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Abstract

Vastly different opinions exist within New Testament scholarship regarding the relationship between Paul’s ethical exhortations in Gal 5-6 and the theological portions of the letter. In an attempt to argue for the cohesiveness of Paul’s argument in the letter as a whole, numerous commentaries outline the letter according to the principles that are described in the ancient handbooks on Greco-Roman rhetoric. Although outlining Galatians according to the typical parts of an ancient speech does provide a way of viewing the correspondence as a coherent argument, studying Galatians from the standpoint of Paul’s adherence to the conventions of the technical rhetorical handbooks has produced problems of its own. First, there is no consensus as to whether or not Paul actually had obtained the highest level of rhetorical education in which the handbooks were studied. While some commentaries on Galatians (e.g., those written by Hans Dieter Betz and Ben Witherington III) propose that the apostle exhibits a rhetorical strategy in the letter that follows the conventions described in the rhetorical handbooks, other studies (e.g., the one by R. Dean Anderson Jr.) that compare Paul’s letters with ancient rhetorical theory have concluded that Paul most likely had no knowledge of the principles of the rhetorical handbooks of his day. Another problem with minutely analyzing Galatians in terms of the conventions described in the ancient rhetoric handbooks is that Galatians is a letter, not a speech. Although ancient letters did usually follow the conventions of ancient epistolary theory, de Boer has most recently pointed out that efforts to classify Galatians as a particular type of rhetoric are misguided since ancient letters were freer compositions
than ancient speeches. J. Louis Martyn has proposed that Galatians should be understood as an apocalyptic sermon and, therefore, since Paul was a divine messenger in preaching the gospel, the letter does not actually follow the conventions of a particular classification of ancient rhetoric. However, even scholars who propose that Paul had no technical knowledge of the rhetorical handbooks admit that certain rhetorical principles of speech and letter writing were ubiquitous in the Greco-Roman world.

This dissertation argues that one of the rhetorical principles that was prevalent in the first-century Greco-Roman world was the device of rhetorical parody. Although the word “parody” is usually associated today with the connotation of burlesque or absurdity, a type of humorous parody that did exist in the ancient world, ancient rhetorical parody should be understood as either an altered quotation of a recognizable text or saying or a newly created saying that closely resembles a recognizable one. Also, ancient rhetorical parody should be understood as a stylistic rhetorical device that was designed to add vividness and polemical intensity to an argument by way of incongruity. In an effort to persuade an audience, a recognizable text or saying was transformed and given a new meaning, one that might be quite incongruous with its original meaning. While this type of rhetorical device was discussed by ancient rhetoricians, its use was common in the everyday conversations of a literate person in the first century. Therefore the ability to use the device of rhetorical parody did not require a rhetorical education in which one studied the handbooks. Rather, it was a process by which a person altered an existing saying or text, possibly one that had been used by one’s opponent in an argument, in
order to gain an advantage over the opponent. Ancient rhetorical parody differs from irony in that irony presents a meaning different from the normal meaning of the words spoken. Irony, therefore, does not require an underlying saying or text.

After determining a definition of ancient rhetorical parody, this study investigates whether or not an understanding of Paul’s use of rhetorical parody in Galatians might clarify some of Paul’s puzzling statements. The investigation is limited to the statements that Paul made in Galatians and does not attempt to understand the letter via Paul’s other letters. This study seeks to determine if Paul’s scriptural quotations and allusions might be a parodic reinterpretation of Scriptures that demanded Torah-obedience in order to dissociate obeying the Mosaic law from faithfulness to God. The study is not limited to the Scriptures that were later canonized by the Church, but it is limited to the Greek text of writings since rhetorical parody is a play on the words of the hypotext.

A comparison of Galatians with Scriptures that demanded obedience to the Mosaic law or praised individuals who championed the law reveals that Paul parodically reinterpreted scriptural passages in order to dissociate the rejection of the Mosaic law from the curse of the law. The curse of the law is shown to refer not only to slavery, but also to spiritual death. This study also reveals that the law-free Galatians were being excluded from the faith community on the basis that they were unrepentant sinners. Additionally, Gal 3-4 is best understood as Paul’s argument against the confluence of the covenant with Abraham and the Mosaic law.
This dissertation concludes that understanding Paul’s use of rhetorical parody not only clarifies several puzzling statements in the letter, but also demonstrates that Paul’s exhortations in Gal 5-6 address the Galatian situation just as much as the theological sections do.
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1. Introduction and a Definition of Rhetorical Parody

In 1979, Hans Dieter Betz proposed that Galatians should be understood as an apologetic letter, a form of judicial rhetoric. Although George A. Kennedy soon demonstrated that the letter was an example of deliberative rhetoric, Betz’s seminal commentary brought about a monumental interest in applying the principles of rhetoric to the study of the letter. Several commentators, therefore, have focused their efforts on outlining and interpreting the letter in line with the basic principles and structure of ancient persuasive speeches. However, in an effort to better understand the nature of the letter, others, while not denying that portions of Galatians do adhere to the conventions and characteristics of different types of rhetoric, prefer to interpret the letter differently and with different emphases. For example, J. Louis Martyn argues that Galatians is best understood as “an argumentative sermon preached in the context of a service of worship,” although he notes that Gal 1:17-24 and 2:17:21 exhibit the characteristics of a judicial speech while 5:13-6:10 could be classified as deliberative. James D.G. Dunn prefers to stress the “theological logic and passion” that drives the letter while Richard B. Hays, acknowledging the vast importance of Martyn’s approach, highlights Paul’s use of

---

4 Galatians (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 21-23.
5 The Epistle to the Galatians (BN TC 9; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993), 20.
Scripture in refuting the teachings of the Missionaries as the apostle’s “attempt to reclaim the biblical story (i.e., the OT) as a witness to the gospel.”⁶ Most recently, Martinus C. de Boer⁷ claims: “The efforts to classify and to outline Galatians as if it were a speech (whether forensic or deliberative, or a combination of the two) with an epistolary wrapper are probably misguided.” De Boer correctly insists: “A letter is a flexible medium of communication.”⁸ However, even though ancient letters probably cannot be understood to conform perfectly to the structures outlined in ancient rhetorical handbooks, de Boer acknowledges: “Paul undoubtedly used certain rhetorical devices or stratagems.”⁹

While recognizing the immense value of these studies, our thesis is that many of the interpretative difficulties inherent in Paul’s theological arguments and the perplexing statements in the letter are solved if the overriding structure of Galatians is understood as Paul’s “parodic reinterpretation” of numerous key phrases of Scripture, particularly Scriptures that repeatedly affirm the necessity of obedience to the Mosaic law as the proper covenant response to God’s grace and also repeatedly affirm the necessity of a proselyte’s adoption of the law. In order to demonstrate the validity of this approach, we must first define what is meant by “parodic reinterpretation.” Therefore, the present chapter of this study will be concerned with presenting a definition of “rhetorical parody”

---

⁶ The Letter to the Galatians in 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon (NIB 11; Nashville: Abingdon, 2000), 190.
⁸ Ibid., 70. De Boer does not mean that Paul was unfamiliar with or did not employ the standard conventions of first-century letter writing (here, 66).
⁹ Ibid.
as it existed in the ancient world. We will see that “rhetorical parody” should not be
associated with the type of “parody” exhibited in Greek Comedies that connoted ridicule
and buffoonery. Rather, “rhetorical parody” could be used by a literate person in the first
century C.E. with a variety of functions: satirical, playful, serious, ironic, polemical
and/or humorous. With a proper understanding of these various functions, we will be able
to delineate the ways in which Paul, a literate person in the first century C.E., employed
the rhetorical device in order to argue against the Missionaries’ “other gospel,” which
demanded that the Galatians become Torah-observant.

