλευθερίαν, but Pharisees (Hippol 9. 4, Epiphanes 1. 16. 2) and Saducees (Josephus Ant 13. 172). See Reitzenstein, ibid., pp. 75-79.

²So Reicke, "The Law," p. 273, comments that the law-tradition in Philo is close to that of apocalyptic literature.

³See Josephus Ant 3. 181-87, on the wonders worked by Moses and his defeat of the Egyptian magicians. Moses is here a δυστοςἄνηρ. This characteristic
bound up with his association with law.\(^1\) This is because the law of God is directly concerned with nature, the fruitful earth, the peaceful sea, et cetera.\(^2\) The ten words written by God are a heavenly letter making possible a εὐρετήριον βίος,\(^3\) because the purpose of the law is to promote life, both physical and spiritual.\(^4\) In keeping with this, the Temple is understood in cosmo logical terms, as in Philo. It depicts the order of the four cosmic στοιχεῖα.\(^5\) Because the Tabernacle is a symbol of the universe, these must be the laws of the God of the

---

\(^1\)See above, p. 257, note 3, on Moses' genius for invention.

\(^2\)Josephus Apion 2. 279.

\(^3\)Josephus Ant 3. 75-78, 88.

\(^4\)Aristobulus presents the same interest in the divine ordering of creation in terms of the Sabbath. To him, it reveals the principle of the number seven which orders the cosmos. The entire natural process is shaped after the structure of seven, which permeates and orders the world and is the basis of the human capacity for knowledge and wisdom. See Hengel, Judaism, 1:166.

\(^5\)Josephus Bell 5. 213; Ant 3. 183, "The tapestries woven of four materials denote the natural elements (τὴν τὸν στοιχείων φύσιν)." See above, p. 298. In Ant 3. 181-83, the tabernacle has cosmic significance, and it is made clear that this meaning was intended by Moses himself. Holladay, Theios Aner, pp. 82-83, suggests that, behind this tabernacle allegory of Philo and Josephus, lies a common tradition, and a Palestinian tradition at that. He gives Rabbinic parallels to many details in the allegory. The Most Holy Place symbolizes heaven, earth, and the sea; the seven-branched candlestick symbolizes the seven planets, etc. In this allegory, νόμος for Josephus comes to have cosmic propor-
universe. The Jews follow a cosmic law-code.\textsuperscript{1}

\textbf{Apocalyptic Literature}

In this literature, as in Josephus and Philo, Moses is the supreme mystagogue, and Sinai is a mystical ascent and occasion of revelation of the secrets of the universe.\textsuperscript{2}

In keeping with the wisdom traditions in which the literature shares, there is a mystical correlation of Torah, the order of the cosmos, the righteousness of Israel, and the ultimate fate of man.\textsuperscript{3} It has been noted

\begin{itemize}
\item This does not seem to be an "apologetic" theology of law, but a law-tradition common to Judaism in both Palestine and the Diaspora, here put to "apologetic" use.
\item All of Jubilees is an esoteric revelation to Moses on Sinai. See also 2 Bar 4:2-7, chap. 59, Ps Philo 11:15-12:1, 19:8-16. See also below p. 358; and Meeks, "Moses," pp. 356-64.
\item Limbeck, Ordnung, pp. 64-70. The stars of heaven are obedient to the Torah (1 Enoch 33:3); and the law-keeping of nature is a pattern for the law-keeping of man (1 Enoch 2:2). Thus the goal of revelation is to bring man into conformity to the order of the cosmos (1 Enoch 36:4, 41:17). This strong sense of relationship between earth and heaven, law of God, and cosmic order, is because creation is not seen as spiritless impersonal reality, but as a world in which the elements are ruled by angels and spirits, the "middle beings" who interpose between God and man. Fruitfulness and prosperity are bound up with observance of calendrical, cosmic, and angelic law, 1 Enoch 80:2-8, 82:4-6. There is also an eschatological relationship between the cosmos and obedience to law. The end of time is determined by the stars (Sib Or 3:81-90; 2 Enoch 65:7; 1 Enoch 72:1; Jubilees 50:5); and if one is to "know God," and be prepared for the consummation of the age, one must also know the cosmological mysteries. In Jub 1:26-29 the "times" of God
\end{itemize}
above that calendrical piety was central to apocalyptic; and evidently for good reason. In 1 Enoch the law and order of the cosmos is matter for "essential revelation" (chaps. 72-79); and especially must the righteous be told the alternations in the movement of the heavenly bodies.\textsuperscript{1} The fates of men are linked, in these eschatological schemes, with the order and movement of the cosmos.\textsuperscript{2} The two laws, the law of order and of creation, and the Torah, come to be identified as one.\textsuperscript{3} Moses the lawgiver fits into this role. The laws given to him are especially the laws of cosmic order and of the secrets of the universe, and the way out of cosmic disorder.\textsuperscript{4} They are bound up with preparation for the time "when heaven and earth shall be renewed." See also 1 Enoch 72:1.

\textsuperscript{1} All this movement will be concealed from sinners, and the result will be disastrous for them (1 Enoch 80-82). The ordering of the cosmos has meaning for salvation, because the stars (angels) and the righteousness of Israel are in mystical relationship (Ps Sol 18:10; Ass Mos 10:8-12; 2 Bar 51:10). See Limbeck, Ordnung, pp. 65-69.

\textsuperscript{2} The righteous are given a knowledge of this order, but the wicked are not, and consequently "evil shall be multiplied upon them. . . . " (1 Enoch 80:8).

\textsuperscript{3} There is a direct relationship between the laws of heaven and the laws of God (1 Enoch 2:2). Knowledge of order is bound up with the Torah in 2 Bar 48:1-24. After surveying the terrifying cosmos which is governed by God, Baruch declares, " . . . the law which is amongst us will aid us, and the surpassing wisdom which is in us will help us."

\textsuperscript{4} In Jub 1:27-2:1, the heavenly laws given Moses by the angel are laws of calendrical observance. See also 2 Baruch 59, where God reveals to Moses the secrets of cosmic order; and Wis Sol 13.
are essential to those who would fellowship with the angels and the "middle beings."\(^1\) The concept of the law of Israel as universal law which, in Philo and Josephus, leads to heroic portrayals of Israel's leading figures, here leads to the demand for perfect obedience to calendrical law.\(^2\)

This intensification of the demands of the law\(^3\) leads to a heightened sense of the remnant, which is both fully obedient and fully predestined to salvation.\(^4\) Further, in keeping with the wisdom movement and its understanding of revelation and inspiration,\(^5\) righteousness

\(^1\) In Jub 1-2, 50, the Sabbath and the feast of weeks had been celebrated in heaven before they were given to Moses and were thus an expression of the heavenly ordering of time. In Jub 2:9, 17-19 angels keep the Sabbath along with men; and in 4:15-20, God's angels descend and teach justice, righteousness, and wisdom—and days, months, and Sabbaths. On the intense calendrical concern in Jubilees, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, Studies in Qumran Law (Leiden: Brill, 1977), pp. 101-14.

\(^2\) See above, p. 300.

\(^3\) Along with the eschatology of the imminence of the age to come goes an intensified demand that Israel be obedient to the law of God. See 4 Ezra 7:20, 45, 72 (the reason the nations are to be judged is that they had the law and did not keep it), 7:88-90 (future rewards are for those who keep the Torah), 9:36, 37 (the law abides for ever), etc. See also 2 Bar 84:2-4, 48:23-24. Limbeck, Ordnung, pp. 38-39.

\(^4\) Ezra 7:60, 61; 8:1, 3; 9:22, etc. Determinism and freedom are not thought through philosophically. See von Rad, Wisdom, p. 263.

and wisdom are identical, and the first and basic redemp-
tive gift to the righteous is wisdom.\(^1\) The law is heav-
enly and esoteric. True insight into the law must be a
heavenly gift,\(^2\) and, conversely, heavenly insight or wis-
dom comes only to those who search out the Torah.\(^3\) Thus
the law is couched in mystery-language, and the "right-
eousness of the law" can be conceived as participation in
a mystery.\(^4\) It could be referred to as "nomistic enthusi-
asm." The keeping of the law brings Lady Wisdom.

---

\(^1\) See Wilckens, "\(\sigma ω \phi \alpha\)," TDNT, 7:503; von Rad
Wisdom, p. 277; and Vielhauer, NTA, 2:597-98, on wisdom
features in apocalyptic (dream-interpretation, figura-
tive utterance, knowledge of the cosmos, neglect of
salvation-history, etc.). On wisdom and redemption, see
4 Ezra 8:52, and 1 Enoch 92:1, 101:8.

\(^2\) Especially in terms of the myth of hidden wis-
dom in 1 Enoch 42 (wisdom found no place on earth etc.),
94:5, and 98:3. See also 4 Ezra 5:9, 2 Bar 48:33-36,
and 3:9-12 (the way of the commandments as the way of
wisdom). Wisdom (Torah) remains God's, and only He can
give it (2 Bar 14:9).

\(^3\) In 4 Ezra 4:21 the dwellers on earth can under-
stand only what is on the earth, and they who are above
the heavens that which is above the heavenly heights.
Hence, in 13:53-56, these things have been revealed to
Ezra because "you searched out My law; thy life hast thou
ordered unto wisdom and hast called understanding thy
mother."

\(^4\) Just as wisdom is a hidden mystery (1 Enoch
42:1-3, etc.), the law itself is a mystery. 1 Enoch
49:1-4 and 48:5 speak of the "secrets of righteousness"
(calendrical and cosmic order, 1 Enoch 72-82). Wilckens,
"\(\sigma ω \phi \alpha\)," TDNT, 7:499-503, suggests that Jewish wisdom-
speculations are related to Hellenistic mystery-
speculations, and pass into Gnosticism, where a central
place is given to Sophia.
There are even angelic guardians of the law. There seems to be a relationship here to the Pagan concept of οὐρανός. The four archangels may take the place of the four elements; and angels, elements, astral bodies, and their functions appear interchangeable. In later literature in which the same traditions are taken up, the "elements" are described as beings who appear to be persons, and who are the cosmic rulers of the darkness of this age. Some of this literature shows striking parallels to material from Qumran.

Here is a law-tradition which shows a close correlation to the one functioning in Galatia. There is a radical nomism. Law is couched in mystery language, and the one who has insights into the law is one who is granted personal revelations from heaven; and the Torah

---


3 So 2 Baruch 48:89, "... Thou givest commandment to the flames, and they change into spirits ... Thou makest wise the spheres so as to minister to their orders."

4 See Test Sol 8:2, "We are the elements, the cosmic rulers of darkness (ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν στοιχεῖα κοσμοκράτω­�ες τοῦ σκότους);" and 18:2, "We are the thirty-six elements, the world rulers of the darkness of this age." Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, pp. 197-77, suggests a date within the first century CE for the original Jewish composition.

5 See Charlesworth, ibid., p. 199, and the sug-
comes to be identified with cosmic law and order. There is a vital relationship between calendrical piety and the righteousness of the righteous; and righteousness, or entrance into the mysteries of the law, is with a view to participating in the cosmic ordering of history and securing a place in the age to come.\footnote{1} Angels have an important role in the administration of the law, and the Pagan concept of στοιχεῖα seems to be passing over into concepts of the role of angels.\footnote{2} This literature shares views of revelation and inspiration with "apologetic" literature;\footnote{3} and with respect to law, the role of Moses here is close to his "hagiographic" role in that literature. It is not impossible that the opponents have combined the cultic function of heroes in "apologetic" Judaism with the above aspects of Torah tradition in apocalyptic literature.\footnote{4} In fact, this would be expected if the traditions of apocalyptic Judaism were taken into gestive parallels to the Qumranic temple scroll.

\footnote{1}{See above, pp. 129-31, 137-39, 261, etc., on the essential place of eschatology in the debate concerning δικαιοσύνη.}

\footnote{2}{Reicke, "The Law," p. 273: "It is quite possible that Paul's opponents in Galatia really embraced doctrines similar to those in the books of Enoch and Jubilees." He suggests that they saw a close association between the angels and the στοιχεῖα.}

\footnote{3}{See above, pp. 238-41.}

\footnote{4}{Barrett, in 2 Corinthians, and Georgi, in Gegenner, both see the opponents of 2 Corinthians as being Palestinian Jews, using a combination of Palestinian traditions and Hellenistic propaganda techniques.}
an apologetic setting—such as a missionary campaign to the Gentiles.

Qumran Literature

Qumran literature, too, shares in, and even intensifies some of the characteristics of, the "hasidic wisdom tradition." A sharpening of the demands of the law accompanies an expectation of an imminent apocalyptic end. But this intense preoccupation with the law, and a consciousness of being a righteous remnant of Israel, in fact leads to a break between the community and the geographical focus of Israel's law, Jerusalem. This

1 Hengel, *Judaism*, 1:228.

2 See Gaster, *Scriptures*, pp. 8-9; R. Huntjens, "Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran," *RQ* 8 (1972-75):380, comments, "The whole object of their intense legalism and searching of the Torah was to be ready for the eschaton." See above pp. 4, on the Qumran peshers. Hengel, *Judaism*, 1:222, refers to the sect as an "eschatologically radicalized . . . movement of sanctification." On the place of apocalyptic traditions and literature in Qumran, see Russell, *Method*, pp. 38-47, noting, on the one hand, fragments of Jubilees, 1 Enoch, the Testament of Levi, and other apocalyptic literature; and, on the other, the community's own apocalyptic works, such as the commentaries on Isaiah, Hosea, Micah, and Nahum, the Zadokite Document, the War Scroll, the Midrash on the Last Days, etc. For the striking affinities of the traditions of Qumran with Jubilees, see James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 258-80.

3 Gaster, *Scriptures*, p. 4. See the titles chosen by the sectaries to designate continuity with previous remnants (1 QH 6:14, 8:6, 10). Priests are "sons of Zadok," etc. (1 QS 5:2, 9:14).

4 See especially 1 QS and CD. The sectaries accused the priests of failing to observe laws of ritual
simultaneous zeal for law and rejection of the temple led to both modifications in law observance and an idealisation of Jerusalem.

Part of this sense of sharpening of the law is a sense of a continuity in the covenants of God. "Sinai was itself but a rearticulation of that which God had previously made . . . with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." Thus the "New Covenant" of the sectaries was an intensification of the eternal covenant that had been constantly reaffirmed with Israel.

Here, in keeping with the "wisdom" tradition, law is a mystery and can only be fully understood through purity etc., and so entered into a covenant to avoid the temple. See Fitzmyer, "Ebionites," pp. 222-23.

They apparently allowed prayers, lustrations, etc., in the place of sacrifices (ibid., p. 230; Philo Prob 1.75; CD 6:11-13; Josephus Ant 18:1-5; and Flusser, "Dead Sea Sect," p. 229).

See above, pp. 231-34, on the designation of the community as Jerusalem.

Gaster, Scriptures, p. 5.

The Term was especially important to the sectaries (CD 6:14, 18-19; 20:11-12).

See particularly 1 Q 22, a paraphrase of Moses' farewell speech in Deuteronomy. It takes the form of a covenant-renewal, indicating the sectarians' understanding of "new covenant."

See above, p. 229, on דָּעָן in Qumran, and the correlation of יָדָע and יָד. Saving knowledge becomes a divine mystery (Hengel, Judaism, 1:222); vision and ecstasy are the confirmation of the "prophetic wise man" (207), and visionary pseudonymity has retreated (205).
heavenly revelation.¹ This heavenly revelation, in turn, is given to the one who devotes himself to the law,² and it constitutes one a member of the eternal communion of the nonmortal beings of the celestial realm.³ The hasidic teacher of the law receives almost a missionary commission.⁴

There is, further, a vital connection between the law and order of the cosmos and the law given to men.⁵

¹Gaster, Scriptures, p. 7. In 1 QS 5:11-12 the laws are "that which was hidden from Israel but found by the man who searches." It is interesting to compare 1 QH 5:11, "thou . . . hast hidden Thy Torah (within me)," and 1 QH 5:25, "the mystery which thou hast hidden in me." In 1 QS 4:6 also the law is an esoteric doctrine. See also 1 QS 1:9, 3:24; 1 QM 1:3; CD 13:12. Divine revelation is needed, even if one is to be able to know the mysteries of the divine revelation in scripture (1 QH 12:11-13). Hengel, Judaism, 1:222.

²In the sense of obedience, e.g., CD 3:13-17, "But with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God, He made His covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them hidden things . . . "; and in the sense of continual meditation on the Torah, searching for its hidden meaning. See above, p. 229, and Hengel, Judaism, 1:177.

³Gaster, Scriptures, p. 7; see above, p. 196.


⁵Especially 1 QS 10:1-4, 1 QS 1:14, and 1 QH 1:10-20, which concludes, "Or ever spirits immortal took on the form of holy angels, Thou didst assign them to bear rule over divers domains: over the sun and the moon, to govern their hidden powers; over the stars, to hold them in their courses; over (rain and snow), to make them fulfill their functions . . . Thou hast assigned the tasks of men's spirits duly, moment by moment. . . . By (Thy will all things exist), and without Thee is nothing wrought."
The intense desire of the community to live according to the structure of the universe\(^1\) is revealed in the concern to observe a particular festal calendar.\(^2\) A life according to the Torah, corresponding to the laws of creation and the course of history, is only possible with the correct calculation of time revealed by God.\(^3\) The "exact interpretation of the law" becomes in particular the exact observance of the calendrical festivals according to the community's own reckoning,\(^4\) and the "New Covenant" is identified constantly with the correct interpretation

\(^1\)Limbeck Ordnung, p. 67.

\(^2\)For example, CD 6:14, 18-19: "They shall be careful to act according to the exact interpretation of the law . . . to observe the Sabbath day according to its exact interpretation and the festivals and the day of fasting according to the (interpretations) of those who have entered the New Covenant. . . ." In 1 QH 4:10-11 the enemies of Israel are guilty of "exchanging the law . . . that they may gaze on their folly concerning their festival days." Huntjens, "Covenant," p. 365, concludes, "The question of the calendar . . . was the single most decisive issue that led to the secession of the sect." This is in particular a solar calendar (CD 3:13-16, 1 QS 1:14, 10:1-9). Compare this to the Essene devotion to the sun in Philo and Josephus (above, pp. 299-300 and the misunderstanding to which these accounts were open. There is an association between the Covenanters' traditions and Jubilees especially in connection with calendrical law. "While the theological parallels . . . strongly suggest that the Qumran covenanters and Jub's author belonged to the same theological tradition, the fact that they adhered to a unique calendar makes the case overwhelming" (VanderKam, Jubilees, p. 270). See also Joseph M. Baumgarten, Studies in Qumran Law (Leiden: Brill, 1977), pp. 102-14.

\(^3\)Hengel, Judaism, 1:235. See how this echoes the concerns of Jubilees and 1 Enoch.

\(^4\)See above, CD 6:14, 18-19. There is a similar concern in Jub 6:36-37.
and observation of the festivals. This preoccupation with cosmic order is especially evident in that the "hidden things" that are "revealed" to the obedient in their quest to understand the law are the Sabbaths, festivals, et cetera. It is not surprising that some have found in these texts close parallels to Gal 4:10.

The Qumran sectaries gave angels an important place in the ordering of the cosmos, drew close connections between angels and heavenly bodies, and saw a strong astral influence in the lives of men. Particularly interesting are the references to the apparently

---

1 Huntjens, "Covenant," p. 363. See CD 6:14, 18-19 and 1 QS 1:14-15 ("They must not deviate by a single step from carrying out the orders of God at the times appointed for them . . . "); also 1 QH 1:24-25. In 1 Q22 1:8, 2:8, and 3:3 the Sabbath is identified with the covenant. Huntjens, ibid., p. 308, notes that the amount of legal material in the texts is very small, there being nothing like Mishnaic halakha. The demand for law-obedience is principally in terms of calendrical feasts. In CD 10:14-12:18 there is a reworking of a portion of Leviticus; but more than half of it is on the Sabbath.

2 CD 3:13-17: "But with the remnant that held fast to the commandments of God, He made His covenant with Israel forever, revealing to them the hidden things . . . His holy sabbaths and His glorious festivals."

3 Davies, "Scrolls," p. 167, on 1 QS 1:14, quoted above (p. 279); Herbert Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament, 2 vols. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966), 1:229-30, sees a parallel in 1 QM 10:10-14: "Thou art He who decreed the day of the Sabbath rest and the holy festivals, the turning-points of the years and (all) the appointed seasons.

4 Ringgren, Qumran pp. 56-57, quoting 1 QH 1:8-15: "Before they became (holy) angels, (Thou madest them) as everlasting spirits in their dominions, the luminaries for their mysteries, the stars for the courses. . . . "

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
angelic/astral figure, the "Prince of Lights." Because the cosmos is so ordered by these spiritual powers, there is a close connection between man's observance of cosmic order and his fellowship with the angels. Hence observance of "God's truth," or His law, of which an essential part is calendrical observance, becomes for another reason a participation in a mystery. There is mounting evidence of the practice of astrology in Qumran, which must belong with this cosmic concern. There is the same ambivalence here as in Philo: the warnings of Jubilees were not heeded.

---

1 See 1 QS 3:20; CD 5:18; and 1 QM 10:10-14, where ἐνθος may mean an astral spirit. Braun, Qumran, 1:229-30, sees this doctrine too as being close to the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου of Gal 4:3, 9.

2 See the references above, p. 204, to the community's sense of the presence of angels in the congregation. Gaster, Scriptures, p. 7, comments, "He (the sectarian) breaks the trammels of his mortality . . . he becomes one with the nonmortal beings of the celestial realm--the "holy ones" who stand forever in direct converse with God."

3 In 1 QM 10:10-12, there is a direct connection between the rule of the cosmos by heavenly spiritual beings, and the institution of the calendrical festivals. See also 1 QS 1:14-15.

4 See Gaster, Scriptures, pp. 8-9. The sectaries sought escape from the cycle of the ages and the elements of the universe, release not just from sin but from mortality.

5 Especially the astrological fragments from Cave 4, some of which are reproduced in Hengel, Judaism, 1:237-28. Further references are given in 2:158-59.

6 Ibid., 1:239. Jub 12:16-18 is in effect a polemic against astrology.
This community also had a great concern for righteousness—a concern which shows both continuity and contrast with Paul's argument for righteousness by faith in Galatians. The sectaries speak of God's righteousness in two principle senses: the perfection of God in contrast to the sinfulness of man, and God's work of pardon or cleansing of man through \( \text{כפושכ} \) (justification) by the \( \text{כפושכ} \) (righteousness) of God. Man's righteousness is spoken of in three ways: the covenantal sense of the community as the righteous elect; the unrighteousness of man before God and the need of cleansing and

---

1 See especially Ziesler, Righteousness, pp. 85-103, and Sanders, Paul, pp. 305-12; and above, pp. 155-57.

2 God and man are contrasted in 1 QS 1:21-2:4, 10:23, and 1 QH 1:26, 4:29-31. This sense of the overwhelming righteousness of God is the foundation of the doctrine of righteousness by grace.

3 1 QH 11:31 (man is cleansed through God's mercy); and 1 QS 11:14 (God will judge the psalmist through \( \text{כפושכ} \) [righteousness]).

4 Here man's righteousness is derived from God's righteousness, and man's way is only perfected by the grace of God. See especially the parallelism in 1 QS 11:13-14:

As for me,

If I stumble, the mercies of God shall be my eternal salvation;
If I stagger because of the sin of my flesh, my justification (\( \text{כפושכ} \)) shall be by the righteousness of God (\( \text{כפושכ} \)).

Here \( \text{כפושכ} \) is parallel to salvation, righteousness to mercy.

5 See 1 QH 7:12. Here the distinction is between the righteousness and the wicked.
justification by His mercy or grace; and, significantly for this study, human righteousness by works of law. The aim of God's grace is always consistent with His repeatedly confirmed covenant, and the man who is justified by grace will then be justified by his law obedience. Being righteous involves doing the law. This is the condition of remaining elect. The doctrine of justification by grace is accompanied by a standard of obedience far stricter than that of the rabbis.

In conclusion, there is here a sharing of various traditions regarding the law with other literature (law and cosmic order, the law as a mystery, etc.), though several strands are strengthened. There is a vigorous awareness of the community as both separated from the rest of humanity and also taken up into the fellowship of divine beings. Because of the break with the geographi-

---

1 QH 12:9, 7:30, 4:31.
2 QS 11:17 (righteousness equals perfection of way); and 1 QH 7:28-31 (righteousness is the opposite of transgression).
3 Man is righteous by God's mercy; but the only way to remain righteous is to do the commandments of God as specified by the sect's covenant. See Sanders, Paul, p. 312.
4 Once having bound himself to the Torah, the member will observe it even at the price of death. See 1 QS 5:8, CD 15:2, 6, etc.
5 Sanders, ibid., p. 312. He disagrees with Ziesler regarding his proposed distinction between the use of the verb (forensic) and noun and adjective (ethical) forms of the root פָּתָא. There is no distinction in use.
cal centre of the law, there is both modification and idealization of law.

In at least one strand of law-tradition in the documents, the "new covenant" is associated especially with the calendrical and cultic feasts. There is a close connection between these last and the orders of creation. The intense interest in the calendar is part of an intense interest in the governing forces of the cosmos and a desire to live in harmony with the cosmos.

There is an emphasis on the grace of God and, at the same time, an understanding of covenant in terms of continuity which places alongside justification by grace a justification by law and a demand for perfect obedience to law. This concern for justification is in the context of a search for deliverance from mortality and the cosmos.

Conclusions

In all of the above traditions there is evidence of certain law-traditions that are held as common property—in particular, the law as the basis for cosmic order, the law as that which ensures harmony between man and his cosmos, and a relation between the law and angels or powerful spiritual forces in the universe. Law is conceived as a mystery, and Judaism as a mystery religion.

1See Huntjen, above, and also Black, in Scrolls, p. 125. There are at least two notions of law and covenant in Qumran, one legalist, one more spiritual.
This common core of law-traditions is strikingly parallel to the law-tradition evidently held by the opponents, which becomes apparent in the mystery language of 3:1-5 and 4:8-11, the connection between law and angels in 3:19 and between the false gospel and angels in 1:6-9, the relation between law and cosmic order evidently behind 4:8-11, and the reference to calendrical piety. It is a law-tradition which matches the way law is dealt with in Galatians as a principle, but as a principle in terms of the selective "Tendenz" of the opponents, with their stress on calendrical law.

It is therefore, a law-tradition which can explain how the opponents' law teaching, while not advocating the adoration of the στοιχεῖα as gods, is yet very much open to a propaganda attack which makes it analogous to pagan devotion to the στοιχεῖα. Philo perhaps struggles against just such an equation of his law-tradition with Pagan astrology and veneration of cosmic forces; and his law-tradition is shared in many respects with apocalyptic and Qumran traditions regarding the law and cosmic order, which are also open to such an analogy. This illuminates the dynamic involved in the way Paul brings the στοιχεῖα into the argument. The opponents evidently exalt the στοιχεῖα and their place in the maintenance of lawful cosmic order. Paul parallels them to the στοιχεῖα that the Pagan Galatians have served in the past, making them—and therefore the law they enforce—enslaving
instruments that come not from God but from the forces of evil. Judaism is suddenly just another pre-Christian religion, and Israel's past history is analogous to Pagan worship of στοιχεῖα. The Galatians have begun with one religion but are now seeking initiation into another—which is really the one they left when they first became Christians.

Apart from these common law-traditions, some of the particular emphases of the Qumran documents appear to be significant, such as the intensification of the law, the identification of the law especially with the sacred calendar (both also in apocalyptic literature), the assumption that all the Old Testament covenants are consecutive reaffirmations of one eternal covenant, and the different definitions of righteousness, so that a righteousness by grace apart from works is held to alongside a righteousness by works.

Besides these emphases of Qumran, the propaganda technique of apologetic literature (as in Philo and Josephus), and the portrayal of Moses as a religious hero, appear to be particularly congruous with the opponents' self-understanding, their evident exaltation of Moses as the supreme mystagogue (see on 3:15-20), and equation of Abraham and Moses (where Paul has apparently accepted their first religious hero, Abraham, and rejected the second).

There would seem to be good reason for suggesting
that the opponents have combined traditions similar to those of Qumran with those of the "apologetic" tradition.\(^1\) Firstly, they are congruous,\(^2\) and much of their law-traditions appears to be common property. Secondly, the Qumran literature is not apologetic. It would be expected that apologetic techniques would be used if ever such a law-theology were presented to Pagans. Qumran reveals how far a nomistic community can go in making law a cosmic mystery. Apologetic literature reveals the method that may have been used to make this Jewish law-mystery appealing to Gentiles. And thirdly, in Qumran, too, the tradition of the religious hero appears. In the Genesis Apocryphon is found the same impressive Abraham as in the "apologetic" literature.

This law-tradition suggests how Paul can charge the nomists with failure to keep the "whole law." The opponents evidently understand law particularly as calendar observance, perhaps even in the sense that the Qumran community does.\(^3\) Josephus closely equates the

---

\(^1\) Similar to the suggestions of Barrett and Georgi regarding the opponents in 2 Corinthians. See above, p. 306.

\(^2\) As must be all borrowings in religion: Moore, Judaism 2:394-95: "Borrowings in religion . . . are usually in the nature of appropriation of things in the possession of another which the borrower recognizes . . . as belonging to himself . . . the necessary complements of his own (ideas)."

\(^3\) See above, pp. 310-12, on the lack of halakha in the documents, and the replacement of the Temple law observance with their own rites.
observance of Jewish law throughout the world with the observance of the Sabbath and Jewish festivals;¹ and other ancient authors associate Jewish law especially with these observances.² It is possible that, in their combination of apocalyptic and apologetic traditions of law, the opponents have taught the Galatians only those aspects of law that fit readily into the cosmological and mystical understanding of law. Thus Paul refers to this law-tradition in terms of mystery rites, and to Judaism in terms of mystery religion and a devotion to the στοιχεῖα. It leads only to a failure to keep the "whole law."

¹See above, p. 252, quoting Josephus Apion 2:282, which refers to the popularity of Jewish law among Pagans in terms of the Sabbath, fasts, and food laws.

²For instance, Augustine (Civ Dei 6:11), quoting earlier satirists of Jews on Jewish law.
CHAPTER NINE

THE TRADITION OF THE SACRAMENTS

By "sacrament" will be meant here "an act which by natural means puts supranatural powers in effect," and the two sacraments considered here will be circumcision and baptism. There is little debate that the latter can be called a "sacrament:"

1Bultmann, Theology, 1:135, who goes on to say, "... if the act is consummated according to the prescribed rite, then the supernatural powers go into effect, and the act ... is itself a supranatural ceremony which works a miracle." See also Schoeps, Paul, pp. 111-13; and Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 174-75.

2See Bultmann, ibid., pp. 135-36; Schoeps, ibid., p. 113; and on baptism in Galatia, Mussner, Galater, p. 263.


4Goodenough, Symbols, 6:144. The Encyclopaedia Judaica admits that failure to carry out circumcision leads to "excision at the hand of heaven from the community." See Meyer, "περιτέμωνω," TDNT, 6:80-81. Circumcision is a "precondition, sign, and seal of participation in Abraham's covenant," and failure to carry it out leads to a loss of salvation. Hence Goodenough calls it "a visible sign of an invisible grace," adding, "One strongly suspects that before the Christians came to have
function of circumcision, and of baptism, in the theology of the opponents.