One initial example of Paul’s use of rhetorical parody, which will be discussed
more fully in Chapter Three, is the apostle’s parodic reinterpretation of Prov 10:16 in Gal
5:19-23. The proverb and the Galatian verses are the only passages of Scripture that
discuss “works” and “fruit(s)” as the by-products of two opposing types of individuals.
Proverbs 10:16 states: “The works (εργα) of the righteous bring about life, but the fruits
(καρποί) of the ungodly [bring about] sins.” Paul, however, reverses the positive
connotation of works (εργα) and the negative connotation of fruits/fruit when he
describes the positive “fruit (καρπος) of the Spirit” in contrast to the ungodly “works
(εργα) of the flesh.” As we will see in the following discussion, the alteration of words
(or a word) in a well-known saying or text was a type of “rhetorical parody” used by
literate people in the first century C.E. in order to make a witty statement and gain a
rhetorical advantage over an opponent in a dispute.
Since New Testament scholarship has not normally viewed Paul’s argumentation in Galatians as including examples of rhetorical parody, a logical starting point in this investigation is to explore the writings of ancient rhetors who produced handbooks on rhetoric. It is vital at this point to state that we are not contending that Paul had obtained the highest level of Greco-Roman education in which the student studied under a rhetor. We do not have adequate evidence to assert either that Paul knew enough about handbook rhetoric to use technical, rhetorical features in his letters or that he had no

---

10 Although Charles H. Cosgrove (The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians [Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988], 31-35) does refer to Gal 1:6-10 as a “Thanksgiving Parody,” we are using “parody” as a technical term to describe a rhetorical figure used in argumentation. This does not appear to be the manner in which Cosgrove uses the term. Cosgrove’s references to “parody” will be discussed more fully in the overview of scholarship’s interpretation of Galatians in the following chapters.

11 Authoritative works on Greco-Roman education that we consulted include: H. I. Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956); Stanley E. Bonner, Education in Ancient Rome (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); William V. Harris, Ancient Literacy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); and Theresa Morgan, Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). These works divide “education in the Greco-Roman world” into three distinct stages that were taught in sequence as a child progressed through the various subjects that were deemed the necessary elements of education. Marrou (142) refers to the three levels or stages as primary, secondary, and higher. It was only at the level of higher education that a student studied “handbook rhetoric” and philosophy, etc. Quintilian (first-century C. E. Roman authority on rhetoric) presents the same three divisions (Inst. 1.1-2.10). Although the division of Greco-Roman education into three stages did not preclude some degree of overlap between the grammatical and literary studies of the secondary level and the earliest stages of rhetorical education at the higher educational level, the in-depth study of “handbook rhetoric” was begun under the tutelage of a ῥητὼρ. Quintilian (Inst. 1.9.1-6; 2.1.1-13) notes the overlap of the earliest stages of rhetorical studies and grammatical studies in the secondary stage by discussing the possibility that a grammaticus could introduce students to progymnasmata. Apparently, however, the fact that a student completed the primary level of education did not necessarily indicate that the student would continue on to the secondary level. Quintilian (Inst. 1.1.8) mentions the possibility that a person could learn letters, or know how to read and write, but not be thoroughly educated, which required the completion of the highest level of education. Likewise, Marrou (161) mentions the possibility that a child might stop the educational process after learning to “read and write fluently” in the primary stage by stating, “any child who wanted to go on beyond the primary-school stage went to the secondary school.” Further, Bonner presents evidence (188, n.121) in order to claim that many “Roman citizens” completed the primary stage of education, which included reading and writing, but never received any further education at all. Bonner (188) viewed the primary stage of education as “paving the way for those who now proceeded to the more scholarly instruction of the ‘grammar’ school,” but attending the first stage in no way obligated the student to progress to the second stage.
knowledge of the handbooks. However, a review of the ancient rhetorical handbooks will
demonstrate that rhetorical parody was a stylistic device that a literate person could have
used in everyday conversation. Since Paul indicates in his letter (e.g., Gal 6:11) that he
was a literate person, it is safe to assume that he could have employed a stylistic device,
such as rhetorical parody, that was common among literate people in the first century
C.E. without having progressed to the highest of three levels of Greco-Roman education
in which a student studied “handbook rhetoric.”

After reviewing the primary sources, we will explore how classical scholars have
defined ancient parody and how they have interpreted some ancient discussions of
rhetorical parody that are contemporary with Paul. Third, we will examine the numerous
handbooks, encyclopedias, and lexicons that have been produced in the study of ancient
rhetoric and literature. Fourth, we will examine definitions of ancient parody as they are
presented in classical lexicons that are not limited to the field of rhetoric and compare
these definitions of ancient parody with the rhetorical definitions of the term. Then, after
establishing the most probable way(s) in which ancient orators and writers defined and
employed parody in argumentation, we will propose a working definition of rhetorical
parody. Also within the concluding section of this chapter, we will demonstrate that
rhetorical parody, so defined, is a more precise term than “irony” for describing much of
Paul’s rhetorical argumentation in Galatians.

In Chapter 2, we will discuss select patristic writers whose critiques of Paul’s
rhetoric in Galatians are helpful in determining how educated individuals who were
familiar with the stylistic devices of ancient rhetoric approached Paul’s letter. Additionally, we will briefly review recent works that discuss Paul’s letters in terms of the conventions of Greco-Roman rhetoric and are relevant for our study of rhetorical parody in Galatians.

In Chapter 3, we will present a detailed exegesis of the theological portion of Galatians (1:6-5:1) by identifying the more perplexing statements in the argument and demonstrating the ways in which recognizing Paul’s use of rhetorical parody helps us understand the nature of the conflict within the Galatians churches and Paul’s persuasive attempts to preserve the truth of his gospel. Methodologically, we will interpret Paul’s statements in Galatians on the basis of his argument within the letter itself without appealing to the rest of the Pauline corpus, whether undisputed or disputed, to interpret Paul’s theological meaning. Although a comparison of Paul’s statements in Galatians with his statements in other letters is quite valuable in studies that seek to determine whether or not Paul’s theology was consistent or inconsistent or whether or not Paul’s theology developed over a period of time, we do not consider this approach helpful in determining the manner in which Paul’s argumentation flows within Galatians.\(^\text{12}\)

However, we will discuss Paul’s argumentation in relation to the contexts of the Scriptures that we consider to be the source of his parody. Additionally, on occasion, we will compare Paul’s use of particular words and syntax in his undisputed letters; however, 

\(^{12}\) We began this study prior to the publication, in 2011, of de Boer’s commentary. His approach is also an attempt to understand Paul argument “as it unfolds in the letter” without interpreting Paul’s statements via other letters (Galatians, 2); however, he does not interpret Gal via ancient rhetorical parody.
these efforts will be solely for the purpose of determining the ways in which Paul employed particular terms and phrases, not to determine his theological meaning in Galatians via other correspondence.

In the concluding chapter, we will briefly state the ways in which recognizing that Paul employs the device of rhetorical parody not only enhances our understanding of the situation that the Galatian believers were facing in light of the Missionaries’ insistence on Torah-obedience, but also clarifies the meaning of several of Paul’s statements and demonstrates the ways in which different portions of the letter fit together. Additionally, we will propose further areas of study that need to be explored in light of the recognition of Paul’s use of rhetorical parody.

1.1 Quintilian, Hermogenes, and Ps.-Demetrius on Rhetorical Parody

Although parody as a method of comedic mocking is documented as early as Aristotle (Poetics 2.3), three ancient authorities on rhetoric describe a type of parody that is a witty method of argumentation without any inherent buffoonery. Quintilian,\textsuperscript{13} considered to be an authority on Roman rhetoric in the first century C.E., describes the rhetorical device of parody in two different contexts in his \textit{Institutio Oratoria} (The

\textsuperscript{13} According to Roland Gregory Austin (\textit{OCD}, 1290): “Ciceronian ideas deeply imbued” Quintilian, and his rhetorical work “is a storehouse of sanity, humane scholarship and good sense.” He was born around 35 C.E. in Spain, received his education in Rome, and is described by Jerome as the “first rhetorician to receive a salary from the \textit{fiscus} (imperial treasury).”
Quintilian defines παροδία within his discussion of the role of emotion in speech (Inst. 6.2.1–6.3.112). He prefaces his discussion of this topic by stating quite explicitly that since the average person used wit and humor on a daily basis, the rhetorical use of witty and humorous statements in argumentation was, therefore, merely borrowed from the habits of the average person (6.3.14). He also notes, “laughter was not far away from scorn or derision,” but then he immediately follows this admission with the claim that Cicero had referred to the use of witty and humorous statements against an opponent as urbanitas (6.3.8). Quintilian defines urbanitas (6.3.17) as a term, derived from urbs (“city”), that referred to the witty expressions and the type of language that composed the conversations of the educated. It was the opposite of rusticitas, which indicated country manners, rusticity, or awkwardness (6.3.18).