The Function of the Tradition in Galatians

Circumcision

The necessity for circumcision in the opponents' scheme has been pointed out above and becomes even more evident when the unusual nature of Paul's attack on circumcision is considered. Unlike 1 Cor 7:17-24, where circumcision becomes one of the δόγματα,1 Paul here says not only "you need not be circumcised," but "you must not (5:2-4)."² In Rom 2:25-29 he can say περιτομή ... ωφελεί εὰν νόμον πράσσης; but in Gal 5:2-4 he says έὰν περιτέμνησθε Χριστὸς υμᾶς οὐδὲν ωφελήσει, and you are cut off from Christ. It was commented above that in Romans 2 Paul brings together physical and spiritual circumcision, those sacraments which the Jews sharply rejected, circumcision would have been freely called a sacrament. ... "

1See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 126. The principle is that of κλησίς: one must remain in the particular place allotted to him in the world. There is a difference here from Galatians, as there is no sign of Judaizing demands. Note also Drane, Paul, pp. 5-59, on the difference between Gal 5:6 and 1 Cor 7:19.

²Thomas Walter Manson, Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, ed., Matthew Black (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962), p. 169. Drane, Paul, notices the entirely different attitude between Galatians 5 on the one hand, and 1 Cor 8, 10:14-30 and Romans 14 on the other, where Paul pleads the rights of the "weaker" Jewish-Christian brother. In Rom 14:5-6 Paul says, "Observe whatever day you like!" But in Gal 4:10-11 he says, "You observe days ... I am afraid I have labored over you in vain." Circumcision and calendrical obser-
as was done by Philo and the Qumran sectaries;¹ but in Galatians he will not even discuss spiritual circumcision or use the argument that Christianity is the true, spiritual circumcision, as in Col 2:11-13 and Phil 3:3. This suggests that the opponents themselves were propagating the necessity of both physical and spiritual circumcision and the indissoluble connection between the two.²

The opponents are Christians and hold to a justification by faith, which is followed by a justification by works—which, from Gal 5:2-4, is epitomised by circumcision (ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄφελήσει... κατηργήσατε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ οἴτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε). As Christians, they undoubtedly practice a baptism that makes effectual for them a "justification by faith" (as is suggested by the way 2:16-21 develops the meaning of baptism). But it is probably a baptism which is only a beginning initiatory rite to be followed by further, advanced rites.³ As Genesis portrays their hero Abraham, advances apparently occupy an entirely different place in Galatians.

¹Meyer, "περιτέμνω," TDNT, 6:72, and below.
²As in Philo. See below, p. 335.
³See the discussion of the mystery language in 3:3, above pp. 176-81. Baptism evidently comes under ἐνάρξεσθαι, and circumcision under ἐπιτελεῖν. In Qumran baptism was not an unrepeatable occurrence, but probably a daily routine. See Ringgren, Qumran, p. 245. John's baptism was less than an eschatological rite, being only a baptism of "repentance" (Luke 3:3; see also Acts 19:1-7.
the order of salvation is faith, then circumcision; so, in their propaganda, the order of salvation for Gentiles is probably baptism, then circumcision.\(^1\) This would help explain Paul's reluctance to argue from Abraham's circumcision, as he does in Rom 4:11. In Rom 4:1-2, Paul states that Abraham first believed and was then circumcised—and makes a sound argument for the priority of faith. But the opponents' position may have been exactly that of Rom 4:11, speaking of Abraham, καὶ οπλεῖον ἐλάβεν περιτομής, σοφαγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀμορφότητι, stressing circumcision as the sign of the Abrahamic covenant (which, as seen above, they made contiguous with all covenants). This would explain why Paul in Galatians is fearful of mentioning the circumcision of Abraham at all, or the "spiritual" circumcision of the Christian.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\)See Col 2:11-15, apparently polemically countering a Christian system of perfection in which circumcision was one of the final rites. See further below, pp. 328-31.

The Galatians' evident sudden attraction to circumcision is as unusual as is Paul's uncompromising attack on it. Acceptance of circumcision by Gentiles in the Hellenistic world must have been exceedingly rare, and it was not among those features of Judaism to which Gentiles were attracted. The older Sibyllines require washing only, not circumcision, for Gentile converts, and Diaspora Judaism desired to make Gentiles only "Noachides" or "God-fearers," not complete Jews. The Hellenistic world regarded circumcision as a barbaric rite, a criticism that Jewish propaganda was sensitive

---

1Kuhn, "προσφήλως," TDNT, 6:732-33, notes that of all Italian inscriptions referring to Jews (554), only eight refer to full proselytes, and six of these proselytes are women. See also Munck, Paul, p. 129, on the rarity of acceptance of circumcision among Gentiles.

2See above, p. 252. Josephus refers instead to the Gentile fondness for Sabbaths, feasts, etc.

3Sib Or 2:238, 4:24, 162-64, and especially 8:393. This probably represents the missionary propaganda of Diaspora Judaism. See Meyer, περιτεμνων, TDNT, 6:79.


5Meyer, περιτεμνων, TDNT, 6:78. Both Herodotus and Hadrian equate it with castration, and for long periods it was prohibited throughout the Empire.
to. In fact, it may be that Gal 5:12 picks up the Galatians' earlier attitude to circumcision: δισελον και ἀποκοψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες υμᾶς. If so, their sudden attraction to it is even more paradoxical.

It is evident, therefore, both from Paul's "violent reaction" to circumcision, and the Galatians' highly unusual enthusiasm for it, that it not only occupied an essential place in the opponents' scheme but probably functioned with all the power of a sacrament—and a climactic sacrament, at that.

Baptism

It has been argued above that in Gal 3:27-29 baptism is not suddenly introduced for no reason, but has been in Paul's thinking all along. In fact, 2:19-20 and 3:1-5 are polemically developing the significance of baptism; and again, in 5:24, he returns to the subject of the eschatological significance of the rite. Whereas, in Paul, baptism usually clarifies the new life in Christ, here it clarifies justification, and therefore the radical baptism statement of 3:26-29 is summarizing Paul's argument regarding justification. And as

---

1Ibid., p. 79.

2Meyer, ibid., p. 78, makes this suggestion.

3Koester, Trajectories, p. 145.

4See above, pp. 174-75: Baptism is not one step among many, but makes effective the finality of Christ's deliverance of the believer from the present evil aeon.
δικαιοσύνη in Galatians comes to mean eschatological deliverance from the κόσμος or present evil age,¹ so it is being claimed that baptism makes effectual for the believer this eschatological deliverance. In the statement of 3:27-29, Paul claims a sacramental realization of eschatological deliverance without reservation. He appears to border on enthusiasm.²

But it must be asked, Whose sacramental theology is this? It appears very much that it is that of the opponents--that Paul has taken over this sacramental understanding, which they applied to circumcision among other things, and applied it to baptism. The central polemic of the letter sets justification by faith over against justification by works of law. This becomes the setting of baptism (2:19-20, 3:1-5, 26-29, 5:24) over against circumcision (5:2-4, where circumcision epitomizes justification by law). The mystery-language that Paul uses in 3:1-5 to polemically explore the significance of the Galatians' baptism has been examined above. Paul is asserting that that which the opponents see only

¹Above, pp. 129-40. In Wrede's words, the doctrine of δικαιοσύνη in Galatians deals with "Christ and redemption from the powers of the present world."

²Above, pp. 131-32, and also below, pp. 340-70, on the significance of the phrase ἀποκρύψαν καὶ ἐδήλω. John W. Drane, "Tradition, Law, and Ethics in Pauline Theology," NovT 16 (1974):170-71, 178-79, among others, suggests that it may have been an apparently enthusiastic doctrine of baptism such as in Gal 3:27-29 that was partly behind the excesses of 1 Corinthians.
as an initiatory rite at the beginning of the Christian life actually conducted the Galatians into the climax of the Christian mystery. If they cannot see this they can only be called ἀνόητοι, and the whole mystery has been εἰκῆ. That which the opponents say is only a beginning, Paul says is both beginning and ending.

In Colossians there may be another instance of a canonical writer taking claims made for circumcision and applying them to baptism. There is no question that the book is polemical and constantly takes up the catchwords of the heretical "philosophy," particularly in 2:4-23 where the discussion on περιτομή occurs.¹ The "philosophy" could be labelled "enthusiastic," as it offers its devotees a way of sharing in the πλήρωμα of the deity and the universal powers.² One of the means by which the devotee shares in the πλήρωμα is evidently by περιτομή

¹Bornkamm, "Colossians," pp. 123-25, notes that the book explicitly contends with the heresy in 2:4-23, and that, further, the "positive unfolding of the gospel in 1:15-20 is already determined, in terminology and in thought, by antithesis to the heresy, and the structure of the letter as a whole becomes transparent and its peculiarity comprehensible in view of this confrontation." See also Jervell, Imago Dei, pp. 231-32, and Lohse, Colossians, pp. 127-29, reconstructing the Colossian heresy from the "catchwords" taken up especially in Colossians 2.

²Bornkamm, Colossians, p. 124, notes the evidently polemical intent of Col 2:9 (ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς ἔκστασις σωματικῶς) and 2:10 (καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι). He also concludes, from the polemical use of ἀποθνῄσκειν (2:20) and ἀπέκδυεν (2:11) that the philosophy "celebrated a mystery of rebirth" (p. 128).
There are several reasons why this is most likely to be a literal περιτομή. Firstly, the phrase ἐν δὲ καὶ περιτομής περιτομή ἀχειροποιητής is best explained as a polemic against a περιτομή χειροποιητός. The passage refers to circumcision in three ways. The author of Colossians and the heretics both agree that Gentiles, before conversion, were νεκροί . . . (ἐν) τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκίς (2:13); the opponents propound as a solution to this an enthusiastic περιτομή which Colossians calls χειροποιητός; and Colossians offers, instead of this, baptism as περιτομὴ ἀχειροποιητός and περιτομὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Several have noted the fundamentally negative connotations of χειροποιητός as something made by man, over against some-

1Lohse, Colossians, p. 102: "'Circumcision' is . . . understood as a sacramental rite by which a person entered the community and gained access to salvation. The reference to the phrase ἀπέκδυσις τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός suggests the practice of the mystery cults."

2Lohse, ibid., p. 130, suggests that it can no longer be discerned whether an actual or only a figurative circumcision is referred to. That it is a physical circumcision, see Lohmeyer, Kolosser, pp. 108-9; Dibelius, Kolosser, on 2:11 and excursus on 2:23; Gunther, Opponents, p. 83; and Barth, Ephesians, 1:122, on the parallel between Ephesians and Colossians on circumcision. See Bornkamm, Colossians, p. 127: "Possibly circumcision also belonged to the religious practices of the false teachers, perhaps with the altered meaning of a mystery-like intiation."

3See the terminology of Eph 2:11 (τὴς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιητοῦ), an obvious reference to literal circumcision: Barth, Ephesians, 1:125-26.
thing that can only be a work of God. The strictures of the "philosophy" that are condemned in 2:16, 21-23 are physical enough and are offered as ways of dealing with problems of οὐσία and σάρξ (2:23). The philosophy itself apparently speaks of περιτομή as ἀπεκδυσίας τοῦ οὐσίας τῆς σάρκος (2:11).

Secondly, doubts about the literalness of circumcision rest largely on assessments of the degree to which the philosophy is "Gnostic." Lohse and others have disagreed with Schmithals by positing that circumcision among Gnostics was only figurative, never literal. But here it must be noted that the heretical philosophy, in

---

1 Lohse, Colossians, p. 102. The OT uses the term to refer to graven images and idols the pagans made for themselves: LXX Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:18, 21:9, etc. See also Gunther, ibid., p. 84. The word is also used in Mark 14:58, Acts 7:48, 17:24, Heb 9:24.

2 The claims the philosophy makes for circumcision can be gathered from the paraenesis that follows in 3:1-17, built around the idea of "putting off" and "putting on." The letter takes the scheme of the philosophy itself, but twists it in terms of an ethical thrust. See also Jervell, Imago, pp. 231-33, and below.

3 For instance, Lohse, Colossians, p. 102, citing Gospel of Thomas 53: "His disciples said to Him, Is circumcision profitable or not? He said to them: If it were profitable, their father would beget them circumcised from their mother. But the true circumcision in spirit has become profitable in every way." The point is that, wherever circumcision is spiritualized, it is (as here in the Gospel of Thomas) in terms of baptism. But the heresy cannot mean "baptism" by "circumcision," because Colossians opposes its "circumcision" with baptism. And if the heresy's circumcision is not a baptism --what is it? Some of the other evidence produced by Schmithals in favor of a literal Gnostic circumcision will be examined below.
its assertions about the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου, regarded them as benevolent divine powers, though it still retained a dualism between the visible and the higher world. It is therefore clear that there is not here the radical dualism of some later Gnosticism. If this is the case, the nature of circumcision should not be judged by the "spiritualizing" of the rite in later Gnostic writings. The debate seems to be thrown back to the language of 2:11-13 itself, where the suggestion is strong that the rite was a physical one. And if this is the case, then in Col 2:11-13 the claims made on behalf of an "enthusiastic" circumcision are taken over and applied to baptism.

Returning to Galatians, the particular language

1 See Bornkamm, Colossians, p. 124, on the polemical intent of πλήρωμα in 2:9-10. The philosophy regarded the divine fulness as residing in the elements, which, along with angels, were to be worshipped as divine beings. Such a dualism is in the Isis mystery in Apuleius, and Corp Herm 13:11, 13. See also Lohse, Colossians, p. 128, n. 115, agreeing with Bornkamm's interpretation of the relation of the elements to the πλήρωμα: "In no way" is it possible to identify the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου with the archons of Gnosticism.

2 Foerster, Apophoreta, p. 138, commenting on the role of the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου in Galatians (close to their role in Colossians): "Die Gnosis dient ihnen nicht und verehrt sie nicht (ie persönlich gefassten Engelmachten), sondern verachtet sie."

3 So, Gunther, Opponents, p. 83, who notes the Colossian heretics' three motives for circumcision, judging by the polemical claims made instead for baptism: it was a prophylactic against sins; it was a way of imitating the angels (see on Jub 15 below); and it was for deliverance from evil angels.
in which ecclesiology is expressed in 3:26-29 seems signif-
ificant. In 1 Cor 12:12-13 the same baptismal formula
is used\(^1\) with the idea of ecclesiology expressed in terms
of \(\omega\mu\alpha\), which plays an important role throughout the
letter and is probably connected with the Corinthians' own enthusiastic theology.\(^2\) But just as Paul develops a
\(\omega\mu\alpha\)-ecclesiology in 1 Corinthians, he develops a \(\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\)-
ecclesiology in Galatians, using the same baptismal
formula. As the \(\omega\mu\alpha\)-ecclesiology seems to be intimately
related to the Corinthian theology, so the \(\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\)-
ecclesiology is clearly related to the Galatian oppo-
nents' propaganda (see the polemical development of the
idea of \(\upsilon\delta\xi\\) or \(\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\ '\alpha\beta\rho\varphi\delta\upmu\) that begins in 3:6 and
continues through to 4:21-31). This suggests further
that as Paul portrays the function of baptism in Chris-
tianity, he has taken over the opponents' own claims—
especially for that which they put in place of baptism, circumcision.

It is in fact to be expected that Paul should
utilize the sacramental theology of his opponents, since

\(^1\) For the deduction that a more or less fixed con-
fessional formula stands behind the baptismal passages of
Gal 3:28, 1 Cor 12:13, and Col 3:11, see Meeks, "Andro-
gyne," pp. 180-84, Jewett, \textit{Imago}, pp. 231-32, and below,

\(^2\) For instance, the different issues with which
\(\omega\mu\alpha\) is connected in 1 Cor 6:13-20, 7:4, 34, 9:27, 10:16-
17, 11:24-29, 12:12-27, 15:35-44, strongly suggests that
the Corinthians gave an important place to speculations
concerning the \(\omega\mu\alpha\).
this is the typical way in which he argues. Elsewhere, he develops the significance of baptism by taking over the sacramentalism of those he is addressing and pushing it to conclusions which accord with his scheme, or modifies it in a way that takes up sacramental expectations and twists them at certain points. This makes it the more likely that he is doing something similar here in Galatians.

In conclusion, it appears that, in Gal 3:26-29, Paul has taken up the opponents' sacramental theology and played it against them, and so has been able to place the final objective offered to the Galatians (the mystery of 3:1-5, which they have not yet entered into, but are

---

1 For instance, 1 Cor 6:11 where Paul bases his imperative on the Corinthians' own sacramentalism. See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 107, and especially notes 45, 46; the comments of Lohse and Dinkler; and 1 Cor 10:1-13 on the Israelites' baptism into Moses as a τόπος of the Corinthians' identification with Christ. Paul does not debate the effectiveness of baptism in introducing the believer into the aeon of Christ, but debates the nature of the aeon. Baptism itself is not a saving event, but is that which unites the baptized with God's pilgrim people, who are not in the angelic heights but in the desert, tempted and in danger of falling. Baptism heightens responsibility. Robinson, Trajectories, p. 62; and Käsemann, Römer, pp. 151-52.

2 For instance, Rom 6:1-4 and the "eschatological reservation" introduced into what was probably a purely sacramental understanding of baptism, similar perhaps to Col 2:11-13 and Eph 2:5-6. See Bultmann, Theology, 1:133, 140; Käsemann, Römer, p. 151; Robinson, Trajectories, p. 30; and Bornkamm, Experience, p. 73. Baptism indeed "imparts to the initiate a share in the fate of the cult deity" (Bultmann), but the surprise is that it brings a share in Christ's death; and there is a distinction between the life of the believer and the resurrection life of Christ.
about to, 4:21, 5:2-4) and placed it in the Galatians' past. If he is doing so, and is applying to baptism what the opponents claim for circumcision, and, in linking it to a sperma-ecclesiology, is even taking over the opponents' terminology, it may be that in 3:27-29 Paul is taking over almost entirely a formula that was widespread in early Christianity and was for the opponents a cultic confession which they associated with their sacrament of circumcision.¹

Possible Sources of the Tradition

Circumcision

The attitude of Diaspora Judaism to circumcision as a requirement for Gentile converts has already been considered. It is unlikely that this stream of Judaism would make demands on Gentiles like those of the opponents. Palestinian Judaism, on the other hand, was much more insistent on circumcision of converts.² In the Maccabean age, circumcision became in Palestine something worth dying for,³ and once Jews gained the upper hand

¹Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, pp. 239-40, suggests that Gal 3:26-28 was probably taken over from the opponents and altered by the insertion of διὰ τῆς πίστεως; Betz, "Composition," p. 357, also suggests that Paul may have taken over this confession.

²Kuhn, "προσήλυτος," TDNT, 6:731-33, and 741. Palestinian Judaism wanted no loose adherents, only circumcised proselytes.

there was compulsory mass circumcision. The Herod family had a strict attitude to the rite, and in Josephus' account of the conversion of Izates, it was a Palestinian Jew who insisted on circumcision.

Paul will not use in Galatians the argument of physical and spiritual circumcision that he does in Romans—suggesting that the opponents themselves speak of the rite in these two senses. Philo speaks of physical and spiritual circumcision and knows of Jews who advocate spiritual circumcision alone. But despite his attempt to appeal to the Hellenistic world, he defends the rite (though he gives "rationalistic" reasons for it) and insists that the two senses of circumcision be held together. The Qumran tractates, too, speak of figurative circumcision and obviously insist on the necessity of both senses.

---

1Ibid., pp. 77-78. See Josephus Bell 4:270-82; Ant 14:403; and Ant 13:395-6 for the period under Alexander Jannaeus.
2Josephus Ant 16:220-25, etc.
3Josephus Ant 20:34-38 and the interesting roles played by Hellenistic and Palestinian Jews. Foerster, Apophoreta, p. 137, suggests that this incident shows a remarkable parallel to the situation in Galatia. The Galatian opponents have an attitude similar to the Palestinian Jew.
4Spec Leg 1:304-6.  
5Ibid., 1:1-11.
6Migr Ab 92.
71 QS 5:4-5, 26-28; 1 QpHab 11:13.
8For instance, 1 QS 5:5: "Men of truth are to
Philo, Qumran, and Paul all stand over against later Rabbinic Judaism with its disinterest in the figurative understanding of circumcision. On the other hand, it seems correct to postulate Gnosticism's rejection of literal circumcision. It is only by saying that Paul has misunderstood the opponents at this point that Schmithals is able to call them Gnostics.

The particular language of 3:1-5 and 4:1-11, and the law-traditions and apostle tradition examined above, indicate that the opponents presented Judaism as a sort of cosmic mystery, and the law as the practical means of entering into the mystery of the cosmos. If circumcision epitomized their system of works of law, then it must have been presented in a way that was consistent with that circumcise in the community the foreskin of desire and obduracy."


2 As well as Lohse and others mentioned above, p. 326, see Jewett, "Intruders," p. 201. Schmithals, Paul, pp. 37-38, has proposed a literal Gnostic circumcision, using especially Patristic evidence, and his star witness is Cerinthus. But many feel now that this evidence is worthless: see A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reininck, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christain Sects (Leiden: Brill, 1973), pp. 6, 8, 12, 19, and the discussion below, p. 338.

3 Schmithals, Paul, pp. 37-38: "Gnostic circumcision could never obligate one to keep the law in the Pharisaic sense. . . . It never did so in Galatia, as stated above--an important argument for the correctness of our thesis." It is suggested that it is precisely at this point--the removal of nomism from the argument of Galatians--that Schmithals has committed his most basic error.
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system. There is in fact evidence that circumcision was
given a mystery-role.

Jubilees, which takes the stricter Palestinian
view of circumcision,\(^1\) says that the rite is necessary,
at least in part, because the angels are created circum-
cised. Circumcision then is in imitation of the angels.\(^2\)
In 2 Baruch, proselytes enter into all the good of the
age to come because they submit to circumcision.\(^3\)
Schmithals may be correct in seeing "traces" of this
interpretation in Col 2:9-19.\(^4\) Goodenough presents
further significant evidence. In the Jewish ceremony
that was in use until the eighteenth century, there are
features that are best explained by a very old associa-
tion of circumcision with the sun and the zodiac, just as

\(^1\)Jubilees 30:1-8; see also 15:26, "And every one
that is born, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circum-
cised on the eighth day, belongeth not to the children of
the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham, but to the
children of destruction; nor is there, moreover, any sign
on him that he is the Lord's." This is the tenor of the
traditions the work elaborates on. A similar emphasis is

\(^2\)Jub 15:27.

\(^3\)2 Bar 41:4-5. See Charles' commentary on this
text, Baruch, p. 68.

\(^4\)Though Schmithals doubts that actual circumci-
sion was in question in Colossians and asserts that this
was a Gnostic circumcision. However, see above, pp. 328-
31, on circumcision among Gnostics; and Bornkamm on the
Jewishness of the Colossian heresy. It has also been
noted that Schmithals' evidence for a semi-gnostic cir-
cumcision among Jewish-Christians, especially in connec-
tion with Cerinthus, is worthless, as is his allusion to
Jerome's opinion that Galatians was written against
Cerinthus (Paul, pp. 36-38). See the above references to
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the rite seems to signify fertility in some way.\(^1\) And in Odes of Solomon 11 there is a hymn to the circumcision of the heart, probably to accompany the performance of the physical rite, which recalls the initiation hymn of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* Book 11.\(^2\)

There are further reasons why, from the side of the Galatians themselves, Judaism's supreme rite should come in the form of a powerful mystery initiation. Firstly, Judaism itself was presented to the Hellenistic world as a mystery.\(^3\) And secondly, circumcision, functioning in this mystery setting as the final rite of initiation and that which separated the initiated from the uninitiated, became a powerful sacrament that gave right to take part in the full service of and fellowship with God.\(^4\) So although the impetus to circumcise, as

Klijn and Reininck. Cerinthus is not said to have taught circumcision before Epiphanius.


\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 195-97. Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, pp. 189-90 disputes Goodenough in calling the Odes "Jewish-Christian," but notes their "strong Jewishness." He notes also a close affinity to the Dead Sea Scrolls (where physical and spiritual circumcision were held together: see above), and concludes that they must be dated around 70-125. Others agree with Goodenough's interpretation of Ode 11's understanding of circumcision, i.e., Schmithals, *Paul*, p. 38, note 74.


\(^4\)Georgi, ibid., pp. 135-36. *StrB* 4:32 cites
well as the particular way in which circumcision functioned as a mystery for the opponents, probably came from a more Palestinian provenance, ready acceptance of the rite in these terms was perhaps prepared for among the Galatians because of their own experience of Judaism.

In summary, it has been suggested that a circumcising mission such as had appeared in Galatia is much more likely to have come from Palestine; the literal-figurative language of circumcision is found in both Philo and Qumran; circumcision is presented in some Palestinian literature as imitative of angels; in Colossians there is evidence of an "enthusiastic" Jewish-Christian circumcising movement which must be countered by an "enthusiastic" baptismal theology, and a model of "putting off" and "putting on;" Goodenough presents evidence of Judaism that saw circumcision as a mystery-rite; and Judaism in the Hellenistic world laid the foundation for an understanding of circumcision as a final initiatory rite. All of this provides background for the evident way in which Paul in Galatians claims for baptism what the opponents are claiming for circumcision; and it provides the background, too, for a more careful analysis of the form and terminology of Gal 3:28.

Sources in which circumcision makes Jews the elite people of God. Jewett, "Intruders," p. 209, suggests that the promise of perfection which Jewish tradition attached to circumcision made it appealing to Hellenists.
Baptism

The way in which Paul is using baptism will be considered firstly in terms of a comparative form-analysis of Gal 3:27-28, 1 Cor 12:13, and Col 3:10-11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gal 3:27-28</th>
<th>1 Cor 12:13</th>
<th>Col 3:10-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰς κἀκεῖνον ἐβαπτίσθησας</td>
<td>εἴς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθησας</td>
<td>ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον (ἀνδρὸς) τὸν ἁνακαινισμένον . . . καὶ τὸν ἑαυτόν . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς εἴσαι σῶμα</td>
<td>ἐβαπτίσθησας</td>
<td>εἰς σῶμα νεοῦ . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐκ ἔστως ἐν Ιουδαῖος,</td>
<td>εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι</td>
<td>οὐκ ἔνι Ἡλλην ἐν Ιουδαῖος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐδὲ Ἔλλην, οὐκ</td>
<td>εἴτε Ἔλληνες</td>
<td>καὶ Ἡλλην ἐν Ιουδαῖος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένι δοῦλος οὐδὲ</td>
<td>εἴτε δοῦλοι</td>
<td>περιτομή καὶ Ἕλληνς,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ</td>
<td>εἴτε ἐλευθεροί</td>
<td>πάντως, ἐν πνεύματι,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένι ἄρσεν καὶ</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θῆλυ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάντες έχον</td>
<td>πάντες ἐν πνεύμα</td>
<td>πάντας άλλα πάντας,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χ.</td>
<td>ἐποτίζομεν.</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν πάσιν Χ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These verses have been examined by Meeks, Jervell, and Macdonald, among others, who have concluded that there is here a creedal formula, a rather fixed form, whose life-situation in the church is the liturgy of baptism. If this is the case, an analysis of the use

---

1 See Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," History of Religions 13 (1974):165-208, who notes the language of "putting off" and "putting on," the listing of pairs, statements that "all" are "one," etc.; Jervell, Imago, pp. 231-32, who notes allusions to Genesis 1-2, without the texts becoming quotations of scripture. There is instead a reference to a scripture tradition that is well known; Dennis Ronald Macdonald, "There is no Male and Female: Galatians 3:26-28 and Gnostic Baptismal Tradition," (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1978), who notes the change of verbs from the first person to the second person in Galatians 3, and the change of the method of comparison in Gal 3:28 to accord with LXX Gen 1:27 (pp. 4-15). He suggests that Colossians is dependent on Galatians rather than on a common tradition; and
of the form in Colossians 3 and 1 Corinthians 12 should help in understanding the use of the form in Gal 3:28.¹

In Colossians, the formula by no means stands out from its context.² It appears in the midst of motifs coming from baptismal paraenesis³ and should therefore not be separated from 2:11-13,⁴ where Colossians evidently takes up the claims of the opposing philosophy and applies them to baptism.⁵ As the indicative and imperative of the letter are so bound up with baptism, and as

that the formula itself is not in question in 1 Corinthians 12. But see the arguments below on Colossians. He admits that the tradition behind the formula is certainly evident in Corinth (pp. 96-99).

¹Assuming with Travis, "Form Criticism," in Marshall, Interpretation, pp. 154-55, that various instances of a similar form will provide ways of understanding the function of the form in any one of those instances.


³Ibid. Lohse, Colossians, p. 141, notes that ἀπεκδισάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι emphatically stress the relation to baptism.

⁴See also above, pp. 328-31, on Col 2:11-13 and the relation of these verbs to the heretical "philosophy," which has determined the vocabulary and structure of the whole letter.

⁵The saying in Col 3:9-11 is not introduced or concluded as a baptism-saying (as it is in Gal 3:28 and 1 Cor 12:13). It is understood to be a baptism-saying, though, because it picks up the language of "putting off" which is first used in Col 2:11-13 (Jervell, Imago, p. 233: in 3:1-17, 2:20 is directly picked up, which itself has picked up 2:11-13. The "putting off" and "putting on" clearly refer to baptism, from a comparison with Rom 6:2 and 2 Cor 5:6). Hence 3:9-11 should not be separated from 2:11-13 (Jervell, Imago, p. 233). But it has already been noticed that 2:11-13 is polemical taking up the claims of opponents regarding circumcision and reinterpreting them in terms of baptism.
baptism is so polemical in that it interprets the claims of the opponents,\(^1\) it is logical to suppose that the formula of 3:9-12 is part of the polemical situation and that these verses represent one interpretation of the formula, over against that of the opponents.\(^2\)

In 1 Corinthians, too, the saying is very "contextual" and is being used as part of the debate, one interpretation of the saying being stood over against another.\(^3\) If this is so in Colossians and 1 Corinthians, a similar relation between form and function could be expected in Galatians.

---


\(^2\) See Jervell, *Imago*, p. 232, on the way the saying refers to Genesis 1-2 without quoting it. The reference is to a tradition, eventually resting on Genesis 1-2, which is well known in the community. Again, ibid., p. 235, the passage evidently takes up assumptions already held about ἀπεκδομάμενοι and ἐνδορμόμενοι and twists them, so that they become the basis for an imperative.

\(^3\) On the way the question of male and female is involved in the Corinthian situation, see above on 1 Corinthians 11 and 12, and the various problems relating to sex and the body in 1 Corinthians (e.g., 5:1-13, 6:12-20, 11:2-16, 14:33-36; and chapter 7 [the monotonous parallels of obligations of men and women, indicating that the roles of "male" and "female" are at issue]), and the significant omission of ἀφορεῖν καὶ ὁμάλω in 1 Cor 12:13 when compared with Gal 3:28, this being Paul's "eschatological reservation" of the Corinthians' own enthusiastic interpretation of the tradition, appearing in 1 Cor 11:10, 15:35-50, 70:1, etc. See Meeks, "Androgyne," pp. 199-201; D. L. Balch, "Backgrounds of 1 Corinthians 7: Sayings of the Lord in Q; Moses as an
Part of the context of both Colossians and 1 Corinthians is the debate over the precise meaning of "putting off" and "putting on" (see references to Colossians above; and also φορέων and ἐνδύειν in 1 Cor 15:49, 53). Therefore, the question of "putting on" (ἐνδύειν) in Galatians 3:28 should also be expected to be part of a contextual debate.¹ It has already been noticed above that the ecclesiology language in both 1 Cor 12:13 and Gal 3:28 is contextual (see above on σῶμα and σπέρμα; and the "slave-free" element in the saying is also contextual in Galatians, in comparison with 4:21-31, etc.). If the language of the formulae in these instances is contextual, it is reasonable to assume that the formulae themselves are contextual.