Although Quintilian admits that humorous speech “often turns the scale in very important matters” (Inst. 6.3.10 [Russell, LCL]), he deems certain forms of humor unacceptable in oration. The unacceptable type of humor is the humor that scurrae (“jesters/buffoons”)16 and mimi (“mimics/actors/mimes”)17 typically use. To make this point explicitly clear, Quintilian insists, “Caustic raillery, even jeering (scurrilis) and anything connected with the stage (scaenica) must be foreign” to the orator. Rather, the

14 Inst. was most likely published before Domitian’s death in 96 since Quintilian refers to the emperor in an extremely flattering manner (10.1.91). Inst. is extant in twelve books and has been considered authoritative on first-century Roman rhetoric since the discovery of a complete text in 1416.
15 Although Quintilian wrote in Latin, he often refers to technical rhetorical terms by their original Greek name, rather than by their Latin synonym.
16 Lewis and Short, 1650.
17 Ibid., 1145.
orator must speak with “refined humor”\(^\text{18}\) \(\text{(Inst. 6.3.29-31)}\). Therefore, we have no doubt that risqué and vulgar forms of humor were not included in Quintilian’s understanding of rhetorical parody.

Throughout his discussion of witticisms in orations, Quintilian refers to humorous language primarily with two terms in addition to cognates of \textit{urbs}, i.e., \textit{ridiculus} \((\text{ridiculum dictum in 6.3.6; ridiculum in 6.3.26; and dicta ridicula in 6.3.46)}\) and \textit{iocus} \((\text{iocum in 6.3.21; ioco in 6.3.30; and iocus in 6.3.94)}\). It appears that he does not make a distinction between these two terms; however, he defines \textit{iocus} as “being the opposite of ‘serious’” \((\text{Inst. 6.3.21 [Russell, LCL]}))\). Here, it is important to note that \textit{OLD} defines \textit{ridiculus} as having the primary meaning of “capable of arousing laughter.” It is for this meaning, rather than the secondary meaning of “absurd, silly, ridiculous,” that \textit{OLD} specifically references \textit{Inst. 6.3.6}.\(^\text{19}\)

For Quintilian, humor is possible in all types of speech and all topics of argumentation \((\text{Inst. 6.3.36-66)}\). Any type of trope \((6.3.67)\) could be formed with a witty statement or joke as well as all “Figures of Thought” \((\text{σχήματα διανοιάς in 6.3.70)}\). In listing the ways in which an orator could employ humor to gain an advantage in argumentation, Quintilian notes its use in irony \((6.3.91)\). Then, continuing his discussion of \textit{urbanitas} (“wit”), he describes different ways in which existing verses could be creatively used to make witty statements \((6.3.96-97)\). The first way is \textit{sue toti ut sunt}.

\(^{18}\text{OLD, “urbane,” 2105.}\)

\(^{19}\text{OLD, “ridiculus,” 1653.}\)
(“one may quote whole lines”). For the second, he states: *seu verbis ex parte mutatis* (“Alternately, the words may be altered in part”). For the third, Quintilian says: *seu ficti notis versibus similes* (“Again, lines can be invented resembling well-known ones”). Immediately after Quintilian describes the third method of making up lines that *imitate* and are *similar* to existing sayings, he states (6.3.97): *quaes παραδιαφήμεσθαι* (“which is called ‘parody’”). Since the verb is singular, Quintilian is referring to the third method, which is making up a saying that is similar to and in imitation of an existing one, as “parody.” However, he is not referring to the verbatim quotation or the alteration of well-known sayings as “parody.”

Quintilian also presents a second discussion of parody in *Institutio Oratoria*. In explaining his theory of Elocution (8.1-11.1), he characterizes a “Figure of Thought” as “a departure from the simple ways of making a statement” (9.2.1). One type of “Figure of Thought” is *προσωποποίησις*, which is also referred to by the Latin term *sermocinatio* (9.2.29-37). At the beginning of his description of *προσωποποίησις*, Quintilian notes that *προσωποποίησις* is a “bolder” (*audacia*ra) way of making a statement compared to the “Emotive Figures” that he has just discussed. In describing *προσωποποίησις*, Quintilian

---

20 *Inst. 6.3.96* (Russell, LCL).  
21 *Inst. 6.3.97* (Russell, LCL).  
22 Ibid.  
23 However, regarding the alteration of an existing saying, Donald A. Russell (*Inst. 6.3.97*, LCL) states (n.106): “See Demetrius 150 for this humorous use of parody.” We will discuss Ps.-Demetrius and *Eloc.* 150 below.  
24 In describing Emotive Figures, Quintilian states: “The Figures adapted to intensifying emotions consist chiefly in pretence. We pretend that we are angry, happy, frightened, surprised, grieved, indignant, desirous of something, or the like” (*Inst. 9.2.26* [Russell, LCL]).
points out one of the advantages of using the rhetorical device: *adversariorum cogitationes velut secum loquentium protrahimus* (“we expose the thoughts of adversaries as though they were talking to themselves”).

In *Inst.* 9.2.33-35, Quintilian makes several important statements that relate the use of parody in προσωποποίεσις to his previous discussion of parody in *urbanitas*. After noting the importance of creating “before our eyes images of things, persons, or spoken utterances” (9.2.33), Quintilian describes the use of parody in προσωποποίεσις. In 9.2.34-35, he says:

> Ut dicta autem quaedam, ita scripta quoque fingi solent quod factit Asinius pro Liburnia: “mater mea, quae mihi cum carissima tum dulcissima fuit, quaeque mihi vixit bisque eodem die vitam dedit’ et reliqua, deinde ‘exheres esto’ Haec cum per se figura est, tum duplicator quotiens, sicut in hac causa, ad imitationem alterius scripturae componitur. Nam contra recitabatur testamentum: ‘P. Novanius Gallio, cui ego omnia meritissimo volo et debeo pro eius animi in me summam voluntate’, et adiectis deinceps alias ‘heres esto’: incipit esse quodam modo παρωδία, quod nomen ducitum a canticis ad aliorum similitudinem modulates abusive etiam in versificationis ac sermonum imitatione servatur.

Writings as well as words are sometimes made up, as by Asinius in his defence of Liburnia: “My mother, who was very dear and very close to me, who lived for me and gave me life twice on the same day . . . ” and so on, and then: “shall have no part in my estate.” This is both a Figure in itself and doubly so when, as in the present case, it is based on a document submitted by the other side. The opponent’s case here involved the reading of a will which ran “Publius Novanius Gallio, to whom, as my benefactor, I will and owe everything, in recognition of his good will towards me . . . ” and so on, with other provisions, and finally “shall be my heir.” We thus have what begins to be a sort of Parody. (This is a term derived from songs made up to imitate others, and so used by Catachresis for imitations in verse and prose.) (*Inst.* 9.2.34-35 [Russell, LCL])

---

In Quintilian’s description of παρωδία as a rhetorical device, the emphasis is on the advantage an orator gains over an opponent by playing catachrestically on the words of the opponent. Although Quintilian refers to this use of parody as παρωδία rather than as παρωδία, he is basically presenting the same definition of the rhetorical device (παρωδία) as he presented for the refined witticism that he called παρωδία. Both παρωδία and παρωδία are wordplays that are made up from and closely resemble the source, or hypotext, that they are imitating. In the example of the will that Quintilian cites to illustrate παρωδία, the mother’s lawyer imitates the son’s will, which names the son’s benefactor as his heir to the detriment of the mother’s interest in her son’s estate. When the mother’s lawyer parodies the son’s will, which praises the son’s benefactor for demonstrating good will toward the son and therefore earning the right to be the son’s heir, the absurdity of privileging the benefactor’s “good will” while ignoring the mother’s loving sacrifices for her son is emphasized.

The example that Quintilian employs to illustrate his understanding of παρωδία is an orator’s imitative wordplay on a written document that had been previously submitted by an opponent.26 Therefore, Quintilian defines παρωδία as an emotive figure in which the words of an opponent’s written document are altered by an orator and used to gain a rhetorical advantage over an opponent. So, while the parody itself could either be a written or oral product, the example that Quintilian uses to illustrate παρωδία indicates that

26 Note Quintilian specifically describes παρωδία as being composed in imitation of the other side’s scripturae (“document/writing”).
the words that are parodied are drawn from a written source. As we will see below, Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of Prov 10:16 in Gal 5:19-23 is very similar to the example of the will that Quintilian uses to illustrate the rhetorical device of \( \pi \acute{\alpha} \rho \omega \delta \eta \).