There are significant expressions in all the sayings and their contexts which suggest a tradition

³The expression in Gal 3:28 is in fact reminiscent of the language of the mysteries, in which one came to share in the powers of the mystery-god. Lohse, Einheit, p. 236, refers to the parallels to the mystery in Ἀπολειοῦμεν, Μεταμορφώσεις. Bultmann, Theology, 1:140, and Käsemann, Römer, p. 151, both note that the language and thought is foreign to the Old Testament; though Paul does not build his baptism-theology on the mystery-cults, but criticizes them. However, in this instance, the language of ἐνδύειν may have first belonged to the opponents. See above, pp. 176-81, on the mystical and even magical terms used here, in which the opponents evidently present their program (ἐνάρξεως, ἐπιτελεῖν, βασκάζειν, ἄνοδος). The mystical language of "putting on" may reflect, then, the opponents' own sacramental theology, as it does in


²The expression in Gal 3:28 is in fact reminiscent of the language of the mysteries, in which one came to share in the powers of the mystery-god. Lohse, Einheit, p. 236, refers to the parallels to the mystery in Ἀπολειεῖς, Μεταμορφώσεις. Bultmann, Theology, 1:140, and Käsemann, Römer, p. 151, both note that the language and thought is foreign to the Old Testament; though Paul does not build his baptism-theology on the mystery-cults, but criticizes them. However, in this instance, the language of ἐνδύειν may have first belonged to the opponents. See above, pp. 176-81, on the mystical and even magical terms used here, in which the opponents evidently present their program (ἐνάρξεως, ἐπιτελεῖν, βασκάζειν, ἄνοδος). The mystical language of "putting on" may reflect, then, the opponents' own sacramental theology, as it does in
based on Genesis 1-2. Both Ephesians\(^1\) and Colossians refer to the ἀνθρώπος and the ἄνδρος ἀνθρώπος, κατ' ἐκκόσμον τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν (Col 3:10), and τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα (Eph 4:24). Colossians stresses the fact that Christ is ἐκκόσμον τοῦ θεοῦ, and 1 Corinthians speaks of ἐκκόσμον τοῦ χοίρου and ἐκκόσμον τοῦ ἐπουρανίου.\(^2\) It has already been noted that in all instances this language echoing Genesis 1-2 is "contextual." However, Gal 3:28, by a change of comparative expressions (from οὐκ ἐνι . . . οὐδὲ τὸ οὐκ ἐνι . . . κατ) deliberately echoes LXX

Colossians, in the debate with the speculative-Jewish φιλοσοφία.

\(^1\)See Jervell, Imago, pp. 232-33, on the close parallels between Ephesians and Colossians, and the way they deal with similar issues. Derwood Smith, "The Two Made One: Some Observations on Eph 2:14-18," Ohio Journal of Religious Studies, 1 (1973):34-54, notes the expressions in these verses which stand close to the above formula, especially ἄνθρωπος τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν, ἐνα τοῖς δύο κτίσον ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕνα κατακόσμον ἀνθρώπων, and ἀποκαταλλάξας τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι. He notes further that these expressions stand particularly close to Greek traditions of duality and its resolution, as in Plato Symposium 189-91, 191d, Timaeus 31 b-c, and the later stoics. Particularly significant are the words ἀμφότερα and διωμός, and the inexplicable use of the neuter ἐν in Ephesians 2, which Plato uses for the overcoming of duality. These Greek traditions also involved an original androgyne that was afterwards divided (Plato Symposium 189e). For Ephesians, he concludes that the context is polemical: the duality of the letter stands over against a more speculative kind of duality centering on male and female, which draws also on Genesis 1-2 and Judaism (circumcision etc.) and follows the pattern of urzeit and endzeit and the return to the Adamic condition.

\(^2\)Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 120, also notes the many allusions to Genesis 1-3 in 1 Cor 11:3-16, where the roles of male and female seem very much to be at issue.
Gen 1:27 (ἀρσεν καὶ ἡμὶν ἐποιήσεν αὐτοὺς). It is to be expected that this Genesis-language, which belongs to the "urzeit-endzeit" pattern in which redemption is the return to an original condition, is contextual in Galatians also, and even more so because of this striking modification.

This suggests some conclusions for form and function in Galatians. In the Pauline churches, there was apparent widespread concern with the interpretation of a tradition, drawing on Genesis 1-2, and its relation to baptism. This concern and interpretation of this tradition appears to have belonged in Galatia too. 1 Corinthians shows that there were sharply different interpretations of the tradition; and Colossians suggests a situation in which the tradition was worked out in terms of circumcision and opposed by the same tradition worked out in terms of baptism. Only in Galatians and Colossians is there a concern with the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.

In Colossians the opponents seek to share in the glory of the στοιχεῖα through a ritual system of speculative Judaism. In Galatians, too, there is a concern for Jewish ritual; "law" and "works of law" are understood in selective terms, and traditions are operative in which there

---


2 Meeks, ibid., p. 185; Smith, "Two Made One," p. 43.
is a concern for fellowship with angels (also in Col 2:18), bound up with interest in the στουχεῖα. As the formula in question was evidently part of the "context" of Colossians (as well as 1 Corinthians), it is suggested that in Galatia, too, the formula belongs to the context of the debate, and the Genesis-tradition is bound up with the claims of the opponents.

To clarify the formula and its function further, the sayings above should be related to close parallels that appear both in the Fathers and in Gnostic literature.1 The best examples of these sayings are in 2 Clem 12:1-2, the Gospel of the Egyptians (Clem Alex Stromata 3. 13. 92, NTA, 1:168), the Gospel of Thomas 22 (NHL, 121), and the Gospel of Philip 67. 29-36 (NHL, 141).2


2The saying also occurs in Hippol Ref 4. 7, Clem Alex Strom 3. 985 (Theodotus), Acts of Peter 38 ("Concerning this the Lord says in a mystery, 'Unless you make what is on the right hand as what is on the left and what is on the left hand as what is on the right and what is above as what is below and what is behind as what is before, you will not recognize the kingdom.'" The context is Peter's crucifixion, when he is told by the Lord, "It is time for you, Peter, to surrender your body"), Acts of Philip 140, Acts of Thomas 147 (in a prayer of Judas: "The inside I have made the outside, and the outside [inside]")", Gospel of Truth 32:10-16 ("Thus it is with him who lacks the one; that is, the entire right which draws what was deficient and takes it
The Lord said, 
When you have trampled on the garment of shame, and when the two become one and the male with the female neither male nor female . . .

Jesus said to them, When you make the two one, and when you make the inside like the outside, and the outside like the inside, and the above like the below, and when you make the male and the female one and the same, so that the male not be male nor the female female . . .

For the Lord Himself . . . said, I came to make [the things below] like the things [above, and the things outside like those inside. I came to unite] them in that place

Certain characteristics of these sayings are significant for understanding the canonical versions of the tradition. For most of them, the context is a concern from the left-hand side and brings it to the right, and thus the number becomes ICO"), and Clem Alex Strom 6:47-48. See Meeks, "Androgyne," pp. 184, 189-90; and Jacques E. Ménard, L'Evangile selon Philippe, introduction, texte, traduction, commentaire (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), p. 188.

1 The text of the Gospel of Philip here requires some reconstruction. Ménard, Philippe, p. 188, follows Schenck, Isenberg, and most others in the reconstruction that is basically used here. He defends it on the grounds, firstly, of other references in the gospel to the tradition of original androgyny and division of sexes in the fall (70. 10-25 [NHL 142], on Eve, Adam, the separation of the sexes, and the coming of death; 65. 19-26 [NHL 139], on the power of the bridal chamber: "But if they see the man and his wife sitting together, the females cannot go to the male, neither can the male go
for the future state. In all of them, a return to the primordial androgynous state is a necessity for ultimate redemption. This corresponds to the stress on the "one" in the canonical sayings. All the sayings have a version of "putting off," which is found in the saying in Col 3:9 and is inferred in Gal 3:28. All refer to the dissolution of male and female, a concept found in the canonical sayings only in Gal 3:28. The context of these
to the female. It is the same if the image (εἰκών) and the angel (ἄγγελος) are united together; etc.); secondly, of the immediately following passage, which speaks of the below and the above, the inside and the outside; and thirdly, the other parallels to the saying.

1 Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 59. So Gos Thom 37 asks, "When will you appear to us?" In 2 Clem the saying is in answer to the question, When will Christ's kingdom come?

2 "When the two become one" (Gos Egypt); "When you make the two one" (Gos Thom); "When the two shall be one" (2 Clem); [I came to unite] them in that place" (Gos Phil).

3 οἴμετε ἐς ἔστε (Gal 3:28); ἐς ἐν σώμα (1 Cor 12:13); πάντα καὶ ἐν πάσιν Χριστός (Col 3:10-11); ἐς, μία, ἐν, (Eph 4:5); οἱ ἄμφοτεροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι (Eph 2:14-18).

4 "When you have trampled on the garment of shame" (Gos Egypt), probably a reference to the freeing of the soul from the body (compare to Philo Leg All 2. 55, Immut 56; and Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 194). J. Z. Smith, "The Garments of Shame," History of Religions 5 (1965):224-30, notes that expressions such as undressing, being naked, and treading on the garments of shame are parallels, used in Christian baptismal contexts.

5 Though not in the saying itself, the concept is elsewhere in the Gospel of Philip. See the references given above. In these sayings, the reference is not merely to social equality of male and female, but to an eradication of the sexes entirely and to a new order of humanity.
noncanonical sayings, too, is an interest in Genesis 1-2 and a speculation on the future state in terms of urzeit and endzeit. Concerning life-situation and function, the examples in the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of the Egyptians appear to refer to baptism, but not those in 2 Clement and the Gospel of Philip. Here, as in the New Testament, there is apparently evidence of a variety of interpretations of baptism, and its relationship to

1 See the references in Gos Thom 84-86 (NHL, 127) to Adam, the creation of images in the beginning, etc. Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 50, points to the references here to a return to the primordial state. In Gos Phil 70. 10-25 (NHL, 142) there is the reference to Adam and Eve, the fall, and the entrance of sin into the world. Macdonald, ibid., pp. 23-26, points to the evidence of speculation on Genesis 1-2 in Cassianus' teachings (it is Cassianus who has cited the saying referred to as coming from the Gospel to the Egyptians: see Clem Alex Strom 3). Jervell, Imago, pp. 122-70, has analyzed the prominent use of Gen 1:27 in Gnosticism; and Pearson, Pneumatikos, pp. 51-76, examines the use of Gen 2:7 in Gnostic exegesis, concluding that "Gen 2:7 is a focal point for Gnostic speculation" (p. 51). He gives examples from the Apocryphon of John, the Gospel of Truth, the Apocalypse of Adam, the Hypostasis of the Archons, etc., and shows the close connections here with Rabbinic literature.

2 The debate between Clement and Cassianus and his followers revolves around interpretations of Matt 22:30 and the attainment of the resurrection state. See Clem Alex Strom 3. 6. 47-48; and Macdonald, ibid., p. 26. The saying in the Gospel of Thomas is clearly a baptism-saying.

3 In both 2 Clem 12:3-4 and Clem Alex Strom the saying is understood by Clement as referring to the soul's leaving the body. It then loses its physical form, and changes to unity (Strom 3. 93). The Gospel of Philip belittles baptism, applying the unification-saying to the final rite of the bridal chamber. See Meeks, "Androgyne," pp. 191-92. In many Gnostic systems, the elite or τελεστα reached their exalted state in the sacrament of sacred marriage; see Gos Phil 69. 20-30 (NHL,
the future, androgynous state. And it is significant that the saying-tradition itself is not heterodox at this time: it can be quoted in 2 Clement as an accepted saying of the Lord.

The common elements in each instance of the saying, the allusions to (but not quotations of) Genesis 1-2, and the parallels to the canonical sayings which are at the same time not quotations of any one of them,

142): "Baptism is the holy building. Redemption is the holy of the holy. The holy of the holies is the bridal chamber . . . the bridal chamber is that which is superior to it (i.e., baptism)." See also Gos Phil 72. 30-73. 10 (NHL, 143-44); and Hipp Ref 6. 14. 6, 6. 9. 10. Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 73, equates baptism and the bridal chamber, which seems to be correct in some Gnostic systems (e.g., the Tripartite Tractate [NHL, 54-97]) but not in others (e.g., Gos Phil referred to above, and On the Anointing [NHL, 435], which is specifically devoted to Gnostic sacraments, and in which the Bridal Chamber is a postbaptismal unction).

In the New Testament, the formula is already working polemically in respect to baptism. It is interesting that, in these later sayings, it is the Syrian Gos Thom and the Valentinian Cassianus who are closest to Paul in Gal 3:28.

In fact, the citation formula in 2 Clement is both the longest and the most emphatic: ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ οὗτος ὁ Κυρίος ὑπὸ τινὸς, πότε ἦξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἰςεν . . . . Clement, in Stromata 3, doesn't object to the saying but only to Cassianus' interpretation of it. See Macdonald, ibid., p. 27. Smith, "Two Made One," pp. 41, 47, seems to be correct in saying that the tradition itself is not gnostic. Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 166, says the Gnostic forms show bizarre variations of the original tradition.

Summarized in Macdonald, ibid., p. 60.

See Jervell, Imago, p. 232 (see above, p. 342).

Jervell, ibid., the canonical sayings themselves draw on a widely known tradition.
suggest that both canonical and noncanonical examples of the sayings-formula go back to a common independent tradition, whose life-situation in Christian circles was concern for the attainment of the original androgynous condition and whose connection with baptism was a subject of debate.\(^1\)

In order to get behind this debate in the New Testament, and in Galatians in particular, sources of concern for unification of opposites should be briefly examined. Leach speaks of formulations of unification of opposites, including the opposites of male and female, in "every myth system."\(^2\) Particularly, Christianity's symbolization of a reunified mankind may have reflected aspirations of society and religion around it. The shrine of Agdistis in Philadelphia offered, through cultic means, a way of dissolving the differences between "household slaves," "men and women, bond and free."\(^3\) In

\(^1\)See the conclusions of Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 142; and Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 166.


\(^3\)F. C. Grant, Hellenistic Religions, The Age of Syncretism (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1953), pp. 28-30; and Arthur Darby Nock, Conversion (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 217. The shrine dates from C2-C1 BCE, and the inscription is more significant in that these distinctions were starkly apparent in "outside" society. The "Three Reasons for Gratitude" of Thales or Plato were "That I was born a human being and not a beast, next, a man and not a woman, thirdly, a Greek and not a Barbarian" (for the text, etc., see Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 167). This saying was taken over
most of the Oriental and Egyptian mysteries, the cult provided a way of setting aside social distinctions.¹

Some offered a cultic exchange of sexual roles through initiation.² The philosophical schools, too, strove for a community experience in which there was a "unity of all rational being--the gods, men, and women."³ And of course Judaism had its Adam-speculations, in which distinctions of race and sex were dissolved.⁴ It was characteristic of these attempts at new community in the face of the breakdown of πόλις, φαντασία, and ἀλήθεια⁵ that myth and social structure were intimately related. There could be no credible achievement of new structures, and

by Judaism; "Blessed (art Thou), who did not make me a Gentile; blessed (art Thou), who did not make me a woman; blessed (art Thou), who did not make me a boor," Tosefta, Berakot 7. 18.


²Delcourt, Hermaphrodite, ch. 1. Mcoks, ibid., p. 184, cites examples of transvestism in initiation rites in pagan mysteries. The initiate momentarily transcended the distinction between male and female.

³See Meeks, ibid., p. 171, who refers to Diogenes Laertius 5. 12, 7. 175. The Epicureans also sought a community in which normal social roles of sexes were abolished (ibid., pp. 174, 179).

⁴Davies, Paul, pp. 53-55. Adam was created from material from the four corners of the earth, so that in him there was "neither Jew nor Greek" (Pirke de R. Eliezer, # 11, pp. 76-77); and he was also bisexual (Gen R. 8. 1; b Erub 18a; b Ber 61a; StrB, 1:802, and further below).

⁵There was no enduring realization of the aspirations of the mysteries, ἀλήθεια, etc. See Nock, Conversion, passim. The rites had to be repeated.
breakdown of old without some concrete realization in cultus of the mythological ideas for humanity.⁴

All of this suggests that the traditions reflected in the formula under discussion, and even the formula itself, probably had a wider context than early Christianity;² and the symbolic achievement of unification could have been by rites other than baptism.

The "male-female" element in the saying, and the myth behind it, should also be explored.

As mentioned above, phenomenologists have observed an interest in the opposite sex roles, and resolution of these opposites, in "every myth system."³ Very often the myth of a bisexual progenitor of the human race, common in the Hellenistic world, was involved.⁴ However, the sayings under consideration come from a

---

¹ So Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 183, notes that "The structures of the myth and the structures of social relationship" had to "mutually enforce one another." See also Hengel, Judaism, 1:74.

² Meeks, ibid., p. 166. See how Col 3:11 adds, "Barbarian, Scythian," terms which have no relation to the context, suggesting that the saying at this point is drawing on a basic formula that was known in an even wider circle.

³ See Leach, "Genesis as Myth," referred to above; and Delcourt, Hermaphrodite, ch. 1.

⁴ Meeks, ibid., p. 185. See Smith, "Two Made One," pp. 36-38, referring to Plato's androgyne in Symposium 189e, and Timaeus 31 b-c. On these references, see also Dodd, The Bible, p. 165. Gressmann, Orientalisch Religion, pp. 86-87, notes that Zeus was portrayed as bisexual (a godly, exalted condition) as far back as the fourth century BCE.
context in which such a myth has become bound up with interpretations of Genesis 1-2.\(^1\) This process is evident in at least two writers of Diaspora Judaism.\(^2\) Much has already been written on Philo's treatment of the two creation accounts,\(^3\) in which the ἀνθρώπους of Genesis 1, created in the εἰκών θεοῦ, was ἀφθαρτός, ἀσώματος, οὐτ' ἄρεν οὔτε θῆλυ, whereas the ἀνθρώπους of Genesis 2 consisted of σῶμα καὶ ψῡχή, and was φθαρτός, though he too at first was one and enjoyed μόνωσις.\(^4\) The taking of the rib from Adam in Genesis 2 was the separation of the sexes and the destruction of this μόνωσις,\(^5\) which resulted in the fall of concupiscence and the resultant clothing in "coats of skin," the body or "garment of flesh."\(^6\) It is for this reason that this ἀνθρώπους is now

\(^1\)See above, pp. 344-49, on the references to Genesis 1-2 in the sayings and their contexts.

\(^2\)Smith, "Two Made One," p. 38, traces the way the tradition passed into Hellenistic Judaism, probably at a time before Philo.

\(^3\)See Davies, Paul, pp. 53-55; Jeremias, "ἀνθρώπους," TDNT, 1:364-66; Jervell, Imago, pp. 59-62, Richard A. Baer, Jr., Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female (Leiden: Brill, 1970); Macdonald, "Male and Female," pp. 25-26, 92-95. In Philo, see Leg All 1. 31-33, 53, 88-92; Plant 44; Heres 57, 164; Qu Gen 1. 4, 8, 56; 4. 160; and Opif 134, 151-52.

\(^4\)Opif 134; Leg All 1, 31, 2. 12-13. See Baer, Male and Female, pp. 21-22, 28. Philo here uses a Platonic construction of form (or genera) and then the empirical.


\(^6\)Quaest in Gen 1. 53; 4. 78. See Macdonald, ibid., pp. 95-96.
a mixture of corruptible and incorruptible, body and soul.\(^1\) Death was the separation of soul and body, whereby the soul returned to its place of origin and original unity.\(^2\) This is illustrated in the experience of Moses, who, in his pilgrimage from earth to heaven, exchanging mortality for immortality, "resolved his two-fold nature of soul and body into a single unity, transforming his whole being into νοῦς."\(^3\) This is a return to the condition of the first ἄνθρωπος of Genesis 1.\(^4\)

However, this soteriological restoration of the state of ἄνθρωπος can be experienced in the present through the true φιλοσοφία, or the study of the scrip-

\(^1\)The soul (i.e., the "higher" soul) was called the "inside," and the body the "outside." So, *Leg All* 3. 40-41, 239-40; *Heres* 81-85. See *Baer, Male and Female*, pp. 30-31; and *Macdonald, "Male and Female,"* pp. 92, 94-96.

\(^2\)See *Leg All* 2. 55, 80; *Som* 1. 43 (ἐκδύςεῖν the body) *Migr Ab* 192; *Poster* 137 (ἀποθέειν); *Immut* 56 (casting off, ἐπαμφιασάθεντι, the garment of flesh το σώμαν περιβάλων). Philo regards the νοῦς or "higher" soul as male, and the created world, "body and soul," or αὐτῶν, in female terms. In fact, the female is only imperfect male; (Qu Ex 1. 7, Qu Gen 1. 25). Soteriology is a matter of "becoming male" (Qu Gen 2. 49) as it is in *Gos Phil* and other later Gnostic texts. To become "neither male nor female" is for females to become male. This soteriology is also a change from duality to unity, as both God and the "higher" or rational soul are one. So, *Spec* 3. 179. See *Baer, ibid.,* pp. 39-49.

\(^3\)Vit Mos 2. 288.

\(^4\)Moses here is quit of the body altogether, that is, he has left behind completely the ἄνθρωπος of Genesis 2. His final state corresponds to the ἄνθρωπος κατ' εἴκοσι τοῦ Θεοῦ, δ' κατ' ἀληθείαν ἄνθρωπος, the rational soul of man in its isolation and purity. See *Baer, ibid.,* pp. 49-50.
tures, and the Jewish rites, which in Philo become the most potent of mysteries. The Therapeutai have achieved this heavenly experience, and it is significant that they have also succeeded in breaking through the social roles of male and female.

There are suggestions of this myth in the romance, Joseph and Asenath. Here Asenath removes her old, black

1 See Leg All 3.71: "When the mind soars aloft and is being initiated into the mysteries of the Lord, it judges the body to be evil and hostile." Philo uses many mystery terms to characterize Judaism. Moses' leading of the repentant into obedience to the law is μυσταγωγεῖν (Virt 178); the technical mystery term ἱεροφάντης is used for God, Moses, the seventy elders, the high priest, etc. (Spec 1. 41, 2. 201, 4. 176, etc.); there are lesser mysteries, τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια, and greater mysteries, τὰ μεγάλα μυστήρια (Abr 122, Leg All 3. 100). These last are probably not separate mystic rites, but the Jewish cult and calendar conceived in mystical terms (Goodenough, Introduction, p. 206; and Baer, Male and Female, pp. 11-13). It is significant, too, that, in Vit Mos 1. 155-58, Moses' ascent on Sinai becomes a mystic vision in which he is enthroned as "god and king." Philo shares in a larger tradition in which Moses' ascension becomes the paradigm of mystical experience: see Wayne A. Meeks, "Moses as God and King," in Jacob Neusner, ed., Religions in Antiquity (Leiden: Brill, 1968), pp. 354, 369.

2 Vit Con 90.

3 Ibid., especially 83-87. The men and women, separated by a wall in the regular Sabbath meeting, eat together thereafter at the sacred banquet, men on the right and women on the left. Then men and women, in sacred vigil, sing and dance in separate choirs, until "having drunk as in the Bacchic rites of the strong wine of God's love, they mix, and both together become a single choir (γυναικαι χόρος εἰς ἕξ ἄμφων)." Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 186, speaks here of "ritual unification of the sexes." See also Baer, ibid., p. 100. He suggests the ritual was perhaps part of a Pentecost celebration.

4 Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 117, makes this suggestion. Marc Philonenko, Joseph et Aséneth. Intro-
garment;\(^1\) receives an unction of incorruption and is renewed and made alive once more;\(^2\) puts on her ancient robe of marriage, her "first robe;"\(^3\) is introduced into the "mysteries of God;"\(^4\) and is told to take off her veil because η κεφαλή σοῦ έστιν ψς ἀνδρος νεανίσκου.\(^5\)

However, this speculation should not be confined to Diaspora Judaism. For the Rabbis, too, Adam was created adrogynous,\(^6\) and the two sexes resulted when Eve was taken from Adam.\(^7\) The "robes of skin" of Gen 3:21, duction, texte critique, traduction et notes (Leiden: Brill, 1968), pp. 108-9, dates the tractate cautiously late in the first century BCE or early in the first century CE.

\(^1\) Jos As 14. 12, ἀπόθεου τὸν χιτώνα δυνέρ ἐνδέδυσα; compare with Gen 3:21 (ἐποίησεν κόρος . . χιτώνας . . καὶ ἐνδέδυσεν αὐτοῦ). See Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 117.

\(^2\) Jos As 15. 4 ("You will be renewed and recreated and will receive a new life").

\(^3\) Jos As 15. 10 (στολήν γάμου, τὴν στολήν τὴν ἀρχαίαν τὴν πρώτην).

\(^4\) Jos As 16. 9.

\(^5\) Jos As 15. 1. Philonenko sees this as a reference to the androgeny of an intimate into the mystery cults and gnosis, similar to Gos Thom 114. Macdonald, ibid., p. 119, notes the obvious relevance to the language of 1 Cor 11:10.

\(^6\) Gen 1:27 and 5:2 are translated "Male and female created He him" (Bab Talmud, Megilla 9a; Mekilla, Pisha 14, which Lauterback translates, "a male with corresponding female parts created He him" [1:111-12]). See also Gen R. 8. 1; b 'Erub. 18a; b Ber. 61a; StrB, 1:802.

\(^7\) Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 186, notes that in Gen R. 8. 1, Adam was created δύναμων, a word used synonymously with ἀνδρογλυγός; and, in the creation of Eve, the two "sides" or "bodies" were separated. The similarity
the physical body, replace the lost image of God.\(^1\) There is also the use of Gen 1:26 to refer to the converted man, the "new man." In Num R. 11. 2 Abraham the proselyte is also made new, probably by circumcision.\(^3\) The Rabbis also share in the tradition of the mystic ascent of Moses on Sinai, in which he received a crown of light and was reclothed with the lost image of Adam.\(^4\) Moses' ascent became the paradigm for the Jewish mystical experience.\(^5\)

In apocalyptic literature, too, the future state

to the language and thought of Plato Symposium 189b is striking. See also Lev R. 14. This would seem to explain the reference to making "what is on the right hand as what is on the left," etc., in Acts of Peter 38, above. Philo also speaks of Eve as "half of his (Adam's) body" (Qu Gen 1. 25, Opif 151).

\(^1\)Gen R. 4. 20. 12; Apoc Mos 20:1-3.

\(^2\)Smith, "Two Made One," pp. 41-42, notes the use in Gen R. 39. 14 of the verb of Gen 1:26 and 12:5 to refer to the making of a proselyte. "He who brings a Gentile near is as though he created him." Notice the similarity to the language of Joseph and Asenath 15. 4, above.

\(^3\)Smith, ibid., p. 42.

\(^4\)Moses' ascent on Sinai was a focal point for a cluster of Moses-traditions, as becomes apparent from a comparison of various sources. In Philo Vit Mos 1. 155-58, Moses is declared to have become god and king on Sinai, a mediator between God and men. His office is founded on his Sinai-ascent as a mystic vision, using Ex 7:1. This last text in itself provides no basis for declaring Moses a king, though it does speak of him as "god." Philo may be drawing on a widely-circulated midrash which associated Ex 7:1 with Ex 34:29 and Deut 33:5, enabling Moses' Sinai-ascent to be seen as an enthronement. Such a midrash appears in Tanh 4. 51 (reproduced in Meeks, "Moses," p. 356). Before Philo, Ezekiel the Tragedian spoke of Moses' reception of crown, throne, and scepter.
of the righteous is a return to the original Adamic state. They will be reclothed with the "garments of glory" which Adam lost in the age to come. Moreover, just as Adam was associated with the angels in the beginning, so, in the future age, the righteous will be like the angels. Apocalyptic literature reveals certain

on Sinai (Eusebius Praep Evang 9. 29). The Samaritans know of the same tradition, Memar Marqah 2. 12, 5. 3 (on Moses' glorification as god on Sinai, see Deut R. 9. 3-5), Midr Tehillim 90). This glorification of Moses on Sinai is referred to in terms of a restoration of the lost Adamic image of God in Qu Ex 2. 46, Debarim R. 11. 3, Yalkut ha-Makiri on Prob 31:29, Ps 49:21, and 68:13 (reproduced in Meeks, "Moses," p. 364), as well as the Samaritan Memar Margar 5. 4, 6. 3. Meeks concludes that the primary function of this tradition is to guarantee an esoteric teaching. Moses' ascension has this function in Jubilees (all of which is an esoteric, angelic revelation to Moses on Sinai), 4 Ezra, and Talm Yer Peah 2. 4. Moses takes heavenly journeys and receives cosmological secrets in Ps Philo 11:15-12:1, 19:8-16, and 2 Bar 4:2-7. Holladay, Theios Aner, pp. 108-29, also comments on Vit Mos 1. 155-58, claiming that Philo has been influenced most heavily by the Platonic ideal of the philosopher-king (which undoubtedly plays an important role, especially in Vit Mos 1. 150-54). However, he seems to be unable to explain Moses' sovereignty over the elements, and the parallels in Rabbinic and Samaritan sources in which Moses is god and king.

1Adam's original glory is referred to in Apoc Mosis 20-21; 2 Enoch 30:11; 4 Ezra 3:6-7; 2 Baruch 23:4. The righteous are reclothed in this glory in 4 Ezra 7:95-97; 8:51; 2 Baruch 48:49; 49:3; 54:15, 21; 1 Enoch 39:7-9; 50:1; 58:2; 103:2, etc. See Jervell, Imago, p. 46. The expression "glory of Adam (or man)" appears in the Qumran writings in 1QS 4:23, CD 3:20, and 1QH 17:15.

2See Vita Adae 4:2, 12-17, 33; Apoc Mosis 7:20; Jub 3:15; 2 Enoch 30:11, 14; 1 Enoch 69:11. See also Smith, "Two Made One," p. 43; and Meeks, "Moses," p. 361.

3See 1 Enoch 51:1-4 in the B-rescension (Charles, Enoch, p. 101): 1 Enoch 104:4-6 ("ye shall become companions of the host of heaven"); and 2 Baruch 51:5-12 ("They shall be made like unto the angels").
definite ascetic tendencies,¹ and the future angelic state is of course a sexless state.² It is significant for this study that, in the apocalyptic hope of the future angelic state, the spiritual resurrection body is compared to the stars.³

It has been shown above that these same specula-

51:7, this hope is for those who are saved by works, and those to whom the law has been a hope—reminiscent of the "works of law" of Gal 2:16, etc. There is a similar promise in Jub 1:29, 4:26, and 2 Baruch 32:6.

¹For instance, Jubilees, which seems to have affinities with the theology of the opponents in certain other respects (the "apologetic" Abraham, calendrical laws, etc.) also has ascetic tendencies. Circumcision plays a role in Israel's fellowship with angels (who were created circumcised), 15:26-34. There is a preoccu- pation with sexual sin, and the patriarchal narratives are dealt with in terms of this preoccupation (i.e., Reuben's incest, 33:9-10). Observance of the heavenly laws, and especially the Sabbath, is in imitation of angels, 2:30 etc. Adam is placed in the Garden of Eden forty days after creation, while Eve is placed in the Garden eighty days after creation. The whole book stresses female uncleanness (i.e., 3:9-12). Sabbath laws tend to be ascetic (e.g., sexual relations are not permitted on Sabbath, 50:8, which contrasts strongly with the teachings of the Rabbis). All this becomes even more significant when seen in the context of the stress in Jubilees of circumcision and is absolute necessity. Those who are not circumcised do not belong with the children of the covenant which the Lord made with Abra- ham, etc., Jub 15:26.

²4 Ezra 7:128. See also StrB, 1:891. This belief was not taken up by the Rabbis (ibid., 1:897). They believed that married life would continue after the resurrection, as would eating, drinking, etc. They make man immortal by allowing him to be half-angel. In only one late reference is intercourse forbidden after the resurrection—and this reference discusses Moses' ascent on Sinai. See above on the mystic ascent of Moses; and Balch, "Backgrounds," p. 354.

³4 Ezra 7:96-101; and 2 Baruch 51:10 ("equal to
tions concerning Adam and adrogeny made their way into the writings of the Fathers. They also appear in an un-Christianised form in the Gnostic work Poimandres, which probably predates the Christian Gnostic forms of the myth. Here there are suggestions that initiates experienced a mystical resolution of the fallen condition through γνώσης, liturgy, or even sacraments. Then, the stars"]. Charles, Pseudepigrapha, 2:589, comments that, in this period, stars and angels were closely related. So, in Galatians, the opponents are concerned to fellowship with angels and are devotees of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, which must be associated with astral worship.

1 See above, the references to Clem Alex Stromata 3 and 2 Clem 12.

2 There are allusions to Genesis 1-3 in Poimandres in connection with creation and fall, androgeny, and restoration to the primeval condition. See Dodd, Bible, pp. 146-65. There are echoes of Genesis 1-2 in the account of the Urmensch in such words and expressions as εἰκόν, ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχήν, αὐξάνεσθαι ἐν αὐξῆσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθαι ἐν πληθεῖ. The idea that "Adam knew his wife" is now reinterpreted, as is the "deep sleep," ## 15, 27. There is a close parallel to Symmachus' Gen 11:17, οὐ μὴ φαγῇ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἡ δ' ἀν ἡμέρα φαγῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξυλου δεντος ἐστι. The two ἀνθρώποι of Poimandres show a striking resemblance to those in Leg All 1 31, 2. 134. For the hermetist, as for Philo, the division of the sexes is the cause of death and carnal desire, and man in God's image could not be a sexual being (#18-19).

3 See Dodd and MacRae, cited above, p. 289.

4 See the account of the resolution of the fall, the putting off of the seven fallen characteristics, and the return to the condition of the seven governors, who are δοσολοθιάς (#18-21). It is also a return to the image of God: the goal of man is ἐν θεῷ γνωσταί, δεδομέναι (#26). See Jervell, Imago, p. 147.

5 See the soteriological value of gnosis (#18). Liturgy is suggested in ## 9, 14, and 17, pointing to the ritual and cultic activity of a particular community.

# 26, "This is the good end of those who have had knowl-
a little later, the same myth appears in the Syrian Gospel of Thomas and the Valentinian Cassianus and the Gospel of Philip.  

The conclusion must be that the original tradition behind the unification sayings was widely known; that it was deeply embedded in Judaism and Jewish speculations on Genesis 1-2; and that, connected with the tradition, there were ritual or cultic means of experiencing a return to the condition of the ideal δυνατότητα—which were certainly other than Christian baptism.

Some of these factors about the tradition make its suggested role in the debate in 1 Corinthians even more convincing.  

It casts light on the concern with angels in 1 Corinthians 11, along with problems resulting from confusion of sexual roles and the preoccupation with speaking in the tongues of angels in 1 Cor 13:1. It explains the confusion over the questions of the body, sex, and marriage, in chapters 5-7.  

edge, to be deified," suggests a liturgy of investiture, or part of it. There is a sudden change of person, and repetition of certain elements.

1See above pp. 347-51.

2See the material above, p. 342.


4Meeks, ibid., pp. 191-92. The two opposite and simultaneous errors into which the Corinthians have fallen is most explicable in terms of an Adamic androgyne myth which has left the church in total confusion as to sexual roles in the present age. See Macdonald, pp. 102, 107.
1 Corinthians 15 now becomes clear; when Paul says ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐν γῇς χωτικώς, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐν οὐρανοῦ (15:47), he is reversing an enthusiastic soteriology based on speculations regarding the two men of Genesis 1-2.¹ This discussion of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 also suggests some intrusion of apocalyptic ideas of the future angelic state. Paul must discuss the fact that there are σώματα ἑποράντα καὶ σώματα ἑπιγεία (15:40), that is, that astral bodies are involved in the resurrection.² Thus a formula similar to the baptismal unification-saying examined above is probably

¹Jervell, Imago, pp. 292-94; Macdonald, ibid., pp. 96-99. Just as, for Philo, the first Adam was a heavenly, incorporeal one and the second was made of the earth and given "coats of skin," so, for the Corinthians, in baptism they have put off the earthly and put on the heavenly man. But Paul reverses the order of the two men; and says that we still bear the image of the earthly and await the heavenly.

²See above, p. 355. In apocalyptic, the resurrection body is an astral body. See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 282. By the heavenly resurrection bodies, Paul means the stars. Balch, "Backgrounds," pp. 356-57, has noticed that the verbs γαμεῖν and γαμίζειν (the last of which is extremely rare in both Biblical and extra-Biblical Greek), which occur together in 1 Cor 7:36, 38, in the midst of this discussion of marriage, occur together also in Luke 20:35, Matt 22:30, Mark 12:25, and Luke 17:27. These dominical sayings concerning marriage were apparently being discussed in Corinth and were perhaps partly behind the confusion regarding marriage (see below). But the significant thing is that the first two of these verses, Luke 20:35 and Matt 22:30, deal with the future, angelic state in the resurrection age. The circles out of which these two sayings come—obviously apocalyptic circles—are also contributing to the Corinthian debate.
involved in the Corinthian conflict, which Paul has taken up and reinterpreted in a particular way, in conjunction with a αὐτοκράτορισσa-ecclesiology. This would explain why the "male-female" element has been left out of the saying in 1 Corinthians. It is exactly a self-understanding which claims to have attained the androgynous state which is plaguing the Corinthian church. It is significant, too, that, just as the underlying mythical tradition was not the property only of Hellenistic Judaism, as forms of it appear in rabbinic and apocalyptic literature, so, here in 1 Corinthians, there are suggestions of the interests of both Hellenistic and apocalyptic circles. That which Philo attained by φιλοσοφία and mystical Jewish rites, the Therapeutai and the hermetists attained by cultus and ritual, and the apocalypticists hoped they would attain in the future by "works of law," the Corinthians believed they had already attained in baptism.

Some conclusions can be drawn at this stage. If

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{See how baptism is involved in the enthusiastic self-understanding of the Corinthians, 1 Cor 1:12-17, 6:11, 10:1-11, 15:29. Robinson, Trajectories, pp. 30-46, suggests that the Corinthians were interpreting Jesus-traditions concerning baptism and the resurrection similar to those which found their way into the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Philip.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{See above, p. 332.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{Macdonald, "Male and Female," pp. 96-97.}\]
Genesis 1-2 was widely known in Judaism and was part of the dialectic in Corinth, it may well have been known by the Galatian opponents. If mythical resolution of the fall condition was experienced, in various circles, other than by baptism, the Galatian opponents, too, may propagate a resolution through means other than baptism. In Colossians, there is an enthusiastic-nomistic use of various "Jewish" ceremonies, climaxed and epitomized by "circumcision," propagated in terms of "putting off" and "putting on," a scheme which Colossians has taken over dialectically. The unification-formula here is so "contextual" that it was probably used by the circumcising heretics. Only Colossians and Galatians refer to the στοίχεια τοῦ κόσμου. In Colossians the opponents seek, by their ritual, to share in the glory of the στοίχεια; in Galatians, the opponents are interested in fellowship with angels and apparently refer to their program of "works of law" in mystery-terms.¹ This offers support for the suggestion that a similar dialectic is involved in Galatians. Confirmation is offered by the direct correlation of Gal 3:28 (ἀποκ θηλυ) with the LXX of Gen 1:27, that breaks with the rest of the formula, indicating a particular relevance of the ἀνθρωπος of Genesis 1 to the situation. Further, the very contextual

¹See above, pp. 174-79, on the terminology of 3:1-5; and pp. 343-44 on ἐνδοχα in 3:27 and mystery-language.
σπέρμα-ecclesiology is juxtaposed with the baptism-saying, which itself uses the unusual Χριστὸν ἐνεσθάμασθε. Also to be taken into account is the suggestion that the particular structure of the argument in Gal 3:6-26 is a polemic against a projection of Moses as the chief mystagogue, and of his Sinai ascent as a consorting with angels; and the mystery-terms in which the opponents apparently present their program in Gal 3:1-5. All this suggests that, in Galatians, there is a polemical intent behind Paul's use of the language of Gal 3:28 and that he has taken this language from the opponents.

The noncanonical sayings quoted above raise another question which may have further implications for the opponents' sacramental tradition. In every one of

---

1 See above note. This terminology is used nowhere else in Paul. His typical way of using baptismal formulae is dialectical, that is, he takes over the statements of others and reinterprets them, as in Rom 6:1-9 as compared with Colossians 2-3; 1 Cor 6:11, 10:1-11. So the language Paul uses here also can be expected to be part of the debate.

2 See above, pp. 263-71. See how this accords with the widespread Jewish tradition of Moses' Sinai ascent as a divinizing, and restoration of the lost glory of Adam. See above, pp. 358-59.

3 Which also rings of Philo's presentation of Judaism as a mystery, enabling the soul to escape the body. See above, p. 356.

4 Also to be borne in mind are, firstly, the place of baptism in Paul's whole argument, and the way it runs throughout the letter (see above, pp. 167-69; when Paul speaks of baptism in 3:27-29, he has not left behind his main argument); and, secondly, the significance of the rhetorical structure of Galatians as a whole (Paul is
these instances, the saying is introduced as a saying of the Lord.\textsuperscript{1} This is not to say simply that the saying was a saying of Jesus;\textsuperscript{2} but this strong association with Jesus must be accounted for,\textsuperscript{3} and it may throw light on some of the baggage that perhaps travels with the unification saying.

A clue to the process in which the unification saying came to be a dominical saying appears in Clement's debate with Cassanius and his followers. In \textit{Stromata} 3. 6. 47-48, the unification-saying is clearly linked with Matt 22:30 (ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὗτε γαμοῖσιν οὗτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ). It is interest-

\textsuperscript{1}See above, p. 347. Note especially the striking citation formula in 2 Clem 12:1, and the ready acceptance of the saying itself in "orthodox" circles (p. 346).

\textsuperscript{2}Macdonald, "Male and Female," p. 68, correctly observes that no noted authorities have ever attributed the saying originally to Jesus. Lightfoot, \textit{Galatians}, p. 149, suggested that the saying may have been founded on Luke 20:35.

\textsuperscript{3}It is difficult to believe that one of these sayings is the eventual source for the others. Schneemelcher (in \textit{NTA}, 1:166, 174, 177) feels that 2 Clement has drawn from the Gospel of the Egyptians, and that the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Gospel of Thomas draw on a common tradition. But Macdonald, ibid., pp. 33-34, cannot accept even this much dependence. He notices three other noncanonical dominical sayings in 2 Clement (4:5, 5:2-4, and 13:2) which cannot be attributed to the Gospel of the Egyptians. Apart from the one parallel in question, there is no reason to think that the author of 2 Clement knew the Gospel of the Egyptians. He concludes that both go back to a common source (p. 36).
ing that this dominical saying shows striking similarities to the basic elements of the unification-saying.

The reference is to the resurrection, and the verse implies a future sexless state, which Jewish tradition understood as an angelic state. Cassianus and his followers were evidently seeking such an angelic state.

There is good reason to believe that this very synoptic saying, or its historical antecedents, was also involved in the Corinthian controversy, where the androgyne-tradition apparently played an important role. Several have noticed that, in Corinth, a crucial issue was the interpretation of various sayings of Jesus, and that the treatment of these sayings by the Corinthians was very similar to their treatment in Q.

1 See above, pp. 358-59.

2 Other Gnostics also sought union with the angels through baptism. See Gos Phil 65. 19-26, quoted above, p. 348; and Excerpta ex Theodoto 21, 22, 36, where males are joined with the logos, females become male, and the whole church is changed into angels. The Marcosians, Adv Haer 1. 21. 3, believed they were baptised into union with the "powers." This suggests a borrowing from apocalyptic Judaism.

3 David L. Dungan, The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), comparing 1 Cor 9:4-18 and 7:1-16 with Q, concludes that Paul here quotes dominical sayings very accurately and is vitally concerned with the ongoing development of the interpretation of the sayings of Jesus. Moreover, James M. Robinson, "Kerygma," pp. 127-31, notices that it is particularly Jesus-sayings as they are known in Q that the Corinthians are interested in. See below.

4 Robinson, "Kerygma," pp. 127-31, finds that "only in Q and 1 Corinthians does the term "'kerygma' occur prior to the pastorals, and only in Q and
has now pointed out that this is apparently true also for
certain dominical sayings concerning marriage.\(^1\) It
appears, from 1 Cor 7:10, 25, that the Corinthians were
claiming that there was a saying of the Lord demanding
that couples should separate, and that Paul was forced to
deny this.\(^2\) Further, the two verbs \(\gamma\omega\mu\varepsilon i\nu\) and \(\gamma\omega\mu\zeta\varepsilon i\nu\),
one of which is exceedingly rare, occur together not only
in 1 Cor 7:36, 38, but in a series of synoptic sayings
dealing with marriage and putting away of wives (Luke
24:38). The Corinthians are apparently making a particular use of these words of the Lord.\(^3\) It is significant,
then, that there is evidence to suggest that Q inter-
preted these sayings in an ascetic sense, so that the
call to the kingdom was a call to separate from one's
wife.\(^4\) One of these sayings, Luke 20:35 and parallels,

\(^1\) Balch, "Backgrounds," pp. 355-56.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 356.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 357.
\(^4\) The Q material is treated differently by Matthew
and Luke respectively on this question. One insists that
a man leave his wife for the kingdom (Luke 18:29) and
the other does not (Matt 19:29 = Mark 10:29); etc. See
Balch, ibid., pp. 353-54. When it comes to the saying
about the resurrection, the angelic state, and marriage,
was the saying concerning the resurrection, marriage, and the angelic state. The Corinthians are apparently treating the dominical sayings regarding the angelic state and marriage as Q does, just as they treat the dominical sayings regarding wisdom and signs as Q does. This coincides with the confusion in Corinth regarding baptism and resurrection, the body, sexual roles, et cetera,\(^1\) in which confusion the tradition of unification and andro-geny is involved.\(^2\)

The suggested conclusion is this. In Corinth, early in Paul's ministry, and later, in the second century, in the debate with Cassanius, the unification tradition is associated with the dominical saying, Matt 22:30 and parallels,\(^3\) which speaks of the resurrection and the future, angelic state.\(^3\) This may be, then, the way the unification saying came to be circulated as a saying of the Lord.

---

one puts the end of marriage in the present tense (Luke 20:34-35) and the other puts it in the future (Matt 22:30 = Mark 12:25). The implication is that Luke follows Q, and Matthew follows Mark. So, in Q, the resurrection-saying was used to forbid marriage—just as the saying in Corinth was being used to forbid marriage.

\(^1\)See above, pp. 342, 363-64.

\(^2\)See above, pp. 363-64.

\(^3\)This suggested function of the resurrection-saying in Q and 1 Corinthians indicates how this same saying came to be understood later by Gnostics as forbidding marriage, etc. They may actually be following a traditional interpretation of the dominical saying which existed in the earliest Christian circles.
This in turn suggests some of the "baggage" that may be travelling with the unification-saying in Galatia: it is evidently bound up with concern for the attainment of the future, angelic state. It has already been suggested that, in the Pauline churches, the unification-saying was being used polemically to support different interpretations of baptism. In all these cases, there was a simultaneous interest in attainment of the angelic state. The early concern behind the transmission of the unification-saying, then, was not simply baptism, but attainment of the angelic state; and the transmission of the saying as a baptism-saying was only one interpretation of an earlier sayings-complex, one assertion of the way the angelic state was actualised in the present. The divided opinion over the efficacy of baptism for the realization of androgeny continued into the second century. And it may even have been Paul who first sug-

---

1See above, pp. 340-46, 349-61.

2There is ὄρθοκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων in Colossians (2:18); in 1 Corinthians the woman is told that she must ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου (11:10), the enthusiasts speak in the tongues τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων (13:1), and, in connection with the resurrection, Paul must discuss σώματα ἐπιγέυμα καὶ σώματα ἐπίγευμα (15:40). The treatment of the dominical resurrection-saying in 1 Corinthians follows the ascetic tendencies of Q, 4 Ezra, and apocalyptic Judaism, which are bound up with interest in fellowship with angels; and in Galatians, the opponents' interest in angels intrudes in 1:8, 3:19, 4:14, and traditions of revelation and inspiration, law, and the στοιχεῖα, etc. See above, pp. 359-64.

3See above, pp. 349-61, on the different under-
gested that androgeny was attained in baptism—and who, by doing so, helped to trigger off the sexual confusion of the Corinthians.¹

It appears, then, that the unification-saying is being used polemically in Gal 3:28, against a competing interpretation in which the angelic state was purported to be actualized in some other way—that is, by a sacramental system based on Jewish calendrical laws, climaxed and epitomized by circumcision.

Conclusions

The implications of the above rhetorical analysis should continually be borne in mind. Galatians is throughout a dialogical response to an offending theology which is now owned by the Galatians themselves.² Then the suggestions of sacramentalism against which Paul argues, even the expressions in 3:28, will probably be associated with the opponents' program.

Further, baptismal statements run throughout the standings of baptism, resurrection, and androgeny, in Clement, Cassanius, and Gos Phil.

¹Balch, "Backgrounds," p. 364, and Jervell, Imago, pp. 309-12, among others, have suggested that the traditions cherished by the Corinthians may have included Gal 3:28.

²See the rhetorical analysis, pp. 93-97; the opponents as efficient missionaries, 111-13; the significance of such words as βασιλείας, 154, and the way restatements of the causa run throughout the letter, 133-36.
letter\(^1\) in such a way that baptism, the concretion of the argument for justification by faith, stands over against circumcision, which comes to epitomize the program of works.\(^2\) Paul refutes the opponents by filling out the meaning of baptism.\(^3\) His answer to the opponents, then, is a sacramental answer: justification conforms to the shape of the eschatological Christ-event into which one is brought by faith and baptism.\(^4\)

This stress on the significance of baptism itself indicates the stress the opponents place on circumcision. For them it is indeed a sacrament, that which works the miracle of salvation.\(^5\)

This all suggests that, in 3:27-29, Paul has not left his main argument.\(^6\) Rather, in this formula and its


\(^{2}\) See particularly above, p. 123, on the way that circumcision stands for attempts at justification by works in 5:4-6.

\(^{3}\) In place of the efficacy of circumcision (works), he argues for the efficic of the Galatians' past baptism; in place of the claims made for works of law, he argues for the realities already actualized in baptism.

\(^{4}\) See above, pp. 114, 149. Nothing can be added to the lordship of Christ, so nothing can be added to the believer's justification.

\(^{5}\) See above, p. 123, on the essential place of circumcision in the opponents' soteriology; and above, p. 321, a definition of sacrament.

\(^{6}\) See above, p. 166, quoting Stählin: in 3:6-22, the lines of salvation-history end in Christ; in 3:27-29,
language can be seen yet another way in which he argues for justification by faith by developing the significance of baptism. In this case, then, this language, and the "baggage" that travels with it, is another indication of the essence of the whole debate in Galatia, and of that which the opponents hope to accomplish by their "sacrament."

The significance of this language and its "baggage" is evident in four ways. Firstly, a form-analysis of Gal 3:28 and other New Testament parallels points to an underlying tradition which draws on Genesis 1-2 in propagating a bisexual progenitor of the human race, a fall from androgeny to division of the sexes, and redemption as a return to the primordial state.\(^1\) Gal 3:28 in particular appears to be picking up a traditional saying, because of the change of verb tenses and because of a distinct break in the pattern of the saying by which the last phrase, ἄροεν καὶ ἔηλ, et cetera, is made to conform precisely to LXX Gen 1:27.\(^2\) The association of the saying with a οἰκομε- ecclesiology, itself extremely contextual,\(^3\) suggests further that the saying itself is being used contextually.\(^4\)

they end in baptism. This suggests the essential place of the pericope in the argument.

\(^1\)See above, pp. 351-59. \(^2\)See above, pp. 344, 345. 
\(^3\)See above, pp. 331-33. 
\(^4\)This conclusion rests partly on the deductions
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Secondly, when later Christian instances of the formula are examined, it is seen that the saying typically operates in a polemical setting, in which competing interpretations of baptism (or of some other rites over against baptism, as in Colossians and the Gospel of Philip) are placed over against each other. Thus the life-setting of the saying is not simply baptism, but attainment of the resurrection condition of primordial androgeny and the angelic state.

Thirdly, the concept of unification of opposites, and of a return to a primordial condition of androgeny, was found to exist in a wide variety of pre-Christian contexts—including Jewish contexts. And along with the myth were means of realizing ritually (or sacramentally) the soteriological goals of the myth: φιλοσοφία and mystic Jewish rites in Philo, ritual among the Therapeutai, "works of law" in apocalyptic Judaism, communion with God on Sinai in the case of Moses in later Jewish speculations.

about the way in which the saying functions polemically in 1 Corinthians and Colossians. See above, pp. 328-31, and pp. 341-43.

1 See above, pp. 347-51. The examination of these extra-Biblical formulae also helps to confirm the traditional form of the saying and the myth behind it.

2 See above, pp. 351-62.

3 As well as examples from Plato, Hellenistic mythology, the Stoics, etc., Judaism knows the myth in Philo, Joseph and Asenath, the later rabbis, and, in certain respects, apocalyptic Judaism. In Poimandres there is another apparently pre-Christian form of the myth,
and γνώσις and liturgy in Poimandres. This further suggests that the opponents could have attached the myth to some Jewish rites, in particular, circumcision; and that Paul in Galatians has taken up their claims and used them for his own purposes—as in fact done in 1 Corinthians and Colossians.

Fourthly, the persistent circulation of the unification-saying as a saying of the Lord suggests that the form of the saying known in Christian circles grew out of a situation in which Matt 22:30/Luke 20:34-36 was seen to be congruous with the mythical speculations based on Genesis 1-2. This association appears in the circles of Cassanius, but was evidently made as early as 1 Corinthians, if not earlier. The primary concern, again, appears to be, not merely the meaning of baptism, but the cultic attainment of the angelic state. This was precisely the future hope of apocalyptic circles, and it seems also to play a role in 1 Corinthians.

showing heavy dependence on Genesis 1-2. See above, pp. 355-62.

1 See above, pp. 355-61. Mention could also be made of the χρώμα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος by which Asenath is "made new" and her head is made "as the head of a young man" (Jos and As 15:4).

2 This is made the more likely in light of the fact that Judaism believed that Abraham was "made new" by the rite of circumcision, even referring to this event in the language of Gen 1:26; see above, pp. 357-58.

3 On the place of the androgeny-myth in 1 Corinthians and Colossians, see above, pp. 342-45, 362-64.
All of this, then, helps to illuminate the use the opponents make of their sacrament of circumcision. It is presented as the climactic sacrament, the completion of the mystery in which the Galatians became novices by baptism, which "puts off" the condition of the flesh and subjection to earthly powers, and "puts on" the original Adamic glory, making one a companion of angels and heavenly powers (συνελεια).

Paul's way of arguing here would then be consistent with the way he argues sacramentally elsewhere, taking up the sacramental assumptions of his opponents and putting them to his own use. The substance of his argument would also be consistent with the way he answers the intruding theology, throughout the letter, by presenting justification as cosmic deliverance, and freedom from the enslaving powers of the present evil aeon. It would be consistent, too, with the indications that the

1\ See above, pp. 174-79, on the language of 3:1-5; also above, pp. 323-24, on the opponents' probable use of Abraham's righteousness by faith, then his circumcision, as the "ordo salutis" for Gentiles.

2\ As the "circumcision" of the Colossian opponents seems to do. See above, pp. 328-31, 341-46.

3\ See above, p. 333.

4\ See how justification is presented in apocalyptic/cosmic terms in the opening and closing of the letter (above, pp. 130-32); and as freedom from the enslaving powers of the present evil aeon (pp. 140-47). The two antithetical spheres of σοφία and πνεῦμα as used to characterize the two programs of "works" and "faith," and to epitomize the whole debate (pp. 176-78).
opponents present their law-program as a mystery, which itself works cosmic deliverance and brings fellowship with angels.\(^1\) It also explains Paul's unusual treatment of circumcision in Galatians, and the Galatians' unusual acceptance of the rite.\(^2\) The opponents probably come from circles such as the Essenes, where baptism was much less than a final, once-for-all sacrament. They also probably present circumcision as imitative of angels, in keeping with the tradition of Jubilees; and they may have affinities with the heretics of Colossae, who also represent an "enthusiastic" circumcising movement seeking fellowship with angels.

Paul has probably stressed the social consequences of the unification-saying by inserting οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἐλλὴν, οὐκ ἐνὶ δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος. This addition, no doubt part of the aspirations connected with the myth already,\(^3\) is used in the canonical sayings not only to counter threats to the community resulting

\(^1\) See an analysis of some of the mystery-terms (pp. 175-79); and the law-tradition as one which lays itself open to the charge of devotion to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (pp. 299-316). This same tradition is interested in fellowship with angels and draws on astral religion (pp. 299-302).

\(^2\) On the unusual presentation of Abraham and circumcision in Galatians, see above, pp. 185-86. (Abraham here is justified by "faith alone"), and p. 322 (in Galatians, circumcision is not one of the δεινώρος); and on the unusual Gentile acceptance of circumcision.

\(^3\) See above, pp. 351-52, on the Pagan and Jewish parallels to the saying, also connected with experiments in breaking down sexual roles.
from religiously heightened distinctions between circumcised and uncircumcised. The opponents may even have used this phrase, too, in keeping with the Jewish tradition about the unity of mankind in Adam. They may have said that circumcision removes the distinction not only between Jew and Gentile, but between male and female, human and angelic. Their mystic-nomistic rite was that which brought in anticipation a realization of the future, mythical roles of humanity, therefore making possible a change in societal roles, and bringing into being the "remnant," the covenant people, the σπέρμα 'Αβραάμ. But Paul asserts that it is in baptism

---

1 Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 204. Colossians uses the mythical language of reconciliation to speak of human unity within the congregation (3:9), and the same occurs in Eph 2:11-12, where the divisive threat is a "circumcision made with hands." See also Gunther, Opponents, p. 84.

2 See above, p. 352.

3 See above, pp. 352-53, on the function of cultus in the change of societal roles. Meeks, "Androgyne," p. 204, points out that the same was true in Christian circles. In Ephesians 5 and Colossians 3 Christ's relation to the church is in terms of a mythical or metaphorical concept of marriage between the Redeemer and the community (see also 2 Cor 11:2, Rev 19:6-9, 21:2, 9). If this mythical relationship cannot be established, the new societal relationships demanded by Christianity cannot eventuate.

4 See above, pp. 233-35, on the opponents' consciousness of being the remnant. The Qumran community, which saw itself in these terms, also claimed that there was a new, utopian relationship between the members of the community. So, 1 QS 4:4, "Abounding love for all who follow the truth." See below, p. 399. The Essenes also experienced some breakdown of the male-female roles. See above, p. 357.
that identification with Christ, the true σπέρμα Ἄβραμ, has been realized.¹ The ultimate intention of the true, heavenly religion is then fulfilled.² The demand for circumcision, then, far from bringing about the "remnant," the covenant people, is dividing them, taking them only backwards into pre-Christian religion.³

There is an indication here of the opponents' Christology. They have a place for Jesus in their system, but it is only a preliminary place. Baptism into Christ makes one a novice, as was Abraham when he had faith. One must then advance to the heart of the mystery through circumcision and the observance of calendrical law. Jesus was given a function within a much larger scheme of "law as the cosmic rule of God."⁴

¹The opponents no doubt agreed that baptism joined the believer to Jesus. The phrase δοῦλος γὰρ of 3:27 suggests that the claim is taken for granted. The term ἐνδύων Χριστόν may also belong to them (or perhaps ἐνδύων Ἰησοῦν). See above, pp. 342-43. But they denied that Jesus was the σπέρμα Ἄβραμ.

²Paul in 3:28 is probably presenting Jesus not only as σπέρμα Ἄβραμ but as Adam.

³This is the implication of 3:29—if you are Christ's, you are already Abraham's seed, heirs, etc. To continue the religious quest now is only to abandon heirship, and to turn to pre-Christian religion. Thus this baptism-saying has the same function as other restatements of the causa, e.g., 3:1-5, 4:8-11.

⁴Koester, Trajectories, p. 145. There seems to be much in his suggestion that Jesus' role is mythologized, along with that of Abraham and Moses. Jesus is apparently made an equal with them in a succession of heroes in Israel's religion. He becomes the last in a series of acts of God, elevating the old covenant to cosmic dimensions.
In this scheme he has no chance of surpassing the significance of Moses and Abraham.

The opponents must also have a particular eschatology. The inclusion of the provocative element, ἄρσεν καὶ ἡῤῥυ, shows that they (and the Galatians) must be less than enthusiasts in the Corinthian sense, where Paul expresses an "eschatological reservation" by eliminating the "male-female" element of the saying. But in Galatia, attainment of the angelic state, and the final resolution of the sexes, still lies in the future. Law-obedience is the means of achieving this goal, and those who are on the way, brought into fellowship with all the powers of the universe through the sacraments epitomized and climaxed by circumcision, proleptically achieve fellowship with the angels and taste a little of the sexless state. Here, then, it is the opponents who have the "eschatological reservation" as far as baptism is concerned, and Paul who portrays baptism into Jesus in terms of "realized eschatology."¹ In fact, it may have been Paul's "enthusiastic" baptism-statement here which contributed to the Corinthian excesses.²

¹Many have noticed the few references to the parousia in Galatians. The stress is instead on the present deliverance from the cosmic forces of the old age.

²See above, p. 372.
"enthusiasts." Both embrace theologies which are forms of wisdom-speculation, both threaten the social unity of the church, and both reject the cross, in theology and experience. But the Galatian opponents are "nomistic" enthusiasts, like the Colossian heretics, and perhaps the opponents behind 2 Corinthians. Wisdom-speculations and enthusiasms could apparently express themselves through a variety of eschatologies. For the Corinthians, the final eschatological event is behind them; for the Galatian opponents, it is still before them.

Robinson has noticed the difference between the "opponent" in 1 and 2 Corinthians, which causes Paul

---

1See above, pp. 212-15, on the apostle-tradition and the demand for ἄποστολος, etc., which is operating in both Galatia and Corinth; in both contexts also are concern for fellowship with angels, interest in the Spirit, miracles, etc.

2The wisdom-speculation behind 1 Corinthians is clear. See Wilckens, "οοφαλά," TDNT, 6:519-22; and Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 45-48. This wisdom-speculation shows affinities with apocalyptic literature; and the literature of Qumran, which reveals some striking parallels to the opponents' theology, also belongs in the "Hasidic wisdom tradition." See above, pp. 227, 294.