The second important figure for our investigation is Hermogenes of Tarsus, a second-century C.E. rhetor, who was respected by Marcus Aurelius for his handbooks on oratory. Although Hermogenes lived a century after Paul’s lifetime, his analysis of Demosthenes’ oratory demonstrates that the rhetorical concepts that Hermogenes discusses were practiced by the classical Greek orator. Hermogenes references \( \pi \acute{\alpha} \rho \omega \delta \acute{\iota} \alpha \) in a passage in which he contrasts \( \kappa \omicron \lambda \lambda \nu \acute{\iota} \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) with \( \pi \acute{\alpha} \rho \omega \delta \acute{\iota} \alpha \) while discussing a topic entitled, \( \Pi \epsilon \rho \acute{i} \ \chi \rho \acute{\iota} \sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma \ \acute{\eta} \pi \acute{\omega} \varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon} \nu \ \pi \varepsilon \zeta \varsigma \phi \ \lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \acute{\omicron} \) (“On the Use of Verses in Prose”).

According to Hermogenes, there are two ways that verses are used in prose. The first is \( \kappa \omicron \lambda \lambda \nu \acute{\iota} \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \), which he defines as “when one quotes the complete verse skillfully in a

---

27 Quintilian refers to \textit{dictum} and \textit{scriptum} (\textit{Inst} 9.2.34) to describe the product formed by the orator and \textit{versificatio} and \textit{sermo} (\textit{Inst} 9.2.35) to describe the product in which \( \pi \acute{\alpha} \rho \omega \delta \eta \) is commonly observed, but he refers to \textit{scriptura} as the source that is parodied with no indication that the source could also be spoken words. Whether or not this indicates that Quintilian, or any other ancient author of rhetorical handbooks, limited the parodied source to written words remains to be seen and will be covered more fully later in this chapter.

28 The corpus of Hermogenes’ work consists of five textbooks. Of greatest importance for our discussion is \( \Pi \epsilon \rho \acute{i} \ \mu \acute{e} \delta \delta \omicron \ \omicron \ \delta \epsilon \nu \omicron \acute{\alpha} \tau \omicron \omicron \varsigma \omicron \varsigma \varsigm
speech so that it [the quotation] seems to be in harmony [with the orator’s words].”30 The second is παρωδία, and Hermogenes states: “It is parody (adaptation) whenever, after quoting part of the verse (poem), one in his own words invents the rest in prose and then, quoting yet another part of the verse (poem), adds something of his own, so that it becomes a single idea (or style).”31 Thus, according to Hermogenes, parody, as opposed to an unaltered quotation, consists of a partial quotation to which a speaker inserts words of his own and then adds more of the quotation in such a skillful way that the mixed forms seem to be all part of the speaker’s prose.

When we study the example that Hermogenes presents, which is taken from Demosthenes’ De Falsa Legatione, we can detect a different emphasis in Hermogenes’ description of parody than we saw in Quintilian’s description of the rhetorical device. As noted above, Quintilian emphasizes making up a writing or statement that is similar to and that abusively imitates an opponent’s document (e.g., the son’s will mentioned above). However, Hermogenes’ emphasis is on the alteration of known verses that have been quoted by an opponent so that the alteration results in a witty and polemical statement that is now used to undermine any advantage that the opponent may have gained by quoting the verse.

30 Ibid.
31 This translation of Hermogenes’ definition of parody in Meth. 30 is that of Zlatko Plese, which he shared in a discussion of this passage. George A. Kennedy translates παρωδία in Meth. 30 as “alteration” in Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 254.
Hermogenes cites Demosthenes’ altered quotation of Euripides’ *Phoenix*, which Demosthenes had used in his speech against Aeschines, and this example adheres strictly to the definition of παραφήδια that Hermogenes stated. But what may not be apparent from the presentation of this quotation in *Meth.* 30 is that Demosthenes, prior to rewording the quotation from Euripides so that it would be detrimental to Aeschines, first quoted the unaltered verse, noting that Aeschines had previously cited the verse against Timarchus. And Demosthenes stated clearly that he intended to turn Aeschines’ previous quotation of Euripides against Aeschines. In other words, Demosthenes skillfully took up the citation of his opponent and changed it just enough so that he could polemically use it against his opponent.

A look at Demosthenes’ citation of the unaltered and altered quotations will help in understanding the rhetorical tactics involved. Demosthenes recounted Aeschines’ quotation of Euripides that was used in the speech against Timarchus as:

```
òστις δ’ ὁμιλῶν ἢδεται κακοὶς ἀνήρ,
οὐ πῶσοτ’ ἠρωτήσα, γιγνώσκων ὅτι
τοιούτος ἐστιν οἶσπερ ἢδεται ξυνών.
```

Demosthenes also recounted that Aeschines, after quoting the well-known lines, further criticized Timarchus for attending cockfights and then Aeschines asked the jury

---

32 *Fals. leg.* 245.
33 *Fals. leg.* 241-45.
34 Harvey Yunis (*Demosthenes, Speeches 18 and 19* [The Oratory of Classical Greece 9; Austin: University of Texas Press], 186) translates this portion of *Fals. leg.* 245 as: “If any man enjoys the company of bad men, I’ve never examined him: I know he is like those he likes to be around.”
regarding Timarchus, “Do you not know what his character is?”Next, Demosthenes stated:

οὐκοὖν, Αἰσχύνη, καὶ κατὰ σοῦ τὰ ιαμβεῖα ταῦθ’ ἀρμόσει νῦν ἐμοί, κἂν ἐγὼ λέγω πρὸς τούτοις, ὀρθῶς καὶ προσηκόντως ἔρω.

And last, Demosthenes reworded Aeschines’ previous quotation as:

östis δ’ ὀμιλῶν ἦρεται, καὶ ταῦτα πρεβεύων, Φιλοκράτει, οὐ πῶςτ’ ἡρωτήσα, γιγνώσκων ὅτι ἀργύριον ἔξηθ’ οὕτως, ὃσπερ Φιλοκράτης ὁ ὁμολογῶν.

It is Demosthenes’ altered quotation of Euripides’ Phoenix that Hermogenes presents as his example for παρῳδία. This famous saying would have, of course, been familiar to Hermogenes’ readers. Therefore, his readers would have detected the alteration and understood his description of parody as an alteration of an opponent’s quotation. However, if Hermogenes made his statements regarding the differences between κόλλησις and παρῳδία with the entire portion of Demosthenes’ speech in mind, his definition of παρῳδία would be very close to the above-mentioned example that Quintilian presented in illustration of παρῳδή. We have a similar rhetorical situation in that an opponent’s saying, which had been previously submitted in order to gain a rhetorical advantage, was taken up by the opposing party, imitated, and presented in favor of the other side. The obvious difference between the two examples is that Quintilian’s

35 Fals. leg. 245 (Vince, LCL).
36 Zlatko Pleše’s translation of this portion of Fals. leg. 245, which he shared in a discussion of this passage, is: “Well, Aeschines, these same verses (whose author you consider a wise man) will now exactly serve my turn against you, and if I quote them to the jury, the quotation will be true and apposite.”
37 Kennedy (Invention and Method, 255) translates: “Who on an embassy delights in the company of Philocrates, ‘I never inquired, knowing’ that he took money, as Philocrates admits he did.”
example of παρωφοδή is an imitation of an opponent’s written document while
Hermogenes’ παρωφοδία is an oral quotation of a written text that is cited first by one party
and then cited, with polemical alterations, by the other party.

Whether or not Hermogenes assumed that his reader would be cognizant of the
total portion of Demosthenes’ speech against Aeschines is difficult to say. Before we
could assume that Hermogenes either had the entire section of Demosthenes’ speech in
mind or was making a clear reference to the original quotation of Euripides by Aeschines,
we would have to have some evidence in Hermogenes’ discussion of παρωφοδία that would
logically lead us to believe that Hermogenes intended such a reference. Here, it is
important to note that Hermogenes chose to illustrate his definition of κόλλησις by
referring, by name, to a portion of Aeschines’ speech, Against Timarchus. The first
portion of Hermogenes’ illustration is a quotation of Homer that appears in Tim. 1.149.38
The second quotation that Hermogenes gives as an example of κόλλησις is from
Euripides and appears in Tim. 1.151.39 As mentioned above, Hermogenes immediately
follows his definition of κόλλησις, the “gluing” of an exact quotation within an orator’s
speech so that the two fit harmoniously together, with his definition of παρωφοδία for which
he cites Demosthenes’ altered quotation of Euripides (Fals. leg. 245). What Hermogenes
does not explicitly state is that the unaltered quotation of Euripides by Aeschines, which
Demosthenes explicitly refers to in Fals. leg. 245, occurs in Tim. 1.152, the line of Tim.