3On the differences between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, see Robinson, cited below; and Georgi, Gegner, p. 303, etc. But there are also important similarities between the "opponents" in each instance. Balch, "Backgrounds," pp. 362-64, mentions interest in the exegesis of the OT in both; the use of Moses-traditions in both (1 Corinthians 7 and 2 Corinthians 3), and the affinities with the theology of Q in both (such as depreciation of the passion and the humanity of Jesus, interest in miracles and divine men, etc.).

very much to alter his approach, so that "the position he assumed in 2 Corinthians was to some extent parallel to that of his opponents in 1 Corinthians."¹ He now "so emphasizes realized eschatology as to sound reminiscent of the heresy of baptismal resurrection he himself combatted in 1 Corinthians."² His position in Galatians is very similar to this last. While the opponents of 2 Corinthians can be called "enthusiasts,"³ they are unquestionably nomists, proclaiming the indissolubility of the old and new covenants,⁴ the salvific value of the Moses-tradition, and their own impeccable Israelite "pedigree."⁵ Their nomistic enthusiasm has led them to fail to appreciate the realized eschatology in God's

¹Ibid., Trajectories, p. 65, resting especially on 2 Cor 13:4 ("For He was crucified in weakness, but lives by the power of God"); 2 Cor 4:5 ("we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your servants because of Jesus"); and 2 Cor 5:16 (the irrelevance of knowing Christ after the flesh)--all contrasting starkly with the relation of the human Jesus to the kerygma, the task of the church and the lives of believers in 1 Cor 1:18-2:5 etc.


³See their search for 565α (2 Corinthians 3), and their heroic understanding of Moses and Jesus (Georgi, Gegner, pp. 286-88); their fascination with ὑποκαλύψεις καὶ ἀπόκαλυψις κυρίου, (2 Cor 12:1); their performance of δυνάμεις καὶ τέρατα as signs of their apostleship (2 Corinthians 12); their concern for πνεῦμα (2 Cor 3:17); etc.

⁴See 2 Cor 3:4-18. Gunther, Opponents, p. 86, even credits them with interest in circumcision, because of the use of καταδουλοῦν in 2 Cor 11:20, compared with Gal 2:4.

⁵2 Cor 11:2.
deed in Christ—as is true, too, for the Galatian opponents.

Finally, this portrayal of the opponents' sacramentalism is consistent with traditions dealt with already, such as the tradition of apostle, traditions of revelation and inspiration in which vision and ecstasy are the confirmation of the prophetic wise man, the tradition of Abraham as one of the great heroes of Israel's religion and as the epitomy of the Gentile who comes to God, and traditions in which Judaism is a mystery religion, Jewish law is the key that opens up the secrets of the cosmos and brings fellowship with the angelic rulers of the universe, and Moses is the supreme mystagogue who, on Sinai, becomes angelic and even divine, receiving again the lost "glory" of Adam.
CHAPTER TEN

ETHICAL TRADITIONS

It has already been noticed that some construct the theology of the opponents from the ethical portions of the letter, considered almost in isolation, or else they see two groups behind the letter, principally on the grounds that the nomism of the opponents in the early portions of the letter cannot be matched with the apparent moral laxity of the recipients of the second portion. Both such theories encounter great problems because of the unity of the letter, the way the letter, in both

1 See above, pp. 27-32, 52-54. Schmithals, closely followed by Marxsen, assumes that the whole letter is against Gnostics; and the nature and content of the ethical section is a principal part of the argument of both.

2 See above, pp. 55-62. Lütgert and Ropes propounded a two-front theory. In the ethical portions of the letter, libertines are confronted, who must be different opponents from the legalists. The paraenetic materials must directly reflect the situation in Galatia, which must be libertine, and cannot therefore be in view in the earlier part of the letter. The "implied two-front" theorists also assume that, in the ethical portions, Paul faces a different opponent. There are perhaps two groups in the Galatian congregation. Jewett has most recently propounded a variant of this theory, assuming again that suggestions of sexual immorality, impurity, and licentiousness reflect the actual behavior of the Galatians.

3 See above, pp. 55-60. Jewett has noticed that Galatians deals with the congregations as a homogeneous
its major sections, expounds the meaning of baptism,\(^1\) and the theological and literary questions of the form and function of paraenesis in Paul's letters\(^2\)—all of which suggest, in fact, that the last chapters of Galatians are integral to the whole argument of the letter and are group (1:6, 3:1-5, 5:7, etc.). The entire congregation seems as much in danger of one extreme (if they are extremes) as of the other, and there are the same concerns in the so-called anti-legalist and anti-libertine sections, i.e., νόμος σαρκί, πνεύμα, 3:1-5, 5:13-24, 6:1-2, 7-8; ελευθερία, 4:21-31, 5:1-13. But against Jewett it must be said that he has no way of holding the letter together. By starting with the ethical portion, and making it entirely contextual, and applying it to the whole congregation, there is no way of explaining how the Galatians are tempted with nomism.

\(^1\)See above, pp. 167-69. An analysis of 3:1-5, 27-29, and 5:24 reveals that both the argument for justification by faith, and the ethical argument, are based on an exposition of baptism, and go back to 2:19-20, which stands at the head of the main argument. Both dogmatics and ethics reject the opponents' program of beginning one way and ending another, and both are different sides of the one gospel Paul presents against the opponents. Furnish, Theology, p. 110, has noted that it is typically, in Paul, the same gospel which finds expression now in theological statements, now in ethical exhortations. The latter give the content and context of the former, and the former carry within themselves the latter. So it is logical that Bornkamm finds, in Paul's baptismal statements, an integral relationship between indicative and imperative. In baptism, everything is given to us for this and the future life, and admonitions only repeat what has already happened in baptism (Experience, pp. 81-84). Paul's argument moves this way in Galatians.

\(^2\)See above, pp. 116-19. Theologically, there is always an intimate relationship between indicative and imperative, and between the human predicament under law and that same predicament under the tyrant sin. Exhortation can never be separated from the theology which precedes it. In literary terms, there is in Paul's paraenesis always a subtlety of tradition and of contextual adaptation of tradition. One cannot simply read from sins enumerated to problems in the community.
answering the same intruding theology as the earlier
chapters. This is further indicated by the way each of
the three parts of the refutatio begin with an indicative
statement; the use of the antithesis of σῶς and πνεῦμα
as two antithetical powers, and two life-possibilities,
in both chapters 3-4 and 5-6; and the way the Galatians
are addressed in both sections of the letter as
πνευματικός, probably using the self-designation of the
opponents themselves, who are nevertheless under a spell
(βασκαίνειν), deceived (πλανάν). Both sections of the
letter appear to be called forth by the one attempt to be
πνευματικός.

1 Schmithals has shown convincingly that the lists
of virtues, in the ethical section of the letter, are
integral to the argument against circumcision. A quarter
of the letter is against "sarkic" conduct, and such stress
cannot be detached from the central concerns of the let­
ter. His mistake is that he understands circumcision here
as Gnostic circumcision, and the opponents as Gnostics;
but he seems to be right on the first count. On the way
Paul places the new creation, the ethical side of the gos­
pel, over against circumcision, see above, pp. 144-45, on
6:15.

2 See above, p. 116, on 5:1, 5:13, and 5:25.

3 See above, pp. 182-84. As σῶς and πνεῦμα
become two exclusive powers and spheres of existence,
there is a careful parallel between the contrast between
Spirit and law and the contrast between Spirit and flesh,
in both chaps. 3-4 and 5-6. In each instance, Paul is
referring to the same human predicament.

4 See above pp. 177-81, and the form the attempt
takes here—a beginning (Ευνοεται) and ending
(Επιτελείων) which actually results in a complete fall from
the status of πνευματικός: the Spirit has come εἰκή. In
6:1-10, the self-styled πνευματικός are in mortal danger
(πλανάν) because their "biting and devouring" (5:13-15,
5:26) is placing them under their own retributive law of
Further, there are reasons for expecting that Paul will here use, to an extent, the ethics of the opponents themselves. Paul typically does so in his paraenesis. The subtlety of a rhetorical refutatio suggests that this will be the case. And thirdly, the suggested dynamic behind Gal 3:28 indicates that the opponents are claiming to be community apostles who are establishing the new community of God, the remnant, or σπέρμα Αβραάμ, in which their sacrament brings a breakdown of traditional social structures, and a realization in anticipation of the future, mythical roles of humanity (no Jew or Greek, male or female, etc.). Thus the community ethics in the paraenesis can be expected to be the opponents' own, the paraenesis itself functioning as a refutation of their community claims. Because in fact the new idyllic sowing and reaping which will annihilate "worldy" sinners. See above, p. 184.

1See above, p. 116. For instance, Furnish, Theology, pp. 71-72, notes that Paul "supports his own exhortations by relating them to what, on other grounds, his readers are already willing to acknowledge."

2See above, pp. 115-18, on the way a refutatio sought to destroy an opponent's argument on his own terms. Paul's claim here, in effect, is that the intruders' program has brought about the very situation it was supposed to prevent.


4On the opponents' claims to be community-apostles, see above, pp. 114, 128-29.

5See above, pp. 378-80.
relationships between members of the community have not come about, the opponents' claims to be community apostles, bringing God's last remnant into existence, must be false.¹

One further aspect which is essential for an understanding of the nature of the ethical traditions which are here dealt with, and the way in which Paul deals with them, is the sudden appearance, here in the ethical section, of the unique expression νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ. Several have noticed this puzzle at the end of Galatians. Whereas, in the early chapters, Paul radicaly rejects the religion of law in unusually harsh terms, in the last two chapters the religion of law returns again—though now it is the "law of Christ." This last is νόμος in the real sense (6:2). The Spirit allows no moral laxity,² and the law of retribution has returned in a real sense (6:7-8).³ Any attempt to fit the ethical passage into Paul's overall argument must be able to explain this dialectical treatment of νόμος.

¹The rejection of this particular claim of the opponents runs right through the letter, and its central place in the debate is evident from its place in the conclusio. See above, pp. 146-47, on 6:12-13.

²Martin, Foundations, 2:154, who notes the puzzling contrast between freedom in Christ from the claims of Mosaic Torah-religion, and the law of Christ, which allows no moral laxity.

The Function of the Ethical Traditions in Galatians

The ethical chapters are built around Paul's use of a particular form, and it is suggested here that the passage as a whole is best approached through an analysis of this form.¹

There is general agreement that Gal 5:19-23 belongs to the form of a catalog of virtues and vices,² which is widely attested both within the New Testament³ and outside it.⁴ The form appears to be daulistic in

¹The way the passage as a whole is built around this form will be further considered below, pp. 402-14.


³Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, p. 78, Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 101, and others, have complete lists. Vice catalogs are found at Mark 7:21 and parallels, Matt 15:19, Rom 1:28-31, 13:13, 1 Cor 5:10, 6:9, 2 Cor 12:20, Gal 5:19-21, Col 3:5, 1 Tim 1:9, 2 Tim 3:2-5, Tit 3:3, 1 Pet 2:1, 4:13, 15, Rev 21:8, 22:15. Virtue catalogs are found at 2 Cor 6:6, Eph 4:2, 32, 5:9, Phil 4:8, Col 3:12, 1 Tim 4:12, 6:11, 2 Tim 2:22, 3:10, 1 Pet 3:8, 2 Pet 1:5-7.

⁴Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, p. 78, gives examples from the Stoa, and from late Judaism (Philo, Rer Div Her 168-73, Wis Sol 14:25, 4 Macc, Testaments of Reuben 3:2-8, Levi 14:5-8, Judah 16:1, and Benjamin 6:4, the Assumption of Moses 7, 3 Baruch 4:17, 8:5, 13:4, 1 Enoch 91:6, Jub 21:21, 23:14, Sib Or 2:254-83, 3:36-45, and 1 QS 4); and there are other examples in Gnosticism (CH 1. 21-23, 13. 7-13; Nag Hammadi Codex 6, book 4).
its essential nature,\textsuperscript{1} climaxing in threat of destruction or promise of salvation.\textsuperscript{2} The life situation of the form seems to be, in many instances, initiation into a community;\textsuperscript{3} and correspondingly, its function tends to be

\textsuperscript{1}Kamlah, Parānese, pp. 39-49, traces the form to Iranian dualism and suggests that the dualistic scheme of the form rests on a dualistic mythical tradition, not on ethical monotheism (p. 165). Thus there is an intense dualistic statement involved in the form (see pp. 116-34, on CH 1. 22-23, where the double catalog is used to assert the two spheres in which all men live: the vices are those of the natural man living under the influence of the planets, etc.; the virtues, which do not at all correspond, express the new sphere into which the initiate is taken up). The same is true of 1 QS 3-4, where the state of men is fixed in terms of dualism, and the virtue- and vice-lists express this intense dualism, being statements of the other-worldiness of the community (pp. 42-48).

\textsuperscript{2}So Kamlah, Parānese, pp. 50ff., defines the form as one which works out a scheme of sin and righteousness in two catalogs, irreconcilable opposites, each ending with a promise of salvation or a threat of destruction. This climax of threat and promise appears, for example, in CH 1. 21-22 (pp. 116-17) and 1 QS 4 (pp. 42-43, 165). It is important to note that, in Jewish apocalyptic, this scheme is typically oriented to the future, and the climax has a promissory function (ibid., p. 3). Any tension in the present between the righteous and the "world" is in terms of a tenacious law-obedience in the face of terrifying odds. See Mussner, Galater, p. 395. See also below on 1 QS 3-4.

\textsuperscript{3}Kamlah himself suggests that, in the case of the Christian communities, the life-situation was probably baptism, as is suggested strongly by 1 Cor 6:9 (ibid., p. 3). See also Doty, Letters, p. 58. Several have suggested that CH 1. 21-22 appears to be concerned with initiation into a community. And O'Connor, "Missionary Document," p. 201, suggests that a missionary document lies behind CD 2. 14-6. 1, which, in its present state of redaction, has come to have the hortatory function of discouraging apostasy.
hortatory, stressing the separation of the community from the world.¹

¹Kamlah, Paränese, pp. 12-18, has argued from the dualism of the form that its function is not paranetic but indicative and is only the basis for the paraenesis. He speaks therefore of a descriptive form, of which Gal 5:19-23 is an example. However, he does not seem to allow the full play of the paradox of divine transcendence and human freedom in apocalyptic and wisdom material, which paradox is never logically resolved. See above, p. 266, citing von Rad; O'Connor, "Missionary Document," p. 219; etc. Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, pp. 108-9, has argued for the paraenetic function of the form, as have also Mussner, Galater, p. 395, and Stoike, "Law of Christ," p. 224. The fact that the life-situation of the form in Christian communities was probably baptism, as Kamlah admits, suggests a paraenetic function. Doty, Letters, p. 58, like Kamlah, speaks of "descriptive" and "paraenetic" forms but reverses some of Kamlah's designations, now calling Gal 5:19-23 paraenetic. It would seem preferable to dispense with this artificial distinction entirely. Furnish, Theology, pp. 95-110, argues convincingly that neat distinctions between "theology" and "ethics," "indicative" and "imperative," break down in Paul's writings. He notes that, in Philemon, the whole thanksgiving section has a hortatory function, pointing forward to the imperatives and expressed further on; and that Paul elsewhere uses indicative statements in order to exhort (e.g., Gal 4:31). It is possible to speak of the "imperative indicative" in Rom 5:1-11, 6:1-14, 7:4, 1 Thess 4:7, and countless other instances. In Romans, "ethics" are not merely introduced in chaps. 12-15. These chapters are only the denouement of the whole preceding argument, and, in this sense, Romans is hortatory from the beginning. So it is in all Paul's letters. The indicative contains the imperative; the imperative spells out the indicative. This makes nonsense of the assertion that, because a form or pericope is indicative, it is not imperative. See also Bornkamm, Experience, pp. 71-82.

Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 100, notes that the form was used principally for apologetic ends, to point out "Pagan trademarks" and to heighten the separation of the particular community from "the world." Here again, one could speak of an "imperative indicative." It is important to note that, for this reason, the vice-lists do not speak entirely to the vices of the community itself, but are to an extent traditional. They are attempts to characterize sin, and the sinful "world," in terms of ethical catalogs. See Kamlah, Paränese,
The relationship of this form to the "two-way scheme" is often not made clear. However, the latter is at least as old as the virtue- and vice-catalogs, and comes to share in so many features of them, especially the essential dualism, that the two can be treated, for

pp. 116-34; Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 100-101; and Doty, Letters, p. 57.

1 That is, a scheme based on the imagery of two ways, roads, ways of life, etc., which is paraenetic in function. The best examples are in Jewish wisdom literature (Ps 138-24, Prov 12:28, etc.), CH 1. 22-23, 13. 7-9, Did 1-6, Barn 18-21, and in the New Testament, Matt 7:13-14, Rom 13:11-14, Matt 25:31-46, Luke 6:20-26, Gal 5:19-23, and Col 3:5-17. See Michaelis, "δόξα," TDNT, 5:42-93, and Kamlah, Paränese, pp. 3, 24-27, 210-14. Hengel, Judaism, 1:140, notes that the form became significant in Jewish wisdom and apocalyptic literature, and that it has Greek parallels (e.g., the fable of Heracles at the cross-roads).

2 For instance, Kamlah, Paränese, pp. 50ff., distinguishes between the "double catalog" and the "two-way scheme," seeing the latter only in such literature as Did 1-6 and Barn 18-21, where the dualistic scheme of the "double catalog" becomes a frame for catechetical material, and can be called a "paraenetic" form.

3 Rather than the two-way scheme being a development of the virtue- and vice-catalogs. Both Michaelis, "δόξα," TDNT, 5:42-93, and Hengel, Judaism, 1:140, trace the form back at least as far as the sophist Prodicus and his fable of Heracles at the cross-roads (Xenoph Mem 2. 1. 21-54).

4 Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, p. 33, sees a direct relationship between the virtue- and vice-catalogs of late Judaism and the scheme of the two ways. He also points out the basic dualistic structure of this latter scheme, and its paraenetic function (p. 35), as does Hengel, Judaism, 1:40. Wibbing, ibid., pp. 61-64, notes that the two-way scheme merges with virtue- and vice-catalogs in Test 12, 1 Enoch 91:6ff., and especially 1 QS 4. It is this basic duality of both the virtue- and vice-lists and the two-way scheme, in apocalyptic literature, the New Testament, and later Christian literature, which distinguishes them from Stoic lists on the one hand,
all essential purposes, as the one form.¹ As far as Gal 5:19-23 is concerned, therefore, it seems correct to speak of the dualistic form of the two-way scheme or virtue- and vice-catalog, which is both paraenetic and propagandistic in intent.²

The dualism of the form itself matches well with the dualism inherent in the argument of Galatians, evident in the language of the two ages or two worlds, the antithesis of ὁδὸς and πνεῦμα, and other stark contrasts such as the age of law and the age of grace, Jerusalem and Old Testament forms on the other (Wibbing, ibid., p. 42).

¹ This is further illustrated by CH 1. 21-23, which, according to Kamlah, is a virtue- and vice-list. But in its present state of redaction at least, the passage also shares the characteristics of the two-way scheme. In the introduction to the lists (in # 21), the question is asked, "How shall I depart into life," taking up a key catchword from the two-way scheme, the way of "life" and the way of "death."

² The proposal that the form is paraenetic in Galatians 5 is confirmed by its use elsewhere in the New Testament. In Colossians, the dualism of the heretical "philosophy" is taken over polemically, and so paraenesis is conveyed in the dualistic form of "old man" and "new man." See Jervell, Imago, pp. 244-48. The way the paraenesis is taken up into the "two-way" frame, as in Did 1-6 and Barn 18-21, suggests again that the "two-way" scheme is not a different, later form. Kamlah, Paränese, pp. 31-34, admits a paraenetic function here. Rom 13:12-14, which also uses dualistic language, is clearly paraenetic (Kamlah, ibid., pp. 31-34). The single scheme of Matt 5:3-11 becomes a double scheme in Luke 6:20-26, resulting in an intensification of both the eschatological element and the paraenetic force (Davies, Sermon, pp. 282-85). Matt 7:13-14 is clearly paraenetic, as is Matt 25:31-46, though again the eschatological element is sharpened in the extreme division between the good and the wicked (Kamlah, Paränese, p. 27).
below and Jerusalem above, et cetera. It would seem to be no coincidence, then, that 5:19-23 has a particularly dualistic construction. The "ethical" portion of the letter, as well as the "dogmatic," seems to be debating the same dualistic thought world.

As noted above, Paul's real meaning is seen, not simply in his use of forms and traditional material, but in his particular modification of them. This typical Pauline modification appears in 1 Cor 6:11, which follows a virtue- and vice-form in 6:9-10. Here Paul concludes, καὶ ταῦτα ὑνες ἦτε. ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγίασθε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὄνομα του Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . , probably a reference to the Corinthians' baptism. Here the essential newness in Paul's ethic becomes apparent. It lies not in new forms of ethical behavior, but in a decisive shift in the division of the ages. In Christ, the new age has already arrived, the Spirit has come, the new man has already appeared. So

1See above, pp. 44-45.

2Kamlah, ibid., p. 12; and Dahl, Paul, p. 103.

3See above, p. 392, note 3, on the traditional nature of the virtue- and vice-lists; and above, p. 117, on Paul's use even of the ethics of his opponents.

4See Gal 4:5, 2 Cor 5:17, 1 Cor 10:11, and Gal 6:15. For Paul, the Christian stands at the "end of the ages." Gunther Bornkamm, Paul, trans. D. M. B. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 198, comments: "That which Jewish and primitive Christian apocalyptic awaited in the future and described in a great variety of pictures (e.g., Rev 21:5), Paul, because of God's recon-
the Corinthians, by virtue of their baptism into the community or "body of Christ," have already been separated finally from those who have no part in the kingdom of God, and have already become righteous, holy, et cetera.\(^1\) Christian ethics are eschatological ethics, the ethics of life truly turned to the future for the first time,\(^2\) as becomes clear in 1 Cor 6:12-20, where Paul goes on to expost the consequences of the eschatological holiness now present in the "body of Christ."\(^3\)

There is the same modification in Galatians 5. Verse 17 portrays a dualism of flesh and spirit in terms of a mythical struggle between two great powers, for whom man is only an involuntary arena.\(^4\) There is no possibility for any third position. Man must be a subject of one power or the other. In terms of this typical apocalyptic understanding of the world, 5:19-23 then takes up this dualism and contrasts the irreconcilable hostility ciling the world to Himself in Christ, proclaimed as an accomplished fact."

\(^1\)Kamlah, Paränese, p. 12; and Dahl, Paul, p. 102. Only Christianity speaks in terms of "You have been justified."

\(^2\)Bornkamm, Experience, p. 80.

\(^3\)The result is an ethic of "eschatological tension" between the "already" and the "not yet," not an interim ethic between the ages, but an ethic of the overlapping of the ages. See Furnish, Theology, pp. 134-35. See also Bornkamm, Paul, p. 204; "The new thing here is not the subject matter, but rather the context of the admonitions."

\(^4\)Kamlah, Paränese, p. 15.
of these two powers in terms of ethics.\(^1\) For those who do the ἔργα τῆς σαρκός (5:19) there remains only the typical climax of the catalog form, the assurance of damnation: οἱ τὰ τοιαύτα πράσσοντες βασίλευαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν (5:21). But in place of the corresponding climax of bliss at the end of the catalog of virtues, there is the unique Pauline modification: οἱ . . . τοῦ χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] τὴν σάρκα ἔσταφρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις (5:24). The aorist ἔσταφρωσαν most probably refers to baptism,\(^2\) as does 1 Cor 6:11. This again shifts the dividing of the ages and gives the form an intensified indicative sense. Christians, because joined to Christ in baptism, have already died to the sphere and power of σάρξ. As an inevitable way of existence, the flesh was eliminated when they were incorpo-

---

\(^1\)Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, p. 40: σάρξ and πνεῦμα are two "Machtsphären," which are irreconcilable opposities. Which of the two the Christian stands under becomes evident from his "Tun," as the following catalog makes clear.

\(^2\)See Kamlah, Paränese, p. 16: Paul typically uses the aorist to refer to the believer's incorporation into the death of Christ at baptism. See also above, pp. 143-44. Thus the aorist here comports with the aorist ἀπέδανον and the perfect σωκυταφώματι in 2:19. Some of those who see baptism referred to here are Jervell, Imago, p. 234, as well as Duncan, Lagrange, Burton, Oepke, and Schlier. Mussner demurs, because ἔσταφρωσαν is the active form, whereas Paul usually uses the passive form for baptism. It would have been difficult to have expressed the thought of the verse in the passive form. The active aorist here implies both indicative and imperative. See Schneider, " σταυρῶν," TDNT, §583. Mussner himself admits that baptism is at least indirectly in view.
rated into Christ.¹ What the dualistic scheme typically referred to as promise has now become a historical reality, and the catalog now functions to proclaim the freedom of the Christian.²

It is for this reason that the catalog, at the heart of the ethical section, must be taking up the main thrust of the letter, going back to the baptismal statement of 2:19-20 and continuing the polemic of chapters 3 and 4 on behalf of the liberty of faith.³ It is because Christ has brought in the eschatological aeon of the Spirit that it is unthinkable for a Christian to exist in the grasp of ω&omicron;φε.⁴ And because this is an eschatological argument, it is also a Christological argument. Paul's argument for justification by faith, and his argument for ethics, have the same Christological base. Nothing can be added to the believer's justification by faith, because in faith--that is, in baptism--he is

---

¹Kamlah, Parënese, p. 16.
²Ibid., p. 17.
³Kamlah, ibid., p. 17, draws attention to the continued polemic against works of law in 5:16, 18, and 23.
⁴Furnish, Theology, pp. 128-29, notes Paul's stress on the arrival of the new age in Galatians 3-4, evident in the coming of the Spirit, being known of God, the cry of the son of God, Abba, the possession already of the inheritance, witnessed by the entrance into the age of the Spirit. It is significant then that 5:24 continues this stress, by proclaiming the defeat of the power of ω&omicron;φε, and demanding the walk in the Spirit.
conducted into the finished work of Christ.\(^1\) So, just as "baptism is the dedication of the new life," so also "the new life is the appropriation of baptism."\(^2\) Here, as in 1 Corinthians 6, because Gal 5:24 is a baptismal statement, ethics become eschatological ethics, the other side of the eschatological declaration of righteousness by faith\(^3\)--the continuation of Paul's "sacramental" answer to the opponents.\(^4\)

Though there is an indicative sense here, the typical paraenetic function of the form is also present. One can speak of an "imperatival indicative."\(^5\) Paul proclaims that the Christian does not live in the sphere of the flesh--because the Galatians do live in the sphere of the flesh (5:13-15). The catalog is the indicative on which the imperative is based: but it is also imperative

\(^1\)See above, pp. 170-71.

\(^2\)Bornkamm, Experience, p. 84: "The obedience of believers cannot penetrate further than to what has happened to us at the beginning. It takes place in the constant 'crawling under baptism' (Luther). In this sense one may formulate it pointedly: baptism is the dedication of the new life, and the new life is the appropriation of baptism."

\(^3\)That is, they are the concrete particularity of "life turned to the future for the first time," the "concrete ways of Christ in the world." See Furnish, Theology, p. 74.

\(^4\)See above, pp. 170-81. It is for this reason that justification and ethics are two sides of the one reality "in Christ." Justification is a life, the life of the new age; ethics are the concrete spelling out of that life. See Furnish, ibid., p. 110.

\(^5\)See above, p. 392.
in that it makes clear which of the two antithetical powers it is under which the Galatians are now living, thus calling them to live under another power.

As well as modifying the eschatological perspective of the form, Paul also typically modifies the contents of the form, adapting it to particular circumstances. On the basis of statistical analysis, Wibbing has suggested the modifications in Galatians 5. For the vices, the first five and the last two belong together as a "family" (πορνεία, ἁκαδαρσία, ἁσέλγεια, εἰςωλολατρία, φαρμακεία; and then finally μέθαι, κῶμοι), forming an

1Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, p. 40.

2See above, p. 103, quoting various authorities. Paul's genius shows through in the subtle modification of vice-lists. See also p. 104, quoting Funk: Paul's customary method of argument is to adapt traditional ethical material in a particular way. He suggests three ways to decide the degree of "contextuality."

3The traditional nature of the material is evident from the assertion that these values are φανερά (5:19). See Furnish, Theology, p. 72. But Wibbing, ibid., pp. 86-108, suggests some contextuality on a statistical basis. Of the vices, ten occur elsewhere in the vice-lists in Paul's writings (πορνεία, ἁκαδαρσία, ἁσέλγεια, ὁμοία, ὑσίς, φθάνος, μεθῆ, κῶμος, ζήλος, ἔρημος) and five do not (εἰςωλολατρία, φαρμακεία, ἐξορθοτaccur, αἰρετικές). Of the latter, two are clearly tradition (εἰςωλολατρία and φαρμακεία typically go together as in Wisdom of Solomon 12:4, Did 5:1, Barn 20:1), and ἐξορθοτaccur is common in the NT, though not in vice-lists (see Eph 2:14-16, Luke 23:12). Of the virtues, six occur in other virtue-lists (ἀγάπη, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, πραότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις) and three do not (χαρᾶ, χριστότης, ἐγκράτεια). Again, however, they are common virtues outside the lists (see Rom 15:13, 14:17, Col 3:12, etc.).

4These vices are normally not the vices of the community, but of the "world." See above, pp. 391-92.
inclusio around eight vices that particularly relate to community life (ἔχοσταται, ἐρις, ἔθλος, ἄμοιοι, ἐριστεῖμαι, διχοστάσαι, αἰρέσεις, φθεύοντ). It is this central cluster that seems to be directed to the Galatian situation, particularly διχοστάσαι and αἰρέσεις. In this list, then, it is the libertinistic vices that are the traditional ones: contextuality, that is, Paul's thrust at the Galatians is at the point of love in the community.

The list of virtues also shows contextuality. ἀγάπη is not merely one virtue among many; and the following virtues are not grounded in the Greek virtue-ideal. They are fruit (singular) of the Spirit, not separate individual traits of character. Love embraces and includes all the other virtues which follow. These virtues put into ethical terms the life of the community of the new age, the life of the Spirit.

1 Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, pp. 96-97, notes that ἐρις, ἔθλος, ἄμοιοι, ἐριστεῖμαι is a kind of formula, as these four appear in the same order in 2 Cor 12:20-21. φθεύοντ is repeated again in Gal 5:26.

2 Wibbing, ibid., pp. 96-97. They are found only in this vice-catalog in Galatians 5, and are unattested in the catalogs of the popular preachers.

3 Wibbing, ibid., p. 106; and Mussner, Galater, p. 381. Paul is not here painting a portrait of the Greek "good man." Furnish, Theology, p. 87.

4 Furnish, ibid., p. 87.

5 Remembering that there is typically no attempt to match vices with corresponding virtues, for the latter belong to the new age, or to those who have come out of the "world," and reflect directly the aspirations of the community. See for instance CH 1. 22, 23, and 1 QS 4,
These suggestions regarding contextual modification of virtue and vice-lists tend to be confirmed in the ethical topoi of Galatians 5-6, and the way they are related to the lists. It is typical for Paul to modify the indicative precisely at the point at which the indicative is to be expanded in the imperative.\(^1\) It is significant, then, that it is with the subject of love in the community that the ethical topoi are especially concerned.\(^2\) In the heart of Gal 5:1-12, the first imperative passage growing out of an indicative statement,\(^3\) appears the maxim, \(\epsilon\nu\ \gamma\delta\rho\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\ \'I\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\ \o\delta\tau\epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\omega\mu\omicron\ \tau\iota\ \l\o\chi\xi\epsilon\iota\ \o\delta\tau\epsilon\ \\acute{\alpha}k\rho\omicron\beta\omicron\omicron\tau\iota\alpha\omicron\, \\alpha\l\l\a\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \delta\iota\ \\acute{\alpha}g\alpha\pi\omicron\eta\). discussed in Kamlah, Paränese, pp. 116-35, 165. The refusal to match vices and virtues appears to be a part of the intense dualism inherent in the lists. In fact, these are likely to be the opponents' own community-values, descriptive of the remnant they themselves are claiming to bring into being. See above, p. 388, on Gal 3:28.

\(^1\)See Furnish, Theology, pp. 95-110. For instance, the thanksgiving section in Philemon is in particular terms, which then become the basis, at the end of the letter, for the imperative. Kamlah, Paränese, pp. 12-13, notes that the double catalog is inseparable from the ethical topoi for which it lays an indicative basis. For instance, the vice with which the lists begins in 1 Cor 6:9 is πορνεία; and this is exactly the vice which is taken up in the imperative passage which follows (6:12-20): φεύγετε τήν πορνείαν (6:18; see also 6:13, 15, 16).

\(^2\)Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, pp. 110-11, 122-27, stresses the way the call to περιπατεῖν (functioning as does the OT γίνεται), which is the call to concrete fulfillment of the topoi, grows out of the catalogs, so that the call to περιπατεῖν in Galatians 5-6 is especially the call to ἀγάπη, which stands at the head of the virtues.

\(^3\)That is, 5:1. See above, p. 102.
The three verses following the next indicative statement (5:13), are completely taken up with the maxim ἄγαπης τὸν πλήσιον σου οὓς σεαυτόν. And after the final part of the imperative inclusio around the double catalog, the call to love in the community is taken up immediately (μη γινώμεθα κενοδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλοῦμενοι, ἀλλήλους φθονοῦντες [5:26]), and continues to be the dominant subject of the topoi (αἵνευν τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε, [6:2]; ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, ἔργαζομεθα τὰ ἀγαθὰ πρὸς πάντας, καλίστα δὲ πρὸς τῶν συνεκτικῶν τῆς πίστεως [6:10]. The dynamic relationship between Paul's indicative and imperative thus become clear. The indicative/imperative nature of the double catalog perfectly accords with the inclusio at either end.

λέγω δὲ, πνεύματι περιπατέτε καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν σάρκις οὐ μὴ τελήσετε (5.16) εἰ πνεῦμαν πνεύματι, (5.25), πνεύματι καὶ στοιχώμεν

and the topoi which expand it. The life of the new age, the life of freedom from the σάρξ and freedom in the

---

1 So, Schlier, Galater, p. 166, on 5:15. It is the opponents' theology that is rending the congregation. There is a link between the misuse of freedom and violation of the law of love. The heresy is a nomistic misunderstanding of pneuma-possession, an inauthentic spiritualism. It is the very attempt to be πνευματικοί that leads to ethical breakdown.

2 Taking up the last of the vices relating to the community, φθόνος (5:21).
πνεῦμα, is a life of love in the community in concrete terms.¹

The function of the ethical passage in Galatians can now be made clear. There is both tradition and modification in the lists, suggesting that they are functioning as both indicative and imperative. They are taking up well known ethical standards, probably many of them the standards of the opponents themselves. But whereas, traditionally, both lists ended with a promise, now only the vice-list does. The virtue-list climaxes in a declaration of the arrival of the new age. The community standards that the opponents lived with only in a tension of law-righteousness and future hope, Paul declares are now to be lived with in a tension of eschatological "now" and "not yet." The lists have become for Paul an indicative which lifts Christian ethics to an entirely new plane.

And yet there is also imperative force to the double catalog. Paul has infiltrated the description in ethical terms of the godless, the "world," the sphere of

¹Where Paul looks for law-fulfillment in Galatians 5-6, it is not in terms of a rejection of libertine or licentious behavior, but in terms of love of neighbor. Stoike, "Law of Christ," pp. 215-16. It is also significant that there is no different problem dealt with in 5:1-12 and 5:13 (seeing that the former pericope is clearly directed against the circumcision program). At the heart of 5:1-12, legalism is opposed to love, and in 5:13-15, σάρξ-conduct is the opposite of love. The threatening, dualistic, all-encompassing nature of σάρξ must be taken into account in 5:13.
οδοξ, with the shortcomings of the Galatians themselves, in their attempts to be πνευματικοί. Suddenly they both appear on the same level, eradicating the difference between "secular" and "religious" vices. The sin of failure to live in love in the community becomes just as deadly as all the wickedness of the "world" and shows that one is in the grasp of οδοξ. The traditional climax in threat of damnation intensifies this shocking transvaluation of values: the Galatians themselves stand on the wrong side of this eschatological dualism. In this ethical description of who the Galatians are—and are not—the is inherent the call to them of whom they are to be. The virtue-list, the description of the life of the eschatological community, functions in the same way, for it is certainly not a mirror-image of the Galatians. And the revolutionary indicative statement in 5:24 itself intensifies the imperative function of the catalog. The pronouncement of the establishment of the new creation is itself a call to live out the new creation.¹ But there is an irony in this pronouncement too. It is the height of folly to live under the power of οδοξ, as the

¹So, Bornkamm, Paul, p. 202: "The new life does not go beyond what grace bestows on faith. Accordingly, it is not sufficient to think of the new life... as a mere supplementary effect of faith; in itself it is a mode of faith, an appropriation of what God has already assigned... Thus the two come together in equilibrium: to live on the basis of grace, but also to live on the basis of grace." See also Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkatagoge, p. 122; Schlier, Galater, pp. 194-95; and Oepke, Galater, Excursis 9.
Galatians are doing in their harsh, exclusivist behavior, now that the σωφροσύνη has been defeated in Christ. To do so only means that the new age, the age of the Spirit, has come εἰκόνα.¹

The double catalog and the ethical topoi are therefore inseparable in function and content. If the catalog carries on the argument of the earlier chapters against the apocalyptic-dualistic heresy of works of law, then the ethical topoi do too. As the double catalog takes up the well known ethical values of the opponents, modifies them at significant points, and proclaims these as the values of the new age into which the Galatians have already been established by faith and baptism,² so

¹Picking up the irony of 3:1-5, and 4:8-11. See above, pp. 279-81, etc. This suggests further that the ethical argument continues the argument of chaps. 3 and 4 against the program of righteousness by works. This same irony appears to be in 6:7-10, the eschatological climax that appears suddenly in the midst of the paraenesis, adding new force (Funk, Language, pp. 264-70). It is not directed against libertinistic, semi-Gnostic Hellenistic enthusiasm (against Jewett, "Agitators," p. 202, etc,) but is carrying on the surprising transvaluation of values which appears in the vice-catalog. Failure in the area of love in the community is as deadly as the most "worldly" of conduct. On this point the Galatians have been deceived (μὴ πλανάσαθε, 6:7), just as Paul says earlier that they have been bewitched (3:1) and are therefore living in deadly danger.

²This suggestion is not without precedent. Bornkamm, "Colossians," pp. 133-35, notes that the ethics of Colossians are the ethics of the opponents themselves, "torn out of the hedge of (their) δόγματα and founded solely in the redemption by Christ's death and resurrection from the ξέωσις οἰκονομίας," transported into the kingdom of Christ. So in Galatians, the ethics of the opponents have now become the ethics of Christ; they always were the ethics of the new age, and for this
the ethical topoi take up traditional values which belong within the ethical propaganda of the opponents themselves, but which their intruding theology has demolished. On their own terms, Paul declares the intruders and those who follow them to be on the "dark" side of the dualistic scheme, the side of the damned, threatened by their own law of sowing and reaping. What makes it suddenly so much more serious is that this is the new age, when God's people are already justified, have already crucified the flesh, and have been delivered from the necessity of living under the dominion of δοξα—when the mystery, far from having only commenced, has actually been consummated, so that the catalog of virtues stands now not under a promise but a proclamation of fulfillment. Foolish Galatians indeed! ¹

Possible Sources of the Ethical Tradition

Because of the dualistic nature of the argument of Galatians, it is no coincidence that Paul has chosen to carry on his argument here in terms of a dualistic form, the virtue- and vice-catalog. It is therefore reason they can only be true ethical options in the new age that Christ has inaugurated.

¹It is significant that, in the ethical section, Paul's eschatology, far from being radically different from the eschatology with which he confronts the nomists in 3:1-5 etc. (as it would be expected to be if he were now facing a very different, libertine opponent), is exactly the same, continuing the "enthusiasm" at the head of the book in 1:4.
logical to look firstly for parallels to this form itself
and to look for dualistic life-situations which would
foster such a form.

External parallels to the complete double catalog
are quite rare.¹ Wibbing traces it to Qumran,² and Kamlah
to Iran.³ Possibly both are right, in that the dualism
of Qumran, along with Jewish apocalyptic dualism gener-
ally, suggests some Iranian influence.⁴

The instance outside the New Testament of a form
most closely approximating that used here by Paul is in
¹QS 3-4.⁵ Its structure is as follows:⁶

¹Kamlah, Paränese, p. 2; and Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 102.
²Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, pp. 79, 81-86; and also 118-23 where he notes the distance from Stoic models, and the proximity to Qumran.
³Kamlah, ibid., pp. 39-50.
⁵Kamlah, ibid., pp. 42-50, 165-66; Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, pp. 81-86; and Mussner, Galater, p. 392. Other instances of the dual catalog or two-way scheme have been noted above. Those in Jewish wisdom literature have not yet developed into a comprehensive hortatory scheme—as has happened in both Galatians 5 and 1 QS 3-4 (Michaelis, "δώδεκα," TDNT, 5:78; Davies, "Scrolls," p. 170; and Mussner, Galater, pp. 392-95). The dual catalog in Poimandres also has this developed hortatory function, along with a declarative function (see above); and the literary context in which it is used itself shows many affinities to apocalyptic Judaism (see above, p. 322).
⁶Here principally following the analysis of Kamlah, Paränese, p. 44.
3:13-14  the life-situation of the catalogs: initiation into the community or instruction of novices
3:16-24  the deterministic structure of the two classes of mankind
3:25-4:1  introduction to the virtue catalog
4:2-6    the virtues of those who live by the Spirit of truth
4:6-8    the climax of the virtue-list, the promise of salvation
4:9-11   the vices of those who live by the Spirit of error
4:12-14  the climax of the vice-list, the threat of damnation
4:15-18  the present situation of the evil age
4:18-23  the hope of purification for the righteous.

---

1 The conception here is strikingly similar to Gal 5:17.
2 In this introduction there is a strong sense that the righteous live still in the evil aeon, and need "help" from the angel of truth.
3 The Qumran list gives virtues first, then, vices, while Paul has the reverse order.
4 Here again, the impression is very much that the righteous live in the present evil age, and the perspective of hope is a future one.
5 Once more, the righteous live in the evil age: "For God has appointed these two things to obtain in equal measure until the final age." There is here also a statement very close to Gal 5:17; "Between the two categories He has set eternal enmity. Deeds of perversity are an abomination to truth, while all the ways of truth are an abomination to perversity; and there is a constant jealous rivalry between these two regimes, for they do not march in accord" (Gaster).
6 Again there is a startling continuity with and contrast to Gal 5:24. Whereas Paul shifts the division of the ages into the past and can speak already of the "crucifixion of the flesh," the Qumran catalog here looks
It is interesting that an essential part of this future hope in 4:18-23 is the restoration of the שׁדַי קְדֹשׁ that which Adam lost in the fall.¹

There is a striking continuity and contrast between 1QS 3-4 and Galatians 5. As in Galatians, the catalog is placed in a dualism overruled by two antithetical powers.² The vice-list is climaxed by a similar threat of damnation. In both, there is a tension of indicative and imperative.³ Both call the initiate to walk (περιπατεῖν/רוא) in a particular way.⁴ But in Galatians, the time of salvation, the time of the Spirit, has already come: the flesh has been crucified, and one need no longer live under its domination. There is a strikingly similar dualism but a radically different eschatological tension.⁵

forward to the "destroying" of "every spirit of perversity from within his (i.e., the righteous') flesh." The triumph of the Spirit of Truth goes "sullying . . . in the ways of wickedness owing to the domination of perversity" (Gaster).

¹See above, pp. 320-23, on this hope in Judaism, and its possible connection with Gal 3:28.

²Though in 1QS it is a Spirit/Spirit dualism, and in Galatians it is a Spirit/flesh dualism. See Davies, "Scrolls," pp. 164-65; Brandenburger, Fleisch, pp. 142-44; etc.

³Davies, ibid., p. 170.

⁴Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, pp. 110-11. See 1QS 4:7, 12 and the two ways as "walks."

⁵In Galatians the tension is between the "already" of the new age and the "not yet;" but in 1QS the tension is that of the call to law-obedience and life
If such a form, with its attendant eschatology and ethic, were part of the context of Galatians, then Paul's polemic has a particular point, and his use of the form is a sharp thrust at the opponents' whole scheme. He agrees with their ethic and agrees that it is an eschatological ethic. But for this reason, it can only be realized in the new age—which has in fact come to pass in Christ and in the community of those who have been crucified with Him.\(^1\) The eschatology which Paul answers when he argues for justification by faith\(^2\) appears to be very close to the eschatology of 1 QS 3-4—and to the eschatology which Paul opposes here in the ethical section. If this is so, Paul's answer is also a Christological answer. The Christology Paul opposes when he declares that justification conforms to the "shape" of the completed work of Christ appears to be the Christology he opposes here, where Jesus has a place in a scheme which still retains Qumran's despairing dualistic estimation of the age in which the believer lives. Here in the ethical section, Christology would continue to be the heart of Paul's answer to the opponents.

by the Spirit of Truth in an age that is almost totally under the thrall of the spirit of error. See Mussner, Galater, p. 395.

\(^1\)See above, pp. 356-57, on the eschatological force of Gal 5:24.

\(^2\)See above, pp. 149-53, on the place of eschatology in the debate over faith and works.
A comparison of the contents of the catalogs in Galatians 5 and 1 QS 3-4 also yields significant results. Six of the vices enumerated by Paul are also in the Qumran catalog, whereas a much higher proportion of the virtues have possible parallels. It would seem that Paul's vices belong more to the common Greek ethical tradition than do his virtues, which may be his way of continuing the traditional function of the form by breaking any correspondence between virtues and vices. Because the virtue-lists are much more reflections of the self-understanding of the community, it is significant that his virtues should so closely approximate those of Qumran. Both see the community in the same ideal terms.

If the contents of 1 QS are the ethics of the opponents, then Paul's modification of the vice-list is also significant. He raises to serious heights the failure to live out love in the community; and this very ethic is at the heart of the Qumran catalog, "Abounding

1Wibbing, Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, pp. 92-93, attempts to find equivalents through the medium of the LXX. He suggests parallels to ὑπνός (ὑπνός ὄνομα), ζῆλος (ζῆλος ὄνομα), ἀκαθάρσεια (ἀκαθάρσεια ὄνομα) and other equivalents), πορνεία (πορνεία ὄνομα), ἀξιολογεῖα (possibly synonymous with the previous equivalent), and εἰδωλολατρία (εἰδωλολατρία ὄνομα).

2Wibbing, ibid., pp. 104-6. There are possible equivalents for πραύτης (πραύτης ὄνομα), μακροδυναμία (μακροδυναμία ὄνομα), ἀγαθοσύνη (ἀγαθοσύνη ὄνομα), χρονιότης (χρονιότης ὄνομα), πίστις (πίστις ὄνομα), and εἰδωλία (εἰδωλία ὄνομα). This amounts to two-thirds of Paul's virtues.

3See above, p. 349, citing Kamlah, Parānese, p. 165.
love for all who follow the truth." Such an ethic could be expected to be owned by community-apostles who claim that their sacraments bring in the present a realization of the mythical goals of humanity, no "Jew or Greek," "male and female," et cetera.

At the point where Paul apparently modifies form and content there are significant parallels to the catalogs of 1 QS. The opponent is to be sought, not among libertines, but among nomistic, dualistic sectarians:

... it is not impossible that Paul was drawing on a didactic tradition within Judaism which is represented for us in one of its forms in the Scrolls.

Consideration must now be given to possible sources for the ethical topoi which are inseparably connected to the catalogs. There are two significant clues to begin with: the opponents are Christians, as well as Judaisers, and evidently, have an important place for Jesus in their scheme; and Paul comes to characterize

---

1 1 QS 4:4. Mussner, Galater, p. 379, sees a further terminological parallel between Gal 5:19-23 and 1 QS in the expression ἔργα τῆς σορωίας, which is close to the μανθάνει of 1 QS 2:5, and the μάθημα of 1 QS 4:23. Despite the distinction in terminology used for the dualism (Spirit/Spirit in Qumran, Spirit/flesh in Paul), most agree that the dualism itself is strikingly similar.

2 See above, pp. 338-38, 347, etc., on the suggested place of Gal 3:28 in the polemic.

3 Davies, "Scrolls," p. 170. He and others have seen the parallels between the ethics of 1 QS and Galatians. But the point is, Why should Paul use these ethics? What is their dialogical function in the argument?

4 See above, pp. 133-53, on 2:15-21. The oppo-
his ethic (which has evidently been to a large extent taken over from the opponents) as the "law of Christ" (6:2).

There seems to be good evidence that, in Pauline paraenesis, "reminiscences of the words of the Lord Jesus Himself are interwoven with traditional material,"¹ suggesting that "it was the words of Jesus Himself that formed Paul's primary source in his work as an ethical διδασκαλός."² It is important to note that these words of Jesus function, not as specific quotations, but as a basis for interpretation and application to some specific situation.³ For instance, Robinson has demonstrated that nents have a kind of "faith" in Jesus as a bringer of "righteousness" in a sense. See also above pp. 35-37, referring to Georgi.

¹Davies, Paul, p. 138.

²Ibid., p. 136. See also Archibald M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (London: SCM Press, 1961). Although not fully agreeing, Furnish, Theology, pp. 53-54, finds convincing parallels between ethical exhortations in the synoptics and those in Paul's letters. "It is certain ... that the apostle was familiar with traditions about Jesus' teaching and had possessions of certain elements of that teaching."

³See Dungan, Paul (Phildalephia: Fortress Press, 1971). His form-critical comparison of 1 Cor 9:4-8 and 1 Cor 7:1-16 with parallel traditions in the Synoptics indicates that both these passages in 1 Corinthians "are intimately related to that complex of traditions now preserved in the synoptic gospels" (p. 146), even though there is not always evidence of a direct quotation. The conclusion is that Paul actually used "a considerable number of Jesus' teachings" (p. 149), which are to be recovered, not on the basis of exact quotation, but of indications of the presence of interpretations of traditions of the teachings of Jesus, adapted to particular circumstances.
in 1 Cor 4:5-13, where "sayings that occur in free variation" in a wide spectrum of Christian paraenetic materials are again functioning in terms of an interpretation that is directed to a specific situation. Here is a contextual interpretation of material that, from other sources, is known to be held together in a tradition of "sayings of the Lord."

It is for this reason that it is not adequate to exclude the possibility of an underlying tradition of sayings of Jesus for any Pauline paraenetic passage, simply because there are no formal quotation or introductory formulae.

Further, there should be an examination of the function in Christian literature of the dual catalog, 

---

1At the core of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain in Q, in the Two Ways of Did 1:3-5, in Clem 13:2, Polycarp Phil 2:2-3, and Barn 18-21.

2Robinson, "Kerygma," p. 130. The description of the opponents in 1 Cor 4:8 suggests the woes of the Sermon on the Plain, using κορευνόνατι, πλούτην; and that of himself suggests the blessings, using πενθῶμεν καὶ διψῶμεν . . . λοιπόν μενεῖν εὐλογοῦμεν, διωκόμενοι ἄνευ ὁμοίων, verse 12. Here is no simple quotation of Jesus' sayings, but an adaptation of them to a specific problem, even though the original source remains recognizable.

3Dungan, Sayings, p. 149, notes that accurate quotation of Jesus' words really belongs to a later period (Tertullian and Irenaeus). Justin Martyr and Clement even cite more freely, as do Did and Barn (below). See also James J. C. Cox, "Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical Logoi as Cited in the Didascalia Apostolorum, Part 2: Methodological Questions," AUSS 15 (1977):11-15, who examines the citation of dominical logoi in the Didascalia, noting the quotations may be with or without citation formulae—and may even have no known parallels.
and the ethical topoi which were usually associated with it.\(^1\) It is typically either a frame for ethics\(^2\) or an integral part of a paraenetic passage.\(^3\) Several have noted that the ethical topoi which are taken up into the catalog, in the Pauline epistles, reflect to a significant degree the ethical teachings of Jesus.\(^4\) This becomes even more pronounced in Did 1-6 and Barn 18-21. Not only are these suggestions of a "common catechetical cluster" in early Christianity;\(^5\) there are also hints that this cluster was typically associated with, or placed into the frame of, a "two-way" scheme. There is


\(^{2}\)Kamlah, Paränese, sees this happening in Did 1-6, Barn 18-21, and the Latin Duae Viae. It has been noticed above that it is already happening in Col 3:5-17.


\(^{5}\)James M. Robinson finds this cluster "at the core of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain in Q," in the Two Ways of Did 1:3-5, in Clem 13:2, and Polycarp, Phil 2:2-3, "Kerygma," p. 130.
the suggestion of an association of this latter form and ethical topoi based on the sayings of Jesus.

Thirdly, there must be some reasonable explanation for the puzzling expression "the law of Christ."¹ There is a closely parallel expression in 1 Cor 9:21, where Paul says Jesus-believers are μὴ δὲν ἀνομοὶ θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐνομοὶ χριστοῦ, closing a passage where he also "has occasion to refer to certain maxims belonging to the tradition of the teaching of Jesus."² This suggests that such ἐπιτάγας and διατάγματα as are referred to in 1 Corinthians (7:6, 25 and 9:14) "are conceived as in some sort constituent elements in the 'law of Christ.'"³ If this is so in 1 Corinthians, then the expression ἐνομος

¹See how ironical this expression is, in the light of Paul's radical separation of Christ and law in Galatians 3-4 (above, p. 348).


³Dodd, More Studies, p. 146. See also Davies, Paul, pp. 135-40, and Longenecker, Paul, pp. 188-90. Furnish, Theology, grudgingly concedes that the genitive ἐνομος θεοῦ of 1 Cor 9:21 is probably a subjective genitive, meaning "without the law of God" (supported by Rom 2:12-13, where ἐνομος refers to God's law), and that "therefore, Dodd's point that the antithetical phrase ἐνομος χριστοῦ at least 'implies the existence' of a law of Christ may be granted." But he denies that the "law of Christ" is the sayings of Jesus conceived as law. However, his objection rests on his assumption that the crux of the ethical passage is 5:25, which seems mistaken. The crux seems rather to be in 5:24.
\[\text{\textcopyright Xπωτού raises the same possibility in Galatians,}^{1}\]

which is not to be tested simply by looking for citations of sayings recorded in the gospels.\(^2\)

\(^1\)It has been shown above, p. 110, that Gal 1:11 etc., does not mean that there were not traditional elements in the gospel Paul preached in Galatia. Gal 1:11-12 must be placed alongside 1 Cor 15:3-5 to get a balanced picture in Paul of the dynamic between tradition and revelation. Wherever possible, Paul stresses agreement between himself and the other apostles (Gal 2:2, 6-9). His gospel is testable by tradition (2:2). Further, in circles in which δικαιώματος plays an important role (Gnosticism, Qumran, and even 1 and 2 Corinthians) there is also a strong interest in traditions. The Galatian opponents themselves have their traditions (about Abraham, Moses, law—even Jesus). If the two are not contradictory for them, we should not make them so for Paul. So when Furnish, Theology, and others, use Gal 1:11-12 to argue against the presence of sayings of Jesus in the Galatian context, there is a misunderstanding of the relation between revelation and tradition.

\(^2\)Stoike, "Law of Christ," pp. 239-46, and others, reject the possibility on this basis. It is argued that the only possible explicit saying of Jesus is in 5:14, and this saying is also well known from the Old Testament and Jewish ethical teaching. When there is such an explicit parallel saying in the gospels (Matt 22:34-40 and parallels) this seems to be choosing a less probable alternative in the face of a more probably one (see Dodd, More Studies, p. 138)—especially in the light of the place of sayings of Jesus in Pauline paraenesis. The result is an inability to account for the expression "law of Christ." Stoike admits a close connection between Gal 6:2 and 5:14 (see Burton, p. 329; Mussner, Galater, p. 399), but he cannot explain how 5:14 has come to be called "the law of Christ." His solution is that the expression comes from the opponents. But if so, how did they get it, and what did it mean to them? If it does belong to them, then Paul has rejected their understanding of law in one sense (chaps. 3-4) and accepted it in another (5:14, 18, 23, 6:2). Why can he do this? If the opponents have coined the expression, then what traditions have enabled them to do so (i.e., traditions of Messiah and law)? They obviously have an important place for Jesus in their traditions, and great respect for law-givers. Such important questions are left too much up in the air. Similar criticisms can be levelled at Furnish, Theology, pp. 51-65. Davies, Paul, 146, note 1, notes
Even on this last basis, Alfred Resch was able to find some significant parallels between Galatians and the synoptics, although his whole endeavor suffers from exaggeration.\(^1\) However, when the ethical chapters of Galatians are compared with other passages in early Christian literature that consist of free variations of ethical topoi associated with the form of a two-way scheme, the results appear more significant.\(^2\)

Several conclusions stand out from such a comparison. There are in all cases certain typical subjects (humility, community love, care, and sharing;\(^3\)

---

\(1\) See Alfred D. Resch, *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs' sche Buchhandlung, 1904), pp. 67-72, summarized in Table 2 at the end of the chapter.

\(2\) See Table 1 at the end of the chapter. On the use of this form along with sayings of Jesus and their exposition, see Robinson, *Trajectories*, p. 86.

\(3\) This raises the question of the βάρη of Gal 6:2, and the strange juxtaposition with φωτίζων in 6:5. It is probably not important, as Dodd says, to distinguish between ἀναπληρώσεις and ἀναπληρώσατε. Mussner and others suggest that 6:2 is repeating 6:1, and that the βαρη are the sins of fellow-Christians. This is probably right, as the whole passage seems to grow out of a saying such as Matt 18:15-20. But Schrenk, "βάρος," *TDNT*, 1:555, seems more correct in saying that this last is only part of the total task of love, and βάρη here cannot be restricted to any one sphere. The phrase with which βάρη is connected, ὁ νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ, seems to relate directly to 5:14 and Rom 13:10 (ibid.). It is significant also that in Acts 15:28 and Rev 2:24 βάρος signifies
teachers and the taught; forgiveness of erring community members; warnings against judging, associated with reminders of the future judgment; the demand for love for a neighbor, who is likely to be a worst enemy). In all of them (setting Galatians aside for the moment) there are attempts to relate these topics to sayings of Jesus, even though there may be no specific quotes for some topoi (i.e., 1 Clem 13:1, 3). All of them give evidence, not just of quotation, but of interpretation in a particular context. There may even be "dubbed-in" quotations for which there is no known parallel. All show a tendency to combine what are separate quotations in the synoptics.

This comparison reveals that there are some rather explicit parallels between synoptic sayings of Jesus and some of the central topoi in Galatians 5–6. The burden of the Spirit on the community, the "yoke" of the law, just as Ab 6:5 speaks of the ἄρμαν. Thus the idea is probably linked directly with Matt 11:28-30 (ibid., and Dodd)—which, however, uses πόρισμα. Paul, then, may be taking up Matt 11:28-30, and playing with the idea of the βάρος of the law of Christ which, because it is a "yoke" (Ab 6:5, "to bear the yoke with one's neighbor"), joins one to one's neighbor so that he becomes one's own πόρισμα.

1 The expression is that of Cox. See above, p. 373. So, for example, 1 Clem 13:2, "as ye are kind, so shall kindness be shown you," which suddenly appears in the midst of a quotation from Matt 5:7, 6:14, 15, and Luke 6:31.

2 Above all, Gal 5:14 and Matt 22:34-40 and parallels, especially noting ὁλος ὁ νόμος in Matt 22:40. See Dodd, More Studies, p. 139. There are certain weaknesses in suggesting that the use in Gal 5:14 of Lev 19:18 goes
However, it also suggests that the place of sayings of Jesus in these chapters may be even more prominent than these rather explicit parallels indicate. Several of the topoi show a proximity to interpretations of sayings of Jesus in other paraenetic passages using a two-way scheme.\(^1\) In the light of the typical way in which early Christian literature treated sayings of Jesus, the comparison suggests, then, that Galatians 5-6 is an interpretation of the same ethical traditions that are behind back to Jewish ethical traditions. Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew*, trans. David E. Green (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), pp. 251-52, notes that instances of the combination of Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18, as in Matt 22:34-40, are actually quite rare. R. Akiba is recorded as having once said, "To love your neighbor as yourself ..., this is a great general principle of the law," but he did not connect the two OT verses as in Matthew 22, and parallels. Philo *Spec Leg* 2. 63 suggests that there are two basic doctrines, love to God and love to man. But again, there is not the particular combination of OT texts. Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18 are placed side by side in Test Iss 5:2, 7:6, Test Dan 5:3, Test Zeb 5:1, Test Benj 3:3; but the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is so heavily interpolated by Christians that it is difficult to use for insight into Jewish ethical traditions. Schweizer concludes that it is probably Jesus who has put the two texts together; and that such an arrangement as this, making Lev 19:18 of supreme importance, along with the authority of Jesus, probably lies behind the prominent use of Lev 19:18 in this sense in early Christian circles, including Rom 13:8-10 and Gal 5:14. Besides this, a saying such as the one behind Matt 18:15-20, dealing with church order, seems to be behind Gal 6:1-5 (Dodd, *More Studies*, p. 146, and Bruce, "Origins," p. 282). As noted above, θάρσος and φορτισμός in 6:2, 5 recall Matt 11:28-30.

these other passages—that is, "sayings of Jesus."

This can be seen in another way, too. The dual catalog was shown to be imperative precisely at the places where form and content were modified; and because of the dynamic of indicative and imperative in the passage, the ethical topoi relate directly to these modifications. But the modifications of the catalog form are in terms of love in the community, which turns out to be the recurring subject of the topoi, too\(^1\)—which are anchored in Gal 5:14, probably a saying of Jesus. Thus the whole paraenetic passage can be seen as an interpretation of the saying behind Matt 22:34-40 and parallels, expanded with the aid of other sayings of Jesus, particularly the ones behind Matt 18:15-20 and Matt 11:28-30. The two chapters, then, stand under the heading of the "law of Christ" and are a development of the dominical saying recorded in 5:14.\(^2\)

\(^1\)See above, pp. 360-61, for more detail on the relationship between the catalog and the topoi.

\(^2\)So suggested by Mussner, Galater, p. 399, who stresses the connection between 6:2 and 5:14, as do Dodd, Bruce, and Schrenk, quoted above. Burton, Galatians, p. 329, feels that it is "probable" that the expression "law of Christ" refers to a law that Christ had promulgated while on earth. As is implied above, these more explicit sayings do not come from Q material. However, Matt 11:28-30 is congruous with the interest of Q in wise sayings, and with the expectations of the wisdom tradition (Koester, Trajectories, p. 183). Matt 22:34-40 appears to use Markan material (Schweizer, Matthew, p. 251), though the way Paul uses Lev 19:17 in Galatians and Romans seems to be closest to the way Matthew uses it (T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus [London: SCM Press, 1971], p. 227, notes that "the Markan conclusion
This is not only consistent with the probable sense of the parallel expression ἐννόημα Χριστοῦ in 1 Cor 9:21, as well as the typical way in which Paul bases his paraenesis on sayings of Jesus; it is also consistent with the overall dialogue with the opponents. In the dual catalog, Paul evidently takes over the ethics of the opponents and defeats them on their own grounds. But the catalog and the topoi are inseparable. So, in the topoi too, Paul evidently takes up the ethics of the opponents. If, then, the topoi are owned by the opponents, and if these topoi are based on sayings of Jesus, then the opponents themselves must have an interest in

[Mark 12:28-34] asserts that no other commandment can take precedence of these two [i.e., Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18]. That is, these two stand in a class by themselves. Matthew's conclusion says something different, that these two commandments are the fundamental principles upon which all other commandments of Scripture are based. Thus it would seem that the exaltation of Lev 19:18 to this particular precedence in early Christian ethics reflects a saying of Jesus [see p. 421, above] which stands behind both Mark 12:28-34 and Matt 22:34-40. But the way Paul interprets this precedence, that is, that all law rests on Lev 19:17, parallels the way Matthew does, rather than the way Mark does. And although this verse is not in Q (Davies, Sermon, p. 373), it does not seem contrary to Q. Lev 19:18 is taken up in a similar way in Matt 5:43 and parallels. Matt 18:15-20 is peculiarly Matthean, but it is interesting that there are striking parallels to it in 1 QS 5:25-6:1, CD 9:2ff., and CD 14:21. Davies even suggests that Matthew is polemizing against the sectarians (ibid., pp. 221-30). This in itself helps the suggestion that the opponents themselves in a sense own the ethics of Galatians.