39 Ibid.
that immediately follows Hermogenes’ chosen example for κόλλησις, which was drawn from *Tim.* 1.151.

It is impossible to know whether or not Hermogenes, when he presented the example of παρωδία, had in mind both the skillful way in which Demosthenes altered the quotation from Euripides and the polemical way in which he used his opponent’s quotation to his own rhetorical advantage. In either case the contrast between κόλλησις, an unaltered quotation within a speech, and, παρωδία, a rhetorical term that described an altered quotation, is evident based on Hermogenes’ description of παρωδία and the additional evidence from Quintilian that ancient forms of parody, although referred to as παρωδή, could include the altering of well-known words for rhetorical effect. The purpose of using the rhetorical device of parody in both Quintilian’s example and in Hermogenes’ example was to take up evidence, either a document or a quotation, that had been used by an opponent and turn it against the opponent. As mentioned above, Quintilian’s example pointed out the absurdity of the son’s will. In Hermogenes’ example, the rhetorical effect was to denigrate Aeschines by altering the famous saying that Aeschines had used to denigrate Timarchus.

Just as Quintilian discusses parody in two different contexts (i.e., one in the context of making up witty statements that imitate existing verses/sayings (παρωδία) and the other in the context of making up a writing or statement that is similar to an opponent’s document but abusively imitates the document (παρωδή) with an intended polemical effect), Hermogenes provides a second description of παρωδία in *Meth.* 34. In
this case, Hermogenes’ topic of discussion is stated to be Περὶ τοῦ κωμικῶς λέγειν (“On Speaking Comically”). Hermogenes introduces the chapter by stating: Τοῦ κωμικῶς λέγειν ἠμα καὶ σκώπτειν ἄρχαιως τρεῖς μέθοδοι (“[There are] three methods in which an orator could speak comically and at the same time mock in an ancient style”).

One of the three methods is described under the heading τὸ κατὰ παρωδίαν σχῆμα (“On the Figure of Parody”). ⁴⁰ Here, Hermogenes presents a definition of the rhetorical figure in which he recounts a scene from Aristophanes (Wasps 40-45). One of the actors in Wasps mentions that, in a dream, he saw Theorus with the head of a crow (κόραξ). This actor then recounts that a young, notorious politician with a lisp referred to Theorus as having the head of a flatterer (κόλαξ). Here, the mispronunciation changed the entire meaning of the word by altering a single letter with quite a comical result. ⁴¹ Although the description of παρωδία that Hermogenes offers in Meth. 34 is different from the description that was given in Meth. 30, both discussions of parody involve the alteration or adaptation of the source. And, as noted above, Hermogenes’ topic in Meth. 30 is Περὶ χρήσεως ἐπών ἐν πεζῷ λόγῳ (“On the Use of Verses in Prose”) while the topic in Meth. 34 is Περὶ τοῦ κωμικῶς λέγειν (“On Speaking Comically”).

⁴⁰ The other methods are: τὸ παρὰ προοδοκίαν (“contrary to expectation”); and τὸ ἐναντίας ποιεῖσθαι τὰς εἰκόνας τῇ φύσει τῶν πραγμάτων (“the invention of images contrary to the nature of the objects being treated”).
⁴¹ Cicero (De or. 2.61.248 - 2.64.258) in listing the various types of verbal witticisms includes changing a letter or two as a way of playing on words (2.63.256) and notes that the Greeks refer to this category of witticism as παρονομασία. Cicero places his description of παρονομασία between his description of saying something different than what is expected and his discussion of quoting a verse as is or with slight alterations.
In his introduction to Meth. 34, Hermogenes’ reference to σκωπτεῖν ἄρχαιος “mocking in an ancient style” is interesting, especially since he does not use the term in other chapters when he presents examples from ancient sources. For example, in Meth. 20, Hermogenes discusses the orator’s use of oaths and gives examples from Homer and Plato, but there is no mention that the examples were an ancient style of using oaths. In Meth. 22, Hermogenes discusses “the method of saying the opposite of what one wants,” and the only example that is given in illustration of the concept is from the Illiad. Yet, he makes no mention that this method was “in an ancient style.” In fact, Hermogenes does not appear to make any other reference to ἄρχαιος in the treatise; however, he does refer to οἱ παλαιοὶ several times within the work.\(^42\)

It may be, therefore, that in Meth. 34 Hermogenes is making reference to a device used in Greek Old Comedy. This seems very likely for several reasons. First, the opposite adjectival term, καινός, was often used to refer to newly composed or new styles of comedies or dramas.\(^43\) Second, the example for κατὰ παροδίαν and the example for παρὰ προσδοκίαν, two of the three methods listed, are taken from comedies that fall under the classification of Greek Old Comedy.\(^44\) Third, the classifications for Old, Middle, and New Comedy were made as early as the writings of Aristophanes of Byzantium (third –

\(^{42}\) Chs. 28, 29, 35.  
\(^{43}\) See LSJ, “καινός,” 858.  
\(^{44}\) Rabe, 451, nn.16, 21.
second century B.C.E.). And fourth, not only does Hermogenes present examples from Old Comedies, but he also demonstrates how the methods, borrowed from such comedies, could be used effectively in oration. To illustrate their use in oration, Hermogenes chose examples from Demosthenes’ *On the Crown*. If Hermogenes were referring to the type of parody that commonly occurred in Greek Old Comedies, such as *Wasps*, did he imply by σκῶπτειν ἄρχαιως that rhetorical parody encompassed the risqué type of humor that was exhibited in such comedies? Or was he referring simply to the humorous changing of letters in words, as had occurred in ancient forms of mocking, without including in his method for παρῳδία the burlesque type of humor that characterized Greek Old Comedy?

While there is no way to tell from Hermogenes’ words how much of the nature of comedies like *Wasps* should be interpreted within his σκῶπτειν ἄρχαιως, it is important to remember that the purpose of *Meth.* 34 was to demonstrate the ways in which an orator could use wit in order to produce a comedic effect and gain an advantage over an opponent in argumentation. Although Hermogenes’ examples are derived from Greek comedies, to interpret παρῳδία as merely a display of buffoonery or a risqué method of speaking is to miss the point of *Meth.* 34. Hermogenes, in *Meth.* 30 and 34, is presenting two ways that rhetorical parody could be used in order to gain the advantage over an

---


opponent. The method could be one in which the speaker alters the wording of an opponent’s citation, a citation to which the opponent has appealed to for authoritative support, and in this way ridicules the opponent (Meth. 30). Or the method could be one in which the comedic effect is achieved by changing a letter or mispronouncing a word in such a way that it exposes the nature or the deeds of the opponent.

From the discussion of ancient rhetorical parody, as it is defined by Quintilian and Hermogenes, the common factor that runs throughout is that rhetorical parody is a method of argumentation in which an orator takes up a well-known saying or previously submitted document and uses it to gain an advantage over the opponent by altering the words of the saying or document. Also, we see that two forms of rhetorical parody existed: one destroyed the argument of the opponent by altering the original saying or text and thus mocked the opponent while the other more obviously interjected humor into the argument by altering the original text or saying. In both cases, the speaker parodied the original line in order to strengthen his own argument.