1 See above, pp. 404-9, etc.

2 This being the typical way in which Paul works in his ethical sections. See above, pp. 406-7.
sayings of Jesus,¹ and the expression νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ may be their own.² It probably epitomizes the connection they see between Jesus and the law. Given their other traditions, and the way they are functioning in the opponents' theology, this connection would have functioned for them in two ways in particular. Jesus would have been seen as a law-giver after the style of Moses, who, through heavenly revelation, was able to communicate the particularities of the secrets of the cosmos; He would have been made a dispenser of wisdom-sayings in keeping with the hidden wisdom embodied in the law. And secondly, He would have been placed in a stream of powerful representatives of covenant-law,³ so that he eternalized the law, especially the Mosaic law, or law in terms of their selective tendencies. He would have been understood as leading the remnant to keep the law in a new, deeper sense; He would have been a reauthentication of Moses. Hence the opponents no doubt spoke of a νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ in a way that made Christ a second Moses, who, because

¹There is already an indirect suggestion of such an interest in the apparent connection between the traditional unification-saying and Matt 22:30 and parallels which may be functioning behind Paul's own use of the tradition in Gal 3:28. See above, pp. 366-72. The opponents certainly have an interest in Jesus, are gospel-preachers, etc. (see above, pp. 141, 171); but at the same time, they are uncompromising preachers of law.


³See above, p. 39.
of the tradition of reauthentication of the converts, could not rise above Moses.\(^1\) By the "law of Christ" the opponents would have understood the precepts of Jesus, interpreted within the framework of the law of Moses.

The opponents' interest in Jesus, and in the "law of Christ" in this sense, is understandable in terms of traditional Jewish expectations regarding the Messiah, some of which may have particular proximity to the debate in Galatians. In a wide spread of Jewish literature, the coming Messiah is to have his new Torah\(^2\) and Qumran materials are among such literature.\(^3\) If Jewish schemes dividing history into the age of Tohuwabohu, the age of Mosaic law, and the age of the Messiah, are to be taken into account,\(^4\) they only reinforce the expectation that

\(^1\)It is interesting that Matthew may polemicize against just such an interpretation of Christ as lawgiver in his gospel, where Jesus is a paradox—He is a second Moses, and yet He is simultaneously a greater than Moses, who does not overthrow the law of Moses but radicalizes its meaning as only the Lawgiver Himself can do. A surprising element in Jesus' teaching is the way law becomes personally attached to Him. It is His law, the law of the Messiah, and all law ultimately demands the "imitatio Christi." Davies, Sermon, especially pp. 86-108.

\(^2\)Davies, Torah, pp. 85-86, draws his conclusions from Isa 2:1-5, Mic 4:1-5, Isa 42:1-4, Jer 31:31-34 and the way these passages were understood in the Targums on Isa 12:13, Song of Songs 5:10, Song of Songs Rabbah 2:13, Midrash Qoheleth 2:1 and 12:1, and Yalqut on Isa 26, as Justin, Dial Trypho 11 and Deut R. 8:6.

\(^3\)See CD 6:11, 8:10, though the relationship between the "Prophet," the "Messiah(s)," and the "Teacher of Righteousness" is a complex one. See Longeneck Paul, pp. 185-86.

\(^4\)As demanded by Schoeps, Paul: the abolition of
the Messiah was to bring fulfillment of the law of Moses in a deeper, renewed sense.¹ Such traditions may help to understand how the opponents can preach both Jesus and the law, and how Paul can turn from rejecting a religion of law to speaking suddenly of the "law of Christ."²

Is such a movement, heretical and yet attached to the sayings of Jesus, at all likely? There is much to suggest that it is. Coming from various directions, several have concluded that "the most original gattung of the Jesus-tradition" was the "Logoi Sophon," "which, in the canonical gospels, became acceptable to the

the law is supposed to be for Paul a "Messinaic doctrine" (p. 171), the result of a "pure aeon-theology" (p. 173); and the expressions "law of Christ" (Gal 6:2) and "law of faith" (Rom 3:27), arising out of these traditions, refer to a new law, after the old law has been abolished. But he has not considered the possibility that the expression, in Galatians at least, may belong to the opponents.

¹See above, pp. 134-35, quoting Davies, Moore, Jervell, and Sanders. Contrary to Schoeps' assertion, these traditions stress the continuing validity of Israel's law-traditions.

²That is, Paul may here have taken over not only a slogan of the opponents, but a source of their ethical tradition. It should be said, too, that it is not possible to determine the opponents' particular understanding of "Messiah" in terms of various Jewish traditions and expectations or to find in their theology a precise distinction between the age of the Messiah and the new age, etc. The schemes of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra are both probably to be dated about AD 100 (for instance, Arthur J. Ferch, "The Two Aeons and the Messiah in Pseudo-Philo, r Ezra, and 2 Baruch," AUSS 15 (1977):143-51; T. Francis Glasson, "Schweitzer's Influence--Blessing or Bane?" JTS 28 (1977):292-93; and apart from these apocalypses, there is only variety in Jewish speculation regarding the division of the ages (Glasson, ibid., pp. 293-302).
achieving the alternative only by radical critical alteration. . .
achieved by Matthew and Luke through imposing the Markan
narrative-kerygma frame upon the sayings tradition repre-
represented by Q."¹ Not only so, but the gattung "logoi
sophon" apparently had certain inbuilt heretical tenden-
cies such as a "gnosticising proclivity," which could
take legalistic directions.² As for Q itself, both the
form and the content of the collection may have had par-
ticular Christological aims, dispensing with the passion

¹ Koester, Trajectories, p. 135. He investigates
the "sayings of the Lord: tradition from the direction
of the Gospel of Thomas--the "oldest form of Christianity
at Edessa" (p. 129)--which may go back to a sayings-
tradition independent of the one appearing in the gospels
(pp. 132-42). Thomas represents the eastern branch of
the gattung "logoi," and Q represents the western branch
(p. 136). Robinson, ibid., pp. 71-113, reaches the same
conclusion on the basis of an examination of the use of
the genre of "sayings of the sages," logoi or logia,
from Q, through gnostic literature, the Papias fragments,
to the use of the formula in the synoptic gospels, Did,
1 Clem, Polycarp, and back to Jewish wisdom literature.
In orthodoxy, the logos became the gospel. Such an
assertion that the logoi or sayings of Jesus were of cen-
tral significance to the earliest church is not new.
Weiss, Primitive Christianity, 2:554, concluded that,
in pre-Pauline Christian thought, "the life of a Chris-
tian is a life after the words and commandments of the
Lord." Davies, Paul, p. 142, writes that the wide
acknowledgment of some form of the existence of Q "means
that in the period of Paul's activity the church was
occupied, indeed we may say preoccupied, with preserving
the words of Jesus," and that Mark was probably written
"in reaction to the over-emphasis that was placed in Q on
the διόσχή of Jesus."

² Koester, Trajectories, pp. 137, 125. So Gnosti-
cism has preserved traditions of Jesus particularly as a
dispenser of secret wisdom or gnosis. In the Gospel of
Thomas, for example, the sayings naturally lend them-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
or presenting suffering only in a heroic manner; and eschatologically, it may have paid most attention to the coming kingdom of God. Already it has been suggested that the debate behind Gal 3:28 may have involved a particular understanding of sayings of Jesus. And in a wider frame, too, it is possible to say that, as Paul takes up the ethical topoi of Galatians 5-6 closely connected with sayings of Jesus, he is taking up the ethics of the opponents themselves and defeating them on their own ground.

The opponents are an early Christian movement, with an important place for Jesus; and yet they reject the full eschatological significance of the Christ-event and the concrete personal implications of the cross. From Galatians 5-6 it appears that they are an ethical movement, even a reform movement. But from the particular way in which Paul has modified the form of the dual catalog, they see themselves as living still in the present evil age. Their hope must lie in the future kingdom of God. This eschatology immediately infers also a particular Christology. It denies that the Christ-event has

and the Gospel of Thomas and Q pay much attention to legal statements (ibid., pp. 138-39).


2 Koester, Trajectories, p. 171.

3 See above, pp. 366-72.

4 See above, pp. 381-83. 5 See above, pp. 145-46.
divided the ages and that the death of Christ has brought deliverance from the present evil age.

Such ethics, eschatology, and Christology are in perfect accord with a belief that acceptance of Jesus brings a justification by faith to which must be added a justification by works of law—a justification by faith which is the beginning of a covenant relationship that must then be maintained by a δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἔργων νόμου. If there is a "low" Christology, and no eschatological dividing of the ages, then the ancient covenant dispensation is still in force. It is the one Christology and eschatology that Paul must answer firstly by a proclamation of justification without works of law—and finally by a proclamation of the totally new ethic that is the other side of the defeat, in Christ's death, of the power of the σάρκα.¹ Justification is an eschatological doctrine, and ethics become eschatological ethics.

One last thing should be said. Paul has not, here in Galatians, so enthusiastically stated the Christian's freedom from the law that he reaches excesses and can never speak again so boldly.² He has not removed all suggestion of external compulsion and specific ethical

¹See above, pp. 398-99. Because Gal 5:24 is a baptismal statement, it continues Paul's "sacramental" answer to the opponents begun in 2:19-20. Ethics become eschatological ethics, the other side of the eschatological declaration of righteousness by faith.

²So, Drane, "Tradition," p. 177; and Paul, pp. 57-58
precepts, putting in their place the law of the Spirit as a sort of "inward and nonpropositional guidance." The ethical passage of the book returns to particularity and contextuality, a real sense of "law," in two ways. Firstly, the modifications of the catalog form are especially directed as shortcomings in behavior attributable to the intruding theology. They are "imperatives" in the real sense, demands that are expected to be carried out. Secondly, the ethical topoi, which are inseparably connected with this contextual modification, are themselves an interpretation of a larger ethical tradition; they not only represent a particular application of that tradition but also infer and bring into play the whole tradition. "Law" has returned in full force. The difference

1 Bultmann, Theology, 1:328. This is his understanding of the "law of Christ." So, too, the earlier Dodd, as in The Meaning of Paul for Today (London: Swarthmore Press, 1920), pp. 146-48. But note how Dodd changed his position to the one referred to above, p. 369, that is, that Jesus was to Paul an ethical δικαιοσύνη. For Drane, too, the "law of Christ" is not the teaching of Jesus, but the person of Jesus, His indwelling life in the believer.

2 Furnish himself notes "contextuality and concrete relevance" in Paul's ethic generally; and in Galatians 5-6 in particular, "Paul describes concretely" how the exhortation to love is to be fulfilled. The Christian must know the concrete "ways of Christ" in the world. See Theology, pp. 72-74.

3 Furnish, ibid., p. 199, suggests that Gal 5:14, rather than reducing all law to an indefinite requirement to "love," instead requires that the Christian should "obey" the law--now made particularly relevant in terms of love for neighbor.

4 Funk, Language, pp. 264-70, notes the unusual
between the opponents and Paul is not that of law versus no law, but of law identified with Moses in a particular sense versus law identified with the person of, and attached to, Christ; and of law as a way of entering the new age versus the law for one who is already, in Christ's deed, in the new age and for whom, for the first time, there is the possibility of fulfillment of eschatological demands.

Conclusions

An essential part of early Christian theology was meditation on Jesus and His sayings—meditation using various frames in which Jesus-traditions were placed and coming to diverse conclusions. Paul's own letters represent certain directions which such meditations could take.

place of the "eschatological climax" in Gal 6:7-10, where it reinforces the law of Christ. The law of retribution has returned in a real sense. See above, p. 348.

1Georgi, Gegner, pp. 282-89. See, for instance, some of the directions this meditation took, in Corinth, in Q, in later writers such as Polycarp, etc. See Robinson, "Kerygma," pp. 128-31. In the various problem situations the NT writers had to deal with, "it seems to be the transmission of traditions about Jesus that is the primary source of the difficulties" (p. 131).

2So the frame used in the Gospel of Thomas is a Gnostic anthropological dualism, which makes Jesus the dispenser of gnostic wisdom. See Koester, Trajectories, p. 137.

3So the beginning-point of all Paul's theology is Christology. See Käsemann, Paul, pp. 73-78, against Bultmann; Bornkamm, Paul, p. 136; and Ridderbos, Paul, pp. 44-53.
as do the gospels themselves.\(^1\) The Galatian opponents, too, are Christians and have an evident interest in Jesus and His teachings.\(^2\) In the ethical section of Galatians Paul gives yet another interpretation not only of Jesus' sayings but--because he builds this interpretation on the assertion that the new age has arrived in Christ--of Jesus Himself. This stands over against the opponents' own interpretation of Jesus' sayings, which also grows out of an understanding of Jesus.

This assessment of the dialogue involved in Galatians 5-6 offers an explanation of the sudden appearance of the unusual expression "the law of Christ." It would seem that, in the Galatian context, "maxims which formed part of the traditions of the sayings of Jesus are treated as if they were in some sort elements of a new Torah."\(^3\) The subtlety is that an analysis of the usual sources for Paul's paraenesis, the form of the two-way scheme and its connection with the ethical topoi of the chapters, possible Jewish traditions that provide a

\(^1\) Not only is Mark apparently a criticism of the Christology and eschatology of Q (Davies, Paul, p. 142), but Matthew represents a very different meditation again on Jesus (Davies, Sermon, pp. 56, 61, 99-104), etc.

\(^2\) See above, pp. 154-74, on Gal 2:15-21. Koester, Trajectories, p. 145, notes that it is a "different gospel" which Paul so vigorously attacks, a perversion of the "gospel of Christ" (Gal 1:6-7), which probably means, as it does in 2 Cor 11:4, that it proclaims "another Jesus."

\(^3\) Dodd, More Studies, p. 146.
precedent for the expression "law of Christ," and the typical function of a rhetorical refutatio all suggest that the expression and the maxims belong to the opponents. This is in a frame in which the Mosaic covenant is mythologized as the highest form of wisdom, and Jesus is merely the last of wisdom's spokesmen. The opponents have brought to Christianity their frame of sectarian Judaism and have placed Jesus and His teachings in that frame.

Paul, then, must find a way of negating the frame and all its consequences, while retaining Jesus and His teachings. In the earlier chapters he takes Jesus out of the sequence of great heroes of the law by making the law an interim period, and the line of salvation a line that runs directly from Abraham to Christ. He historicises Jesus, stressing the cross in history and eschatology, so that he can speak of the arrival in the present of the new age. He is then ready to defeat the opponents on their own grounds, in terms of Jesus and His teachings.

This would explain why Paul can move so abruptly from speaking of being imprisoned under the "whole law" (Δόλοι τὸν νόμον [5:3]) to speaking of fulfilling "all the law" in the life of the Christian (ὁ μᾶς νόμος [5:14]; ἀναπληρῶσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ χριστοῦ [6:2]; and the references to νόμος in 5:18, 23). The force of the two ways in which Paul speaks of law must be preserved; and in this way, a correct assessment of the ethical section
safeguards the understanding of the domatic section.
Paul battles against the "whole law" in principle. But it is law in principle in terms of the "Tendenz" of the opponents' selectivity, and of their assertion of the cosmic and soteriological significance of law, which brings one into all the blessings of the age to come. There are certain indications of this in the "dogmatic" section itself; but it is confirmed by the way in which, in the "ethical" section, Paul comes to speak positively of "law."

It is for this reason that the paraenetic passage of Galatians belongs with the whole argument. In both chapters 3-4 and 5-6 Paul is developing the significance of baptism. Both sections go back to 2:15-21, the believer's death to the law in the death of Christ, and the elaboration of righteousness as "life" which has one unchanging quality from beginning to end. The ethical passage, which, at its heart, places the Christian under the new imperative, is the converse side of that righteousness which is life which is first taken up in 2:15-21.\(^1\) In both sections, then, Paul is dealing with the one problem, the one intruding theology. The "biting and devouring" (5:13-15) which epitomizes an ethical breakdown among the Galatians as serious as any "worldly"

\(^1\)So Mussner, Galater, p. 287, writes that the Nova Lex, the νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, is not merely the "third use of the law," but the "usus practicus evangelii," a totally new order of life.
sins, arises out of the intruders' program of nomistic perfection and spirituality (ὀμετός οτι πωευματικότης [6:1]) --the same program which results in a hierarchic exclusivism and a boasting of converts, and the cruel rejection of Paul himself.¹ The ethical section is an important commentary on the opponents' program, theology, spiritualism, self-understanding, and ecclesiology.

Paul can here speak of fulfillment of law in the Christian life (5:14), and of this life as one in which law can find no shortcoming (5:23). But only when Jesus and His "law" are taken out of the frame of law in terms of cosmic redemption, that is, law in terms of the "Tendenz" of the opponents, can "the will of God revealed in the Christian" be "identical with the demand of the law."² Only when the lordship of Christ over the aeons and the cosmos is established--only when the lordship of Christ over law is established--does the "eschatological" ethic, the fulfillment of the "whole law," become a real possibility.³ Only in the new freedom of the Spirit, the "new creation,"⁴ is there the possibility of realizing

¹See above, pp. 216-18.

²Bultmann, Theology, 1:262.

³While man still lives under the old aeon, "Scripture" (here, law) consigns "all things to sin" (3:22), and there is no true fulfillment of law. See Bultmann, Theology, 1:263.

⁴Gal 6:15, which, it has been noticed (above, p. 126), was a summary answer to the circumcision program.
the command's intention to bestowed life.¹

Paul is saying to the opponents, "Even your ethic breaks down, for the very reason that it is an eschatological ethic. You have not acknowledged the eschatological work of Christ, and for you there can be no fulfillment. The very thing you preach most against has happened, and you have fallen subject to στάσις." In this sense the paraenetic section is a rhetorical refutatio, the final argument against the intruding theology. The heresy is not a perfection of that religion into which the Galatians were conducted by their baptism, the religion of πονεώμα (3:1-5). It is a retrogression into the antithetical existence, the existence of στάσις. Paul is refuting the opponents' case in terms of their own ethos, claiming the debate has been won, demanding damages and compensation—the return of the community to the freedom of the Spirit.

¹That is, realizing that the essential nature of law, any law, is demand. See Bultmann, ibid., pp. 268, 270-71, 330. It is the same in Matthew. There is no law for the Christian but the "law of Christ." Law comes to be personally attached to the Messiah. See Davies, Sermon, pp. 94, 106-7. The radical demand of the new age takes up the particularity of the "old time" and goes beyond it. The "better righteousness" becomes finally the demand of the "imitatio Christi" (Matt 5:17-20, 21-48, 19:16-22). In the dogmatic sections of his epistles, Paul starkly contrasts works and faith. But his ethics parallel strikingly those of the Messiah in Matthew 5-7. See Davies, Paul, pp. 138-46.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rom 12-15</th>
<th>Synoptics</th>
<th>Gal 5-6</th>
<th>Did 1-5</th>
<th>Barn 18-21</th>
<th>Clem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:3 Don't think of self more highly than--ought</td>
<td>Matt 5:5 Blessed meek</td>
<td>6:3 If anyone thinks he is something when he is nothing, he deceives himself</td>
<td>3:9 Thou shalt not exalt thyself, nor let thy soul be presumptuous.</td>
<td>19:3 Thou shalt not exalt thyself, but shall be humble-minded in all things.</td>
<td>1 Cor 13:1 Let us ... be humble-minded. ... putting aside all arrogance and conceit ... 13:3 let us ... walk in obedience to His (Jesus') hallowed words, and let us be humble-minded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:6 Do not be haughty. ... never be conceited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cor 13:2 As ye are kind, so shall kindness be shown you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 Love one another with brotherly affection: outdo one another in showing honor.</td>
<td>Lk 6:27 καλῶς ποι-</td>
<td>6:2 Bear one another's brother.</td>
<td>4:8 Share everything with thy brother.</td>
<td>19:8 Thou shalt share all things with thy neighbor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:16 Live in harmony with one another.</td>
<td>Matt 11:28-30 the φορ-τίον of the Messiah.</td>
<td>6:5 Bear your φορτίον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:11 Let us do good to all, especially household of faith.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rom 12-15</th>
<th>Synoptics</th>
<th>Gal 5-6</th>
<th>Did 1-5</th>
<th>Barn 18-21</th>
<th>Clem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:7 He who teaches, in teaching.</td>
<td>Lk 6:40 The teacher and the taught.</td>
<td>6:6 Let him who is taught share with him who teaches.</td>
<td>4:1 Remember . . . him who speaks the word of God to thee, and thou shalt honor him as the Lord.</td>
<td>19:9 Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye all who speak to thee the word of the Lord.</td>
<td>1 Cor 13:2 Forgive, that you be forgiven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:18 As far as possible, live peaceably with all.</td>
<td>Matt 6:12 As we forgive our debtors. Lk 6:37 Forgive, and you will be forgiven. Matt 18:15-20 Church order.</td>
<td>6:1 Anyone overtaken in a trespass, you who are spiritual should restore him in a spirit of gentleness.</td>
<td>19:12 Thou shalt not cause quarrels, but shalt bring together and reconcile those that strive.</td>
<td>1 Cor 13:1 The words of the Lord Jesus which he spoke when he was teaching gentleness and longsuffering.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rom 12-15</th>
<th>Synoptics</th>
<th>Gal 5-6</th>
<th>Did 1-5</th>
<th>Barn 18-21</th>
<th>Clem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:10 Why do you pass judgment on your brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God.</td>
<td>Lk 6:37 Judge not, and you will not be judged; condemn not, and you will not be condemned.</td>
<td>6:1 Look to yourself, lest you too be tempted.</td>
<td>6:7ff. As a man sows, so shall he reap.</td>
<td>19:10 Thou shalt remember the day of judgment day and night.</td>
<td>1 Cor 13:2 As you judge, you will be judged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13 Let us not judge one another any more... judge this rather... no stumbling block in another's way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1--Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rom 12-15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:8 Love one another; for he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law ... love is the fulfilling of the law.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 22:34-40 and parallels love your neighbor as yourself. Matt 5:17 (ἀναπληρώσετε) 5:14 For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, Love your neighbor as yourself, (πεπλήρωσεν) (πεπλήρωσεν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2 Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ who curse you ... Love thou shalt love thy neighbor more than thy own life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2-5 Way of life ... bear malice against thy brother ... bless those who curse you ... Love thou shalt love thy neighbor more than thy own life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:4-5 Thou shalt not love your enemies and those who hate you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Did 3:9 follows as an immediate conclusion from the citation of this text.

2 This is a commentary on Matt 5:7, 6:14, 7:1, Luke 6:31, not actually a quoted "word of the Lord."

3 This topos suddenly appears in the midst of the quotation of texts in (2), though there is no such text.

4 TDNT, 1:555 connects with Gal 6:2 by way of the tradition of the ἑρωτός of the law, Acts 15 etc.


6 Compare to 1 QS 4:4, "abounding love for all who follow the truth."
Table 1—Continued


8 Dodd, ibid., p. 146, and Bruce, "Origins," p. 282, note that the main theme of Gal 6:1-5 seems to grow out of Matt 18:15-20.

9 The topos in Rom combines the thoughts of both Barn and Clem, yet only that of Clem seems to come directly from the logos in Luke.

Table 2.—A Selection of Parallels between Galatians and the Synoptic Sayings of Jesus Suggested by D. Alfred Resch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galatians</th>
<th>Synoptics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:20 τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . παραδόντος ἐαυτὸν ύπὲρ ἐμοῦ</td>
<td>Matt 20:28, Mark 10:45 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . ἐκθέν . . . δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λότρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21 οἱ τὰ τοιαύτα πράσσοντες βασιλεῖαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσωσιν</td>
<td>Matt 25:34 κληρονομήσατε τὴν . . . βασιλείαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1 ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλήψῃ ἀνδρώπου ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοι- οῦτον</td>
<td>Matt 18:15, Luke 17:3 ἐὰν δὲ ἀμαρτήσῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς σου, ὅπως ἐλεγξὲν αὐτὸν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μίνου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2 καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ</td>
<td>Matt 22:40 ἐν ταῦτας ταῖς δύσεις ἐντολαῖς δόλος ὦ νόμος κρῆμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:5 ἔκαστος γὰρ τὸ ζῆνον φορτίζειν βαστάσει</td>
<td>Matt 11:30 τὸ φορτίζων μου ἐλαφρόν ἑστίν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:7- The Judgment-saying 8</td>
<td>Matt 13:24-30 Parable of the Harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9 καὶ φῶς γὰρ λόγῳ διέρεσομεν</td>
<td>Matt 13:30 καὶ φῶς τοῦ διερισμοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1From Resch, Paulinismus, pp. 67-72.
CONCLUSIONS

The Unity of Galatians and Its Argument

This thesis began by positing the unity of Galatians and its argument firstly on the basis of methodological considerations. The defensive statements of the letter, which come mostly from the "historical" passages, cannot account for the opponents' theology. The direct charges that Paul answers in Galatians do not explain the most distinctive passages of the letter.¹ A quest for the opponents based on the mirror-image of the defensive statements is inadequate. Further, the whole letter is polemical, and yet only brief verses refer to the opponents themselves.² Then again, references to the opponents are not references to the opponents' theology. Paul does distinguish between the Galatians and the opponents, but not between the Galatians' and the opponents' theology. Rather, his handling of their theology is bound up with the structure of the letter as a whole.³ Finally, the Galatians are treated as a homogeneous community. If there are any threats, the whole

¹Above, pp. 48-51.
²Above, pp. 54-56. See 1:7, 9; 3:1; 4:17, etc.
³Above, pp. 57-60.
community is in danger of acceding to them. Along with this, the only commonly used indicator of two groups behind the letter (either Galatians and opponents separately [Jewett and Hawkins], or two "parties" of Galatians [Gunter, Bruce, etc.]), the ethical passage, raises other complex issues such as use of ethical traditions, making it unacceptable for this purpose. The letter resists subdivision based on its final section, and the same concerns appear in every part.

Thus the dialogical nature of Galatians stands out. It is a letter motivated by an intruding, offending theology, yet it addresses the theology almost exclusively by addressing the congregation that has been "bewitched" by the intruders.

The unity of the letter was further explored in terms of genre analysis. From a comparison of Galatians with other Pauline letters, a comparison of Galatians with extra-Biblical literature giving evidence of a similar purpose and structure, and an examination of certain indicators within the letter itself (especially the conclusio and prooemium), it was suggested that Galatians

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Above, pp. 57-58.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Above, pp. 58-62.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} Above, pp. 28-32.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} Above, pp. 118-19.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} Above, pp. 57-58.
  \item \textsuperscript{6} Above, pp. 71-76.
  \item \textsuperscript{7} Above, pp. 76-93.
  \item \textsuperscript{8} Above, pp. 101-7.
\end{itemize}
belongs to the literary genre of apologetic speech. This has important implications for the relationship of the parts of the letter to each other. The prooemium (1:6-10), which functions as a causa, reveals that it is the Galatians, and their acceptance of the opponents' propaganda, not merely the opponents themselves, who have called forth the letter. The Galatians are in a sense the opponents; and as this passage stands at the head of the letter, the whole letter will dispute the Galatians' acceptance of the intruders' false gospel, and its consequences.2

The propositio (2:15-21) picks up the climax of the narratio in 2:14 and elaborates the issue to be determined in terms of that which is agreed upon and that which is particularly in dispute. Then the whole debate comes to hinge on two understandings of righteousness by faith--one about which there is agreement and one about which there is disagreement. A noticeable shift in language from 2:16-18 to 2:19-20 not only puts the issue in the most relevant form but looks forward to the rest of the argument that is to follow.3

The clear break in structure and language, in 3:1-5, indicates that a new division begins here--in rhetorical terms, the probatio, the central argument

1Definitions are given, above, pp. 85-93, along with examples and a typical structure, pp. 91-93.

2Above, pp. 107-8.

against the offenders and their central argument, running from 3:1 to 4:31. Of this division, 3:1-5 stands apart as an interrogatio, the bridge from the concluding climax of the propositio into the precise way the writer wishes to conduct the probatio. Here again, the point in dispute, righteousness by faith, is put into significant terms. For the rest, certain striking themes run through the whole probatio: Abraham, the (Mosaic) law, slavery, freedom, sonship, et cetera.¹

In rhetorical terms, 5:1-6:10 would be expected to function as a refutatio, the final destruction of the adversaries' argument.² In this case it is integrally connected with what has preceded, and is still addressing the same problem—the Galatians' acceptance of the intruders' theology. Further, a refutatio would conclude the debate by appealing to norms to which even the opponents had to agree. As the passage is in the style of ethical exhortation, then, these must be the ethics of the opponents themselves.³ Paul is attacking an ethos that is owned by the opposition, with standards that belong to the opposition.

In addition to the internal indicators that Galatians belongs to the genre of "apologetic speech," the

¹Above, pp. 113-15.  ²Above, pp. 115-19.
³This is suggested by the genre-analysis and methodological considerations. Furthermore, the fact that Paul's paraenetic passages draw on the traditional ethical material makes this the more likely.
letter, when analyzed in terms of this genre, unfolds in a way that is consistent with the evident unity that has been demonstrated already. Genre-analysis indicates the sense in which Galatians is dialogical, dialogical to what extent, and dialogical with whom. It is a dialogue especially with Galatians who have accepted the theology of the intruders.

These conclusions regarding the unity of the letter were then confirmed by an examination of internal indicators of structure which at the same time sought to establish an outline of the opponents' position and the essential issues being disputed.