What is missing from the above discussion is the idea that ancient rhetorical parody was inherently characterized by buffoonery or absurdity. Even though Hermogenes’ σκώπτειν ἄρχαιως may possibly refer to Greek Old Comedy, it is most probable, within the context of Hermogenes’ discussion, that it refers primarily to the alteration of a word to produce a comic effect as a way of exposing the weaknesses or schemes of the opponent. Most importantly, Quintilian explicitly rejects any notion that the orator could be humorous in the fashion of court jesters, buffoons, actors, or mimes.
Therefore, his requirement that an orator exhibit urbanity in any humorous statement seems to be a clear indication that Quintilian did not want to run the risk of being misunderstood regarding the type of humor that he condoned in oration.\footnote{Inst. 6.3.29-31}

In addition to the valuable discussions of parody by Hermogenes and Quintilian, one other ancient treatise is very important for our understanding of parody. Although Demetrius of Phaleron has been mistakenly credited as being the author of the treatise entitled Περὶ ἔρμηνειάς (Eloc.), also referred to as “On Style,” the identity of the actual author is unknown. The date is also uncertain, but the treatise was most likely written in the second – first century B.C.E.\footnote{See, Doreen C. Innes, introduction to Demetrius, Eloc. (Innes, LCL), 312-14; and Michael B. Trapp, “Demetrius (15)” in The Oxford Classical Dictionary (ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth; 3d ed. rev; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 450.}

Just as Quintilian described the urbane manner in which an orator should use humor, Ps.-Demetrius similarly stresses the refined way in which a speaker\footnote{Eloc is not limited to a discussion of rhetoric, but the work addresses proper “style” in speaking and in writing letters (223-35), etc. See, Innes, 311-12.} should make witty statements. In the process of analyzing the four styles that included the plain or unadorned (ἰσχυρός), the grand (μεγαλοπρεπής), the elegant or polished (γλαφυρός), and the forceful (δυνατής), Ps.-Demetrius acknowledges that several combinations of the styles could occur. The forceful style could combine with the elegant and the plain (Eloc. 36). He describes the elegant style (Eloc. 128-86) as characterized by beauty (or charm) and graceful or cheerful lightness. Ps.-Demetrius makes it clear that he is not referring to the vile or cheap scoffing (σκώμης) that
characterized the comedies, which he deemed “not far from γελωτοποιία,” a term which is an accurate designation for buffoonery. He contrasts the comedic type of cheap scoffing with talking cleverly (ἀστείος) and making witty/clever (ἀστείος) statements that added forcefulness (δείνωσις) and intensity (ἐμφάσις) to the elegant style. Ps.-Demetrius states: “Charm is also used by Homer sometimes to make a scene more forceful and intense” (Eloc. 130 [Innes, LCL]). These witty statements could be in the context of jokes or puns (σκώμμα), and jesting (παίζων) is viewed as adding force and using charm for a grim effect (Eloc. 130-31).51

Additionally, Ps.-Demetrius notes that charm could be added to the elegant style by quoting a verse /line (στίχος) of another in a witty manner (Eloc. 150). This statement is in agreement with previous statements that we have already seen in Hermogenes and Quintilian. Although Ps.-Demetrius does not actually employ any form of παρωδέω in his discussion, we should conclude that he is referring to rhetorical parody in Eloc. 150 for several reasons. First, his reference to στίχος makes it clear that he is referring to the quotation of a written line or verse.

Second, LSJ equates Ps.-Demetrius’ word for clever or witty, ἀστείος, with the Latin urbanus that was used by Quintilian. Since ἀστείος is derived from ἄστυ, which means “city” and was frequently used to refer to Athens in the same way that the Romans

50 Eloc. 128; and LSJ, “γελωτοποιία,” 342.
51 Although Ps.-Demetrius uses forms of σκώμμα to describe the refined and the vile type of mocking joke, the context makes his distinction unmistakable.
used *urbs* to refer to Rome, Ps.-Demetrius apparently mentions ἀστείος and ἀστεῖζομαι in the same manner that Quintilian discussed “urbanity” and “speaking in a witty manner.” Both authors were referring to the educated language used by people in the cities as opposed to the more rustic language of the countryside.

Third, Innes translates *Eloc.* 150 as if Ps.-Demetrius had used a form of παρῳδέω: “Charm also comes from parody of another writer’s line. . .”

And, last, Russell states, “See Demetrius 150 for this humorous use of parody” as a footnote in his translation of the section of *Inst.* 6.3.97 in which Quintilian is discussing the alteration of some of the words of a quotation.

Since Ps.-Demetrius did not limit his treatise to a discussion of oratory, he also includes a discussion of the proper style for letters (*Eloc.* 223-35) in which he describes letters as similar to dialogues, but advises that they should be somewhat more carefully prepared than dialogues (*Eloc.* 224). He concludes his discussion of epistolary style by stating that letters should combine the elegant (γλαφυρός) and the plain (ἰσχυρός) style (*Eloc.* 235). These points are important for any discussion of the use of rhetorical parody in Paul’s letters. Since Ps.-Demetrius discusses parody and the use of figures in order to add charm (χάρις) in relation to the elegant style and, as mentioned above, he states that charm can make “a scene more forceful and intense” (*Eloc.* 130), his recommendation .

---

52 *Eloc.* 150 (Innes, LCL).
53 *Inst.* 6.3.97 (Russell, LCL).
54 *Eloc.* 130 states: ἡρήτω καὶ πρὸς δείκνυσιν ἐνίοτε καὶ ἐμφασιν . . . Innes’s (LCL) translation is: “Charm is also used by Homer sometimes to make a scene more forceful and intense.”
that letters should combine the elegant and the plain style would indicate that figures and parody would also be an appropriate way of adding charm to letters in order to make them more forceful and intense. One other section of Ps.-Demetrius’ work is also important for our discussion. In his description of the forceful style (Eloc. 240-301), he points out that if a statement uses wit or humor and, at the same time, amazes and secretly stings/bites (ὑποδόκειν), it reveals the speaker’s meaning most forcefully (δεινότερα). Additionally, forcefulness can be created by the use of figures of thought, such as προσωποποιία. Ps.-Demetrius states: “Another figure of thought which may be used to produce force is the figure called prosopopoeia” (Eloc.265, [Innes, LCL]).

Ps.-Demetrius’ advice regarding style and writing letters appears to be in line with the interpretation of parody that we have already seen in the discussions of Quintilian and Hermogenes. As mentioned above, although he does not specifically refer to παρῳδεύω anywhere in the treatise, his discussion of the quotation of known lines (Eloc. 150) has been interpreted as referring to rhetorical parody by other scholars. This being the case, we have another ancient source that further supports our interpretation that rhetorical

55 At the beginning of his discussion of the four styles, Ps.-Demetrius noted that the forceful style could combine with any of the other three (Eloc. 36-37). Therefore, even though he has mentioned that the elegant and the plain style should be combined in letters, there is nothing that would preclude the forceful style from being combined with the other two in a letter.
56 Eloc. 260.
57 Eloc. 262.
58 In presenting a quotation of Demosthenes in order to illustrate the figure of paraleipsis, Ps-Demetrius says: “In these words Demosthenes has actually stated everything he wanted, yet he claims to pass over them, to imply that he has other more forceful (δεινότερα) points to make” (Eloc. 263 [Innes, LCL]).
parody could take the form of a quotation, with possible alterations, of a well-known written line. Although Ps.-Demetrius does not discuss the possibility that the quotation could be from a well-known saying rather than a written document, his treatise does support Quintilian’s definition of παρωδή as a way of adding vividness to an argument. Additionally, Ps.-Demetrius’ discussion of the proper and refined use of witticisms is very similar to that of Quintilian, and, for Ps.-Demetrius, the purpose of such humor is to add force to an argument. Again, for Ps.-Demetrius and Quintilian a risqué or burlesque connotation is rejected for rhetorical parody. Additionally, Ps.-Demetrius’ understanding of the use of figures and, specifically, προσωποποιία is similar to Quintilian’s.

1.2 Previous Investigations of the Concept of Ancient Parody

Although numerous studies have sought to define the concept of parody, we will focus this section primarily on the work of authors who have either sought to establish the nature of ancient parody apart from its Renaissance, modern, or post-modern conceptions or who have stressed the transformative process that occurs when a new text is created by parodying an older text. Near the middle of the twentieth century, two classicists noted the range of meanings that the English word “parody” encompassed and sought to clarify the term as it related to their study of ancient Greek and Latin literature.

59 Many authors have stressed the literary nature of parody, e.g., Viktor Shklovsky, who studied the nature of parody in terms of literary discontinuity and intertextuality, and Bakhtin, who stressed the subversive nature of parody as an expression of social conflict. See Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh, eds., Modern Literary Theory (4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 49-52 and 252-64.
While, apparently, the work of these two scholars, Fred W. Householder Jr.\textsuperscript{60} and F. J. Lelièvre,\textsuperscript{61} has not affected the way that New Testament scholarship has understood the role of parody in Hellenistic rhetoric, their findings deserve another look, especially since most New Testament scholars would probably turn to the main entry in LSJ for a definition of παρῳδέω and its cognates.

Householder begins his article by noting that LSJ defines παρῳδία as “burlesque, parody.” Additionally, all the English dictionaries that were current at the time of his essay (1944) defined “parody” with terms such as “ridiculous,” “burlesque,” and “ludicrous.” Besides objecting to LSJ’s limited definition of the term, Householder did not equate “burlesque” with “parody.” The main differences, in his opinion, between the two English terms were: (1) “parody must be modeled on a specific work or author” while “burlesque may be modeled on a whole class of work or on no particular work,” and (2) “parody applies a grave style and treatment to a trivial or ludicrously inappropriate subject” while burlesque may “apply a ridiculous and low treatment to a lofty and serious subject.”\textsuperscript{62} Householder also takes exception to the implication in some English dictionaries that parody is a method that could be used to ridicule the original author.

Investigating the occurrences of παρῳδός, παρῳδή, παρῳδία, and παρῳδέω in ancient literature, Householder maintains that the basic meaning of the word group is

\textsuperscript{62} “ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ,” 1.
“singing in imitation, singing with a slight change.” The earliest use of παρῳδία is in Aristotle’s (Poet. 1448a.12-13) reference to Hegemon as the first writer of parodies. With this occurrence of the word and with those of παρῳδός and παρῳδία in Athenaeus, Householder concludes that the earliest meaning for παρῳδία is “a narrative poem” that “borrowed words, phrases, and lines” from a poet, most frequently Homer. Additionally, it is composed “in epic meter, using epic vocabulary, and treating a light, satirical, or mock-heroic subject.”

Since this meaning for παρῳδία describes poems that treated a “trivial or humorous subject in the style of a grave and serious one” and the poems were based on the writings of a specific author, “parody” is a more accurate description of the genre than is “burlesque.” However, since the English term normally connotes “critical ridicule,” it is an inaccurate term for this meaning of παρῳδία. Householder insists, “There does not seem to be a grain of evidence that any ancient παρῳδίαι were designed

63 Ibid., 2. Householder’s definition makes sense on the basis that the noun was formed from a combination of παρα, with ὀδὴ. And ὀδὴ (“song”) was derived from a contraction of the Attic ἀοιδή (“song”). Homer also used the verbal form ἀοιδέω (Od. 5.61, 10.227) and its variant form ἀειδέω (Od 1.326, 8.266), which in some cases means “to sing,” but can also mean “to sing praise.” See LSJ, “ἀοιδή,” “ἀαιδέω,” 172. Homer also uses παραείδω (Od. 22.348), but since the verb must be understood in light of the preceding dative and translated as “to sing beside or to one,” Householder is correct in not including Od. 22.348 in his discussion. See LSJ, “παραείδω,” 1309.

64 Although Athenaeus most likely wrote Deipn. in the late second century C.E., his work provides a list of ancient parodists from the earliest period of such writings. Householder (2, n.4) provides a list of the occurrences of παρῳδία and παρῳδός in Athenaeus, Deipn.; however, since he organizes his list according to Athenaeus’ references to named writers of parodies, he does not specify whether the reference is to παρῳδία or to παρῳδός. According to our findings, forms of παρῳδός (“writer of parody”) occur in 1.5b; 2.62c; 4.134d; 4.183a; and 15.697f., and forms of παρῳδία (“parody”) occur in 2.54e; 2.64c; 3.73d; 9.406e; 14.638b; 15 698b (three times); and 15.699a (twice).

65 “ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ,” 3.
to ridicule Homer” or “his style” even though the works were “amusing” and “sometimes satirical.” “Burlesque” could accurately be applied to the genre since it encompassed the ridiculing of subject matter, but Householder maintains that this particular use of παρωφοία makes up only about ten percent of the occurrences of the word group in ancient literature. Therefore, according to Householder, the article in Liddell and Scott is “not only inaccurate but also incomplete.”

After studying the typical ways in which παρωφοία and παρωφοίωσις were used, Householder concludes that this noun and verb referred to “close literary imitation.” Householder points to Inst 9.2.35 in which παρωφοία, as part of Quintilian’s discussion of προσωποϕοία, clearly indicates the imitation of “written documents (as opposed to spoken words).” This same use of παρωφοία occurs in Philodemus of Gadara (Hom. 17.31). Similarly, an occurrence of παρωφοίωσις in Philostratus (Vit. Apoll. 1.30) also meant “close literary imitation.” Householder considers these examples to be “parody” in the “general sense of the [Greek] term” and stresses the lack of any correlation between this use of παρωφοία and παρωφοίωσις and the standard English definitions of parody and burlesque. Although he notes that the word group most frequently appears in ancient literature in “the technical terminology of rhetoricians and grammarians, he notes that one use seems to have been adopted into the language of the educated society.”

---

66 Ibid.  
67 Ibid., 4.  
68 Ibid.  
69 Ibid.
mentioned above that appears in Quintilian’s (*Inst.* 9.2.35) discussion of προσωποικία and is the “close literary imitation” of a written document.

In addition to the earliest meaning of παρωδία as a narrative poem, παρωδία was also used to describe a method of quotation or allusion. Variations could occur within this definition depending on whether the term was employed by grammarians, rhetoricians or educated members of society. The grammatical use denoted a quotation, imitation, or paraphrase of a “serious verse in comedy.” The original quotation could be borrowed and quoted without any change, with the “substitution of one or more words, in paraphrased form,” or changed to such an extent that the imitation of the original included only grammar and rhythm. This grammatical use of παρωδία occurs almost exclusively in Aristophanic scholia, and it always refers to “a device for comic quotation.” 70 Again, Householder rejects the English “parody” as an accurate description of this type of comic quotation since there was no implication that Aristophanes ridiculed Euripides in his quotation of his works. 71

Apart from the grammarians, the word group never indicated a verbatim quotation. Rather, when παρωδικός and its cognates were used as rhetorical terms or to describe a feature of educated conversation, the word group always referred to a

---


71 A very similar opinion regarding the parodying of Euripides by Aristophanes was held by Gilbert Murray (*Aristophanes: A Study* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1933], 121) who claimed that even though Aristophanes parodied Euripides, Aristophanes did not write *Frogs* “as a mere attack on Euripides or as an attempt to show that he was a bad poet.” Additionally, Murray (Ibid., 134) thought that Aristophanes viewed Euripides as a “great poet” and “admired” him.
quotation that had been altered to some degree. In addition to Quintilian’s example of refined witticism (*Inst.* 6.3.97) discussed above, Householder points to a passage in Lucian (*Apol.* 10) in which a participial form of παρῳδέω is employed in Lucian’s request that “Media [sic] come and speak on his behalf, parodying verses.” A line of Euripides’ *Medea* is then quoted in which πενία is substituted for the original θημός. Therefore, Lucian considered an altered quotation to be an example of parody. 72

For additional evidence that rhetorical parody never referred to an unaltered quotation, Householder turns to Hermogenes. Householder refers to Hermogenes’ discussion of παρῳδία (*Meth.* 30) as “the usual rhetorical sense” of parody in which “part of a sentence” is quoted “exactly, completing the grammatical structure with some different words.” This form of parody could either alter the sense of the original or keep the original sense intact “with partial paraphrase.”73 Therefore, he acknowledges that one of the normal ancient definitions of παρῳδία was an altered quotation. And Householder provides a suggested definition for this type of rhetorical parody: “verse quotation with partial paraphrase; loosely paraphrased quotation or reminiscence from prose or verse.”74 Additionally, Householder concludes his discussion of “the usual rhetorical sense of parody” by stating, “This use never has humorous connotations and quite obviously has

72 “ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ,” 6. While, of course, Lucian is well known for his satirical wit, his use of παρῳδέω in this case clearly refers to an altered quotation even though he may be using the altered quotation in a satirical way.
73 “ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ,” 6.
74 Ibid., 7.
no connection with English ‘parody’ or ‘burlesque.’”\textsuperscript{75} Householder is certainly correct that ancient rhetorical parody had no connection with English “parody” or “burlesque;” however, as we have seen from our discussion of Hermogenes’ \textit{Meth.} 30, Demosthenes’ purpose in quoting the passage from Euripides, which Aeschines had previous employed, was to turn Aeschines’ own argument against him. While there is no indication that Demosthenes was in any way mocking Euripides, there is a polemical, and somewhat comedic, effect in Demosthenes’ employment of the same passage against Aeschines.