The opening and closing elements of the letter (1:1-5, 6:11-18) show striking modifications of Paul's epistolary practice, indicating that he has here incorporated items essential to the debate. The issue of apostle is inseparable from the issue of the gospel and throws light on the efficiency and authoritarianism of the opponents, confirming the way the Galatians are completely "under their spell."¹ The stress in the letter on the relationship between apostolicity and doctrine supports the assertions about the unity of the letter. Perhaps even more important, prescript and postscript both indicate the essential place of Christology and eschatology. Justification is to be understood as cosmic

¹Above, pp. 124-28.
deliverance, entrance into the new age, and participation in the new creation.\(^1\) Paul's debate, carried on by elaborating the meaning of justification, is carried on by elaborating Christology, and the eschatology derived from it.\(^2\) And these opening and closing elements introduce or tie off an important antithesis (which, in diatribe style, summarizes the debate), freedom and slavery. The implication is that the central term in the debate, διανοούμενη, is being expounded in terms of this antithesis. In Galatians, justification is particularly freedom from all enslaving powers.\(^3\) In these parts of the letter Paul also stresses the cross in both theology and experience. Unlike Paul's other letters, there is little mention of the resurrection. The cosmic deliverance of justification is elaborated instead in terms of crucifixion.\(^4\)

The causa (1:6-10) sets forth the central feature of the heresy—μετατρέψαται, abandonment or desertion—beginning one way and ending another. In a way that is consistent with apologetic speech, the causa is restated throughout the whole letter. In every section (1:6-10), 2:15-21, 3:1-5, 4:8-11, and 5:16-24), and in different terms (ἐνδοξεσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν, ἐπιστρέψειν, καταλέψειν and οἰκοδομεῖν, μὴ πείθειν, τὴν σάρκα σταυροῦν and ἐπιθυμ- \(^{1}\) Above, pp. 129-48. \(^{2}\) Above, p. 148. \(^{3}\) Above, p. 139. \(^{4}\) Above, pp. 145-48.
The propositio in 2:16-21, in many ways the heart of the letter, sharpens the issue of beginning and ending in theological terms. Terminology, syntax, et cetera, indicate that the opponents themselves accept a justification without works of law. The heresy is essentially a Christian one, and Paul here, in his polemical formulation of justification by faith without works of law, is not leveling a criticism at Judaism itself. Paul and the opponents part company when justification by faith becomes more than just a starting-point, to which must be added a justification by works of law. By moving from aorist to continuous tenses, and from "legal" to mystical and existential language, justification for Paul becomes the equivalent of life, a continuous identification with Christ, and faith becomes an attitude that characterizes all of life, from beginning to end. This move also places the debate in the context of the significance of baptism and the Christian's participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. Whereas Paul usually uses baptism to discuss the new life of the Christian, he uses it here to clarify the meaning of justification. The two have become equivalent. Paul's answer to the opponents

1Above, pp. 148-53.
is a sacramental answer and is therefore a Christological answer: justification corresponds to the present lordship of Christ and can therefore be in no sense added to. Because it is a Christological answer, it is also an eschatological answer. To refuse it is to say "Christ died in vain," that is, that the cross does not mark the dividing of the ages (4:4-5).¹

This significance of baptism, and the definition of justification that grows out of it, runs throughout the whole letter (2:16-21, 3:1-5, 3:27-29, 4:5-6, and 5:24), and becomes the essence of Paul's answer to the opponents. This links the theological and ethical portions of the letter together. Both justification and ethics are dealt with by expounding the significance of the new creation that the Christian enters in baptism; and both justification and ethics take on the shape of Christology and eschatology. This again confirms the above conclusions based on methodology and genre analysis.

The *interrogatio*, in 3:1-5, introduces further significant language as it opens up the central argument of the letter, again by examining the meaning of baptism. The Galatians are twice called ἀνώνυμος, often meaning an unitiate, one who stands outside the mysteries of religion. They are ἀνώνυμοι because they have been bewitched (βασανίζειν), cast under a spell by the intruders. The

¹Above, pp. 153-74.
essence of their foolishness is made apparent by the play on ἐναρξάσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν, words often denoting the beginning and completion of religious ceremonies or mysteries, possibly coming from the opponents themselves. The Spirit came to them at baptism, and the Spirit is the eschatological sign of the completion of religious initiation. Then their new attempt at completion (ἐπιτελεῖν) cannot be a progression in the religion they accepted at baptism, but must be an entirely different religion. If, then, at baptism they entered the religion of πνεῦμα, they must now be returning to a religion of σῶμα. This is why they are ἀνόητοι. They have returned to the standing of one who was never initiated into the true mysteries of religion. Not only is this elaborating the causa; it is also elaborating the way in which the opponents themselves have presented their nomistic program--as a completion (ἐπιτελεῖν) of a mystery of which baptism is only an initiation (ἐναρξάσθαι).

The antithesis of σῶμα and πνεῦμα is then taken up throughout the rest of the letter, climaxing in chapters 5 and 6, where, in their ethos, the Galatians are again charged with having fallen under the domination of the power of σῶμα, which is so serious because the new age of Spirit, and deliverance from σῶμα has already arrived (5:16-24).²

¹Above, pp. 174-81.  ²Above, pp. 180-82.
An analysis of chapters 3 and 4 reveals that the argument between 3:1 and 4:11 is being held together by the device of the "mot crochet." The whole piece is an integral argument, and both 3:1-5 and 4:8-11, functioning as restatements of the causa, lament that the Galatians' experience may have been εἴναξ. The controversial section (4:8-11) has not fallen out of the argument but is intimately bound up with the attack on the offending theology.

One of the conclusions thus arrived at is that the chapters dealing with method, genre, and structure hold together and tend to confirm each other. Galatians throughout is a dialogical response to opponents; in theological terms, the Galatians are identified with the opponents, and the whole letter is written against a single theological complex. The other conclusion is that these indications of unity and structure allow a preliminary hypothesis regarding the theology of the opponents.

The Traditions of the Opponents

If the letter holds together in this way, if these various pieces in Paul's argument are all directed at one offending theology, and if that theology is as sketched out above, then who are the opponents? The attempt to uncover possible sources for such a theology—sources in which the different elements or theologoumena

1Above, pp. 182-85. 2Above, pp. 190-92.
of the letter would be congruous—is at the one time a testing of the hypothesis already arrived at and a further filling out of that hypothesis. There appears, in fact, to be an inner consistency and coherence in the theologoumena and the way they are functioning in the letter.

The opponents' tradition of apostleship is one in which there is a programmatic demand for ἰποκαλύψεις, the content of which must be divulged, and, at the same time, there is a reverence for certain traditions associated with Jerusalem and a scorning of the Jerusalem leadership of the church. The suggestion that the source here is Gnosticism must be dismissed. It is much more likely to be apocalyptic Judaism. This apostle-tradition belongs with a particular self-understanding, which itself would encourage certain "hagiographies" of religious heroes--thus looking forward to some of the other theologoumena to be considered.

A tradition centering in Abraham is evidently important to the opponents. Not only is he a keeper of the law, but in certain circles he is a basis for an appeal to Gentiles and a basis for a reform-nomistic

---

2Above, pp. 213-30.  
3Above, pp. 217-19.  
4Above, pp. 238-41.  
5Above, pp. 247-50.  
6Above, pp. 252-58.
soteriology which applied to Jews as well as Gentiles.¹ Although this Abraham belongs especially in "apologetic" literature, the categories of literature must not be made too rigid. The "apologetic" Abraham appears also in some "apocalyptic" literature,² and certainly the "nomistic" Abraham belongs here. Further, this particular "Abraham" matches well with the tradition of apostle and the self-understanding associated with it.

Central to the opponents is a cluster of traditions associated with the law. Law to them must be a way of cosmic deliverance, the dialogical counterpart to Paul's presentation of justification as cosmic deliverance.³ They also hold to a sense of "justification without the works of the law."⁴ Their special reverence for law is tied up with their presentation of Moses as the chief mystagogue, making the Mosaic covenant the highest form of revealed religion.⁵ "Law" to both Paul and the opponents is the "whole law," but it is the "whole law" in terms of a selectivity in the demand for observance of the law that focuses on circumcision and calendrical feasts.⁶ And it is a law-tradition which, while it may not own to worship of the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου, lays

¹Above, pp. 258-59. ²Above, p. 257.
⁵Above, pp. 264-71.
⁶Above, pp. 269-76. On the "Jewishness" of this program, see pp. 281-82.
itself open to a proagandistic analogy between its own program and Pagan στοιχεῖα—religion as practiced by the Galatians before they became Christians.  

Again, it is the law-traditions in apocalyptic literature which most closely match these characteristics. This literature fills out further the probable law-tradition of the opponents, where law was conceived as that which brought one into harmony with the cosmos and gave one power over it.  

It was a knowledge of law that could come only by revelation; and both the medium and the contents of this revelation lifted one into angelic company. There was such an interest in calendrical piety, and such a close association between the Mosaic law, the secret order of the cosmos, and angelic intermediaries that this law-tradition could have been open to the charge that it was nothing other than a counterpart of the Pagan worship of the στοιχεῖα.

As Paul's answer to the intruding theology is essentially a sacramental answer, sacrament can be assumed to be playing a central role in the debate. As well as making circumcision essential to salvation, the opponents apparently understand the rite in a unique way, judging by Paul's unique attack upon it. It is associ-

---

1 Above, pp. 275-90.  
2 Above, pp. 295-319.  
3 Above, pp. 308-20.  
4 Above, pp. 295-316.  
5 Above, pp. 322-24.
ated with an understanding of Judaism as a mystery religion, has unusual appeal to Gentiles, and may be said to be imitative of angels.¹ In one of the climaxes of the letter, Paul makes baptism its dialogical counterpart. What the opponents say is to be achieved by circumcision, Paul says is already achieved by baptism.² This in itself is consistent with the causa of the letter: the religion is one of beginning and ending, novitiate and final initiation, where baptism is the beginning initiation, and nomistic sacraments, epitomized by circumcision, are the climax.³

Counterparts to this understanding of circumcision, far from being found in Gnosticism, appear in apocalyptic and mystical Judaism, and perhaps receive encouragement from "apologetic" portrayals of Judaism.⁴

The exact role played by the sacraments in the theology of the opponents becomes even more apparent when the baptismal formula of 3:28 is examined more carefully. The opponents are Christians, as well as Judaizers. The use of this form here and in other literature suggests that it may have been first introduced into Galatia by the opponents themselves, in connection, not with baptism, but with their own sacramental program.⁵ If so, the

concern behind the formula may have been a sacramental realization of the angelic state—again, a concern of apocalyptic literature,¹ and one that matches well with the peculiar traits of their presentation of circumcision, as well as the theologoumena examined previously.

The ethical passage of the letter, chapters 5 and 6, figures prominently in the debate regarding the unity of the letter, and therefore is particularly relevant for understanding the program of the opponents. Here there was first an examination of the form and content of the double catalog and of Paul's modification of these two.² It was concluded, firstly, that the ethical passage continues Paul's argument of 2:15-21, is based on baptism, is in terms of σῶμα and πνεῦμα, as in 3:1-5, and has the same thrust as the repetitions of the causa: the Galatians have again placed themselves under the power of σῶμα, the power whose hold was broken in baptism. Paul indeed is probably here conducting the debate in the opponents' own ethical terms and is showing that, in their own reckoning, their program has failed.³ Secondly, the closest parallels to the form and content of the double catalog are again in apocalyptic literature, this time in Qumran writings.⁴

An examination of the topoi associated with the

double catalog revealed that they are inseparable from the former and are again probably the topoi of the opponents. The possibility that sayings of Jesus are involved here is consistent with the treatment of 2:16-21, which stressed that the heresy is a Christian heresy, that it has an important place for Jesus in its scheme (who, in the light of their law-traditions, is probably made a dispenser of nomistic sayings about law and cosmic order), and has a concept of faith. The topoi therefore accord with the dialogical function to be expected of this passage—a refutation of the opponents on their own grounds.  

In conclusion, the examination of the theologoumena reveals that it is indeed possible that one intruding theology has called forth the whole book. Further, there is consistently one probable source for this theology—apocalyptic and sectarian Judaism, especially circles associated with Qumran. At the same time, there may have been a drawing on the propaganda methods of "apologetic" Judaism, although so often the traditions

---

1 Above, pp. 379-83.

2 This is not to say that the opponents were once Qumran sectaries. There was variety in the traditions and doctrines of the Covenanters (see above, pp. 316-17), and a sharing of traditions by the Covenanters and other circles. Perhaps the most significant parallels are those between the opponents and Jubilees (above, pp. 253, 257, 281, 303-7, 337, etc.). The Covenanters were one group in particular who maintained the traditions of Jubilees (above, pp. 304-9), but may not have been the only one.
are common property. Along with these, there is the other important source of early Christian tradition.

It is when Galatians is understood dialogically, as a response to a single opponent, that it becomes possible to draw together the various theologoumena, called for by the particular passages of the letter, and find their inner consistency.

The Theology of the Opponents

From an examination of the above theologoumena, certain probable characteristics of the opponents' theology stand out.

As has been shown above, Christology is evidently central to the letter. Paul refers to it at several important places (i.e., 1:4, 4:4-5, etc.), and the opponents, too, probably have a central place for Jesus.¹ Their gospel is another gospel, with another Jesus. Because of their traditions of law, et cetera, He is probably a Jesus who is powerful to enable the law to be kept, a Jesus who glorifies the old covenant-dispensation.²

¹On the place of Jesus for the opponents, see above, pp. 424-29.

²He is probably a Messiah in the style of the one in Test Lev 18, who causes sin to cease, and makes Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob exult; and the one in Ps Sol 17-18, who expels unrighteousness, establishes righteousness, gathers together a holy people, etc.; or perhaps he is a teacher of the covenant, like the Teacher of Righteousness in the Damascus Document. See above, pp. 135-36.
There is a subtlety in the Jesus of the opponents. On the one hand, they probably preach a glorious Jesus who accords with their tradition of apostle and their self-understanding, a Jesus who becomes another hagiography to stand alongside those of Abraham and Moses, a Jesus who is a powerful representative of God. This is revealed in the way he must be to them a cross-less Jesus, as Paul must stress the cross, in theology and experience. The Jesus of the Galatians may have been very similar to the Jesus of the opponents in 2 Corinthians, "A power-laden glorious miracle-worker, much as in the signs source (of John), whose earthly ministry could well be epitomized by comparing his glory with that of Moses, as in 2 Corinthians 3."

Yet at the same time this glorious Jesus is not

---

1 See the place of the cross in Paul's polemic with the intruding theology, above, pp. 145-47.

2 There is a closeness of the "heresies" in Galatia and in 2 Corinthians. Both make the same demands of an apostle, and look for the same proofs of apostleship ("Apostle," pp. 203-9); both are opponents of the cross (see note above, and 2 Cor 13:4); both preach another Jesus (Gal 1:8; 2 Cor 11:4); both are "nomistic enthusiasts." See above, pp. 381-82.

3 Robinson, "Kerygma," p. 142. He goes on to quote Georgi, Gegner, p. 289, referring to the situation in Corinth: "It is not true that Paul developed his Christology in complete ignorance of the contents and tendencies of the developing tradition about Jesus. Rather he knew about them and hence clearly rejected a motivation that at least at times clearly asserts itself, namely the objective of using a certain form of presentation to make the life of Jesus an unambiguous manifestation of the divine, to cover over the offense of the cross and the humanness of Jesus in general. . . . "
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the eschatological revelation of God. The opponents' doctrine of justification no doubt conforms to their Christology: it is a justification which must be added to, because Jesus to them has not brought in the new age, and the law-covenant remains the most glorious revelation of God. Jesus is probably made one of a series of mighty representatives of God—and in this way, is not able to surpass the significance of Abraham and Moses.

So Paul must proclaim both the humanness, weakness, and cursedness of Jesus (3:13, 4:4-5) and the eschatological finality of Jesus, who has brought the new age, the new creation (1:4, 6:12-14). Paul's Jesus is at the same time less and more than the Jesus of the opponents.

For both Paul and the opponents, eschatology conforms to the "shape" of Christology.¹ Their eschatology is not that of the "Hellenist enthusiasts,"² as is plain from Paul's use of the unification-saying in 3:28.³ It is Paul who stresses realized eschatology, especially in his use of the baptism-tradition: the age of the Spirit is now (3:1-5), the climax of religion is already

¹Reversing Schweitzer, Paul, pp. 98-104, where Christology and soteriology in Paul conform to eschatology. See above, pp. 145-47, in Christology and eschatology in Galatians, with references to Käsemann, Ridderbos, and Koester.

²As claimed by Jewett. See above, pp. 182-84.

³See above, pp. 381-83.
attained (3:28), and the possibility of life under the power of άμηρεῖον has been removed for the Christian (5:24). Even Paul's answer regarding the law is an eschatological one. From the perspective of the cross, it can be seen that the age of law is the age of curse, an age that has now been brought to an end.¹ There is even modification of Paul's typical "eschatological reservation" in Galatians. The form of eschatology so conforms to Christology that the new age has come while the old age remains, and the new age is only present in Christ. Outside Christ, the only possibility is to live in the old age. However, Paul adds little "reservation" to the nature of existence in Christ (5:16-25). In this respect, his eschatology is similar to that in 2 Corinthians.²

All the indications are, then, that the opponents preached something much less than a realized eschatology. Their message was probably centered in the coming kingdom of God, and even their enthusiastic sense of fellowship with angels only contributed to their nomistic reform program.³

Ecclesiology, too, for both Paul and the

¹Sanders, Paul, pp. 483-85.
²See above, pp. 382-84 (quoting Robinson on the stress on "realized" eschatology in 2 Corinthians, and pointing to the parallel eschatology in Galatians).
³See above, pp. 231-36, on the sense of being already members of Jerusalem above, while the tension between the present evil age and the coming age is still retained.
opponents, grows directly out of Christology. The Christology of the opponents would seem to have two consequences in particular here. Firstly, their glorious Jesus fixes attention on the individual in a competitive sense, which results in a hierarchical, schismatic ecclesiology which glories the intruding apostles.\footnote{See above, pp. 217-19, on the self-understanding of the intruding apostles, and the resultant effects on the Galatian community; and 5:12-15 on biting and devouring, examined above, p.} It is coupled with a remnant concept, so that as law-keeping more and more brings fellowship with angels and the higher powers of the universe, it separates the law-keeper more and more from those around him. The glorious Jesus is fragmenting the community. Secondly, the less than eschatological Jesus of the opponents, who has not yet divided the ages, means that this angelic remnant must be a law-keeping remnant, adding justification by works to their justification by faith, thereby becoming a bridge between the covenant-traditions of the Jerusalem of the past and the Jerusalem of the future.\footnote{See above, pp. 234-42, especially pp. 236-37, on the opponents' juxtaposition of the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem, and how Paul breaks this juxtaposition.} The glorious Jesus makes the opponents part of the heavenly Jerusalem. The less than eschatological Jesus makes them keepers of all the traditions of the earthly Jerusalem.

It is for this reason that the heresy has been
referred to above as a "nomistic enthusiasm."\(^1\) It is enthusiastic as it grows out of traditions of the glorious apostle and the glorious Jesus; but it is nomistic, because Jesus has not yet divided the ages. Long ago, Lightfoot proposed that Paul was everywhere confronting a movement that was distinct from the Jerusalem apostles, a Judaising movement which took two forms—a Gnosticising form (evident in 1 Corinthians) and a Pharisaic form (appearing in Galatians). However, these two forms of the one movement only became distinct in the second century (becoming libertine Gnosticism and ascetic Jewish Christianity).\(^2\) This general proposition now requires some modification (for instance, it has been suggested above that the Galatian opponents are not Pharisaic;\(^3\) and Gnosticism was more usually ascetic than libertine\(^4\)); but it also may contain a great deal of truth. Others since have found a "Gnosticising" movement in

\(^1\)See above, pp. 382-84.

\(^2\)Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 284-370.

\(^3\)See above, pp. 22, 34, 37-40 (citing Gunther, Stählin, Koester, and Georgi).

\(^4\)Jonas, Gnostic Religion, pp. 276-77, notes that "except for a brief period of revolutionary extremism, the practical consequences from Gnostic views were more often in the direction of asceticism than of libertinism." Marcion's antinomianism led to a metaphysical asceticism, ibid., p. 44; and Mani's Gnosticism was also ascetic, ibid., pp. 231-32. In both instances, asceticism results from a rejection of Jewish law. Gnostics are immoral libertines mostly in the reports of the Fathers: Foerster, Gnosis, 1:231-36.
1 Corinthians, and different, nomistic opponents in 2 Corinthians.¹ And yet, in many ways, the characteristics of these two movements are not as distinct as they later became in the second century. So it is possible to speak of a "Gnostic coloring" to the opposition in Galatia, while not ignoring its nomism.² In fact, the law-tradition itself could be called "Gnostic" in a sense—though not in the second-century sense.³ It is perhaps this "Gnostic coloring" which gives the opponents their enthusiastic bent. Here is a time, then, when enthusiasm is not at all separated from nomism, but is its natural companion.⁴ It is in this sense, too, that the heresy in Galatia apparently stands in proximity to that in Colossae.⁵

Given the dialogical nature of Galatians, it is

¹See above, pp. 382-84 (citing Robinson on 1 and 2 Corinthians).

²See above, p. 36 (citing Stählin).


⁴This is where Schmithals is quite wrong, and his theory anachronistic.

⁵See above, pp. 283-85, 328-32, and Koester, Trajectories, p. 146.
significant that Paul's answer to the Galatians is basically a sacramental answer. His eschatology, as well as being shaped by Christology, is also shaped by sacrament: the new age is come, but the old age still exists; and only those are in the new age who are in Christ, by faith and baptism. This is not a sacramentalism. Baptism does not bring one into the new age inevitably. Rather, the sacrament becomes the basis for the imperative;¹ and in Galatians, the call is to not allow the sacrament to have been εἰκόνα. It would seem that Paul is able to present such a forceful argument for the eschatological nature of Christian existence because he can take up the opponents' own assumptions about the efficacy of sacrament. These assumptions are revealed in a particular understanding of circumcision, which apparently completes that which was begun by baptism.² Their sacramental goal appears to be consistent with their traditions of apostle, ecclesiology, et cetera. They are seeking the attainment of the angelic state.³ In keeping with contemporary understandings of the realization of change in societal roles, the opponents perhaps believe that they experience proleptically, in their sacrament, something of the angelic

¹See above, p. 171 (quoting Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience, pp. 79-81, on the finality of baptism, and its function as the basis for imperative). Also above, p. 166) quoting von Soden, "Sakrament und Ethik," on 1 Corinthians 10).

²See above, pp. 322-33. ³See above, pp. 380-82.
condition. In all of this, they are adding "justification by works" to their "justification by faith:" their sacrament, too, takes on the shape of their Christology and eschatology.

Far from there being, in the Galatian context, no relationship between the doctrine of justification by faith and ethics, the ethical argument of 5:1-6:10 carries on the argument of justification by faith. Both are ways of looking at the finality of Christ's work, and the new age into which the Christian has been brought. For this reason, there is one argument in both the antinomistic and ethical portions of the letter, which is based on baptism, and goes back to 2:16-21. In the ethical portion, then, Paul is not disputing anti-nomians but nomists, ethical supermen whose system is perhaps illustrated by 1 QS 4. Ethics are seen as the believer's

---

1 See above, pp. 340-72, on the significance of the function of 3:28 in the argument.

2 See above, pp. 271-73, on the law- "Tendenz" of the opponents, and on the few parallels to the phrase ἐργαρν τοῦ νόμου, which suggests a cultic meaning to the term.

3 See above, pp. 323-25, on 5:2-4, where circumcision epitomizes justification by works of law and stands over against justification by faith.

4 As propounded by Schweitzer in Paul, p. 225. There is no logical way from righteousness by faith to ethics. Ethics arise naturally from dying and rising with Christ. See Furnish, Theology, pp. 146-47, 258-59.

5 See the arguments of method, genre, and structure, referred to above, as well as the analysis of the form and content of the double catalog, and the nature of the associated topoi.
part in the struggle between two dualistic powers—a struggle which still looks forward to its final eschatological outcome.

Paul responds to this program, in effect, by saying that this approach to ethics has led to a breakdown of ethics. He puts all ethical maxims on one level,¹ and shows, on the opponents' own grounds, that they are living on the basis of the old age, not the new age. In fact, one cannot fulfill the ethics of the new age unless one enters the new age.

The ethical topoi illustrate the place given to Jesus by the opponents regarding ethics. He was perhaps a dispenser of wise law-sayings, a lawgiver after the style of Moses, who, through revelation, could communicate the secrets of the cosmos. He was probably given a place in a frame of covenant-theology, so that he became only a reauthentication of Moses. But he had not brought the believer into the new age. The opponents may even have used the expression νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ,² in view of some of the expectations of the Messiah and his law in apocalyptic circles.³ But because of the frame in which

¹On the transvaluation of ethics in the vice-catalog, see above, pp. 404-6. All sins take on the same seriousness.

²For those who suggest this, see above, pp. 424-26.

³See above, pp. 380-83, referring to studies of Jewish expectations of the Messiah and his treatment of
Jesus was placed, this law of Christ could only be a reauthentication of the law of Moses.¹

Paul must reject the frame in which Jesus has been placed, while retaining Jesus as an ethical authority. This perhaps explains the unique expression, "law of Christ," and its dialogical function. There is, in chapters 5 and 6, a real return to law-language,² which is a part of Paul's total, dialogical response to the opponents. Jesus is an ethical authority only when it is clear, from 2:16-4:31, that He is the bringer of the new age. This means that ethics have a firm base only when justification is by faith, apart from works of law --that is, when justification corresponds to the lordship of Christ.³

Paul's Response: Justification by Faith

In Galatians, justification by faith is a polemical doctrine,⁴ and epitomizes Paul's whole answer to the opponents. Every section of the letter grows out of law, in Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, and Longenecker, Paul.

¹See above, pp. 425-26, suggesting that there is perhaps a similar debate behind Matthew, where Jesus is presented as a second Moses, and yet a greater than Moses.

²See above, p. 389.

³See above, pp. 429-32, on the relationship between ethics and justification by faith.

⁴See above, p. 154.
2:16-21, where justification is being radically defined as life.\textsuperscript{1} Because of the central place of Christology, justification conforms to the lordship of Christ; and because eschatology grows out of Christology, justification is the equivalent of eschatological deliverance. Justification is not only a point at the beginning of life, but takes in the whole of life: it is the life of the new age.\textsuperscript{2} In Galatians, anthropology hardly enters the discussion;\textsuperscript{3} rather, justification is spelt out in terms of Christology, eschatology, and sacrament. It is spelt out in terms of sacrament, because it is by the sacrament that the believer is established "in Christ."	extsuperscript{4} It is absolute and cannot be added to, because Christ is

\textsuperscript{1}Baptism, usually used to clarify the nature of the new life, is here used to clarify justification. See above, p. 150. The transition from 2:16-21 to 3:1-5 to 3:6 is a transition from justification to life in the Spirit to justification, showing that justification here is life in the Spirit. See also above, pp. 150-53. In Romans we are justified apart from works of law: in Galatians we receive the Spirit apart from works of law.

\textsuperscript{2}See above, pp. 169-74, and authorities cited, especially Sanders, \textit{Paul}, pp. 482-84.

\textsuperscript{3}Sanders \textit{ibid.}, pp. 481-82: "It is not Paul's analysis of the nature of sin which determines his view, but his analysis of the way to salvation; not his anthropology, but his Christology and soteriology . . . (noting the particular polemical use of Habakkuk 2 in Galatians 3) since salvation is only in Christ, therefore all other ways to salvation are wrong." See also above, p. 145, (citing Käsemann and Ridderbos); and Käsemann, \textit{Römer}, p. 129: "so ist die Kreuzestheologie nach unserm Text (Rom 5:8) zugleich der Schlüssel zur paulinischen Gotteslehre, Soteriologie, Anthropologie, und Eschatologie. . . . "

\textsuperscript{4}See above, pp. 166-67.
absolute and has finally brought in the new age. The doctrine stands over against a justification by faith plus works, where law is understood as the secret of cosmic order, the means of rising above mortality, the knowledge of salvation— that which will bring in the new age.

Because justification by faith is sacramentally defined and is the equivalent of the new life, ethics are the other side of justification. Perhaps the heart of the ethical passage is 5:24, where Paul modifies a known form in an unexpected way—in terms of baptism, and the arrival in the present of the new age. This is only the continuation of the debate begun in 2:16-21.

In terms of the present discussion, then, it could be said that, in Galatians, justification is a gift, because it is by faith, which is not a work but the end of works, and trust in the work of God.

1See above, pp. 166-67.

2See Mussner, p. 287. Gospel and paraenesis are only different sides of the gospel, because paraenesis belongs to the gospel. The New Testament "nova lex" is "usus practicus evangelii." For a Protestant viewpoint, see Käsemann, Römer. The justified one is also the new creature (p. 128); righteousness by faith is the actuality of eschatological freedom, life in the Spirit (p. 123); and so Paul's ethic is eschatological, just as justification must be (p. 125).

3See above, pp. 147, 355-57.

4The expression ἀγονις προτετως in 3:2, 5 stands over against "works of law" and is probably best translated "believing what was heard." See Sanders, Paul, p. 482.
tion is all a part with the new life, the life of the Spirit, brought about by God's decisive act in Christ.\(^1\) Justification here comes to mean all that the opponents mean by justification by faith plus justification by works of law. It would appear that it is Paul himself who is fusing the forensic and ethical/relational senses of δικαιοσύνη.\(^2\)

So Paul develops "justification" or "righteousness" in a particular way in this polemical situation. But how "Pauline" is this particular exposition? This must be settled by a much wider examination of Paul's uses of the word-group. And yet, for all its contextu-

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 487: "The judicial and participatory statements (in Romans) are not in fact kept in watertight compartments, as we have seen also to be the case in such passages as Phil 3:8-11 and Gal 3.24-29." Sanders disputes Ziesler's distinction between forensic (verbal) and participatory (nominal and adjectival) senses of δικαιοσύνη. But Ziesler himself realizes flexibility in uses of the word-group. In Galatians itself, he notices that the forensic sense is foremost in 2:16 (three occurrences of the verbal form); but with 2:17, Paul begins to fuse the forensic and participatory senses (one verbal form). By 2:21 (a nominal form), after the new language of 2:19-20, δικαιοσύνη has become a new form of existence, the new life of faith, although the forensic sense is still retained: Righteousness, pp. 172-73. In 176-77, he tries to make the verb-forms in 3:6-14 forensic, but admits that they cannot be separated from 2:16-21 or the references to the Spirit and baptism in 3:1-5. See the discussion above, pp.

\(^2\)Following Sanders, Paul, pp. 482-84, and Käsemann, references below Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 180, goes on to say that "the letter's main concern is forensic." He has not seen the full significance of 2:16-21 (and the way it stands at the head of the discussion), or the function of 3:1-5 in the debate. He has relied too heavily on the verbal forms in 3:6-14.
ality, the development in Galatians may be not "un-Pauline." The expression "Righteousness of God" in Romans 1-3, inseparable from the gift or declaration of "righteousness" or "justification" in these chapters, seems to refer to the power and action of God, as well as His rightness and His fidelity to what He has promised.\(^1\) Paul's argument in Romans may divide not at the end of chapter 5 but the end of chapter 4,\(^2\) in which case Paul in Romans 5-8 is continuing to present the subject of "justification" with which he began in 3:21-26,\(^3\) and "righteousness by faith" again becomes a Christological/eschatological doctrine, "freedom from sin and death" that is found in conjunction with life in the Spirit.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Sanders, Paul, p. 491; also Käsemann, "The Righteousness of God in Paul," in New Testament Questions of Today, pp. 168-82, and "Justification and Salvation History," Perspectives on Paul, pp. 60-78. Käsemann objects ("ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ," JBL 83 (1964):12-16). Though he admits that the phrase is a subjective genitive in Rom 3:25, he claims that Paul reinterprets it in 3:26 so that it becomes a genitive of origin. However, this would not seem to be the contrast Paul is making, either in 3:24-26 or in the whole context of 1:18-3:26. The contrast rather seems to be between "then" and "now" (3:21, 26), and between the two revelations of law (1:18-3:20) and Christ (3:21-26), stressing that God's righteousness "now" is seen in the justification of the sinner (3:26). See Klein's mediating conclusion, and further bibliography in IDBS, 750-52.


\(^3\) Käsemann, ibid., p. 123. The former subdivision makes justification merely the beginning-point for the moral life of the redeemed.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 123.
The doctrine in Galatians stands very close to the doctrine as it is presented in Romans 5-8. This may in fact be the "real Paul."¹

¹Sanders, Paul, pp. 486-87.
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