Additionally, Householder indicates that there was a humorous version of rhetorical parody, discussing the same passages in Quintilian that were mentioned by Hermogenes in the text cited above.\textsuperscript{76} Householder’s main purpose in this section of his essay is to demonstrate that “the notion of humor was not regarded as essentially present in the word” group.\textsuperscript{77}

A decade later Lelièvre reaches very similar conclusions in his investigation of the nature and purpose of parody. Noting that the modern use of the term not only implied imitation and differentiation, but also implied humor, he questions whether or not the ancients would agree. His study reveals that the cognate words for parody are, in themselves, neutral with the basic notion of “singing after the style of an original but with a difference.”\textsuperscript{78} He defines parody as “essentially a play upon an original brought about

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{76} See the above discussions of Hermogenes, \textit{Meth.} 34 and Quintilian on \pi\alpha\rho\omega\delta\iota\alpha.
\textsuperscript{77} “\Pi\alpha\rho\omega\delta\iota\alpha,” 8, esp. n.27.
\textsuperscript{78} “Basis,” 72.
by verbal alteration, distortion, or change of context” and notes that the term implies “a certain mastery both of the original and of the technique necessary for altering it.”\textsuperscript{79}

Although the earliest use of the word group is humorous, it is “not, of course, necessarily at the expense of the original author: in fact it would not be true of most ancient parody to claim that it was so used.”\textsuperscript{80} Lelièvre describes some forms of ancient parody that are actually “criticism using the medium of humor,” which he terms “critical parody,” and points to one example in Hesychius in which a carping or scornful connotation is implied with \textit{parw|dou/ntej}; however, he maintains that such a connotation is not inherent in ancient parody. He concludes his discussion of the critical type of parody by acknowledging that other forms of parody could “be penetrating without being malicious: certainly there is no reason to suppose that the parodist cannot rise to serious appreciation of his original.”\textsuperscript{81}

For Lelièvre, the “main divergence” from the comedic use of the term occurs with the rhetoricians. Once again Hermogenes (\textit{Meth}. 30) is cited to demonstrate that the word group is used to refer to a device of altering a quotation although Lelièvre does provide other examples of this use of parody in addition to Hermogenes.\textsuperscript{82}

Then, after reviewing the humorous use of parody in Quintilian and Hermogenes, Lelièvre attempts to delineate the differences between ancient parody and other ancient

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., 79.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 71.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 75.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 71. Lelièvre also mentions Olympiodorus and Zonaras as rhetoricians who employed this type of parody.
forms. Parody differs from the *cento*, which is a patchwork of verses that are strung together, mainly in the fact that quotations in *centones* are verbatim and lack any original or additional material between them. Parody could also be distinguished from *silloi* since *silloi* are poems, written in hexameter, with the intent to attack or lampoon a philosophical position or other dogma.\(^83\)

Lelièvre, in agreement with Householder, rejects the normal English equation of parody with burlesque, but Lelièvre seeks to explain such an attribution to the modern English term by turning to the comments of J. C. Scaliger. Scaliger characterizes parody as so changing or inverting the words of rhapsodies that their original sense was transformed into something ridiculous. Lelièvre views Scaliger’s interpretation of *ridiculus* as meaning “ridiculous” or “absurd” to be an inaccurate assessment of ancient parody.\(^84\)

Therefore, from the work of Householder and Lelièvre, we come again to the same conclusions regarding ancient parody that are expressed in the primary sources discussed above. When the ancients used παροδεύω and its cognates, the meaning varied depending on whether the word group was used on the one hand to refer to Old Greek Comedy and the scholiasts’ comments pertaining to authors such as Aristophanes or whether on the other hand it was used as a technical term that described methods of oration and/or the witty and refined statements of the educated portion of society. And, as

\(^83\) Ibid., 76-77.
\(^84\) Ibid., 78. See also J.C. Scaliger, *Poetics libri septem* (Lyons, 1561), 1.42.
mentioned above, within the latter (rhetorical) definition of the word group, two types of parody existed. First, rhetorical parody could refer to an altered quotation that allowed a speaker to gain the advantage over an opponent. While its main purpose could be satirical, playful, ironic, or polemical, it still entailed an element of wry humor via the subversion of the opponent’s quotations and expectations. Second, rhetorical parody could refer to the humorous use of altered quotations that typified the conversations of polite society.

Margaret A. Rose, approaching the subject of parody from the standpoint of a literary critic, rather than that of a classicist, investigates the history and nature of parody from ancient to post-modern times. Her work provides a wealth of information, some of which is valuable for any investigation of ancient parody. However, I strongly disagree with her assessment of Quintilian’s understanding of παρόδη (Inst. 9.2.35) as “being misleading” and inducing “some other rhetoricians and scholars to misleadingly define parody as being largely a form of imitation.” In the context of Quintilian’s discussion, the changing of an opponent’s written document not only employed imitation, but it also

---

86 Ibid., 280. Rose is also criticizing Householder and Lelièvre’s assessment of Quintilian’s statement as a non-humorous use of rhetorical parody, which she discusses earlier (17-18) in her work. However, in our opinion, she depends so heavily on the comic quotations in Aristophanes, the Aristophanic scholia, and the work of Athenaeus in arriving at her definition of parody as inherently comical that she fails to recognize that the rhetorical use of the term had evolved past its original connotation that solely implied humor. Rose fails to include Hermogenes and Demetrius, discussed earlier in this chapter, and does not consider the rhetorical lexicons, which will be discussed in the following pages. Therefore, her investigation apparently leads to what we consider an inaccurate understanding of the nature of ancient rhetorical parody. Although she mentions Lampe’s reference to Gregory of Nyssa (10, n.19) and provides Stephanus’ definition as “canticum vel carmen ad alterius imitationem compono” (Thesaurus Graecae Linguae [Geneva, 1572], 1.119g), these examples of the rhetorical understanding of parody as an altered quotation are dismissed by Rose without further comment.
employed transformation for rhetorical effect. Apparently, she misunderstands the transformative interpretation that Quintilian provides in his definition of παρωδία. That being said, her historical overview of what she terms the inappropriate “reduction of” parody “to the burlesque” is helpful. Also, her discussion of the reader’s response to the incongruity between the parodied text and the new product\textsuperscript{87} and her comparison of parody with other genres are very informative.\textsuperscript{88}

Even though Rose dismisses the examples of rhetorical parody by rhetoricians such as Quintilian as being misleading and she, therefore, views all forms of parody as being primarily comical, her statements regarding the nature of parodic incongruity are still relevant for our discussion of rhetorical parody. For Rose, an element of surprise for the reader is always present in parody: “Because both the text of the parodist and the parodied work are the subject of the reader’s attention, the latter may be surprised to see the parodied text offered in its new distorted form.” Additionally, Rose views the “controlled evocation and destruction of the audience expectations” as “basic to ancient parody in which quotation or imitation evoked other texts.”\textsuperscript{89} The concepts of incongruity and surprise fit just as well with the alteration of well-known sayings for argumentation in rhetorical parody as they do with literary forms of parody. As we have seen above, an altered quotation that transforms the sense of the original into something unexpected would definitely get an audience’s attention. Although Hermogenes distinguishes

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 31-34.  
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 9-10.  
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 33, 36.
between κατὰ παρῳδίαν and παρὰ προσδοκίαν in his discussion of the methods in which an orator could speak *comically* (Meth. 34), Quintilian’s description of παρῳδία (Inst. 9.2.35) does include the sense of surprise and transformation in his example of parody. And we can also see that the element of surprise fits quite well within his discussion of παρῳδία as a form of humor in urbane conversation. Additionally, when we remember that Ps.-Demetrius includes statements that amaze and “gently bite” as a desirable element that could enhance an argument (*Eloc. 260*), the view of rhetorical parody that has been presented so far would also incorporate surprise.

While many of the genres that Rose compares to literary parody are not relevant to a discussion of rhetorical parody, a few of her observations do help to clarify the difference between rhetorical parody and other stylistic devices that are used in rhetoric and literature. Her long discussion of the differences between parody and burlesque adds little to our previous discussion of such differences. However, Rose’s comparisons of parody with satire and irony do cast additional light on our understanding of rhetorical parody. One important difference between *satire* and parody is that parody incorporates the original text or saying into its own structure while satire “is not restricted to the imitation, distortion, or quotation” of other literary texts or sayings. Additionally, when satire “does deal” with an original text or saying, it “need not make itself dependent on it for its own character as does parody.”90 While satire may confront what is considered the

---

90 Rose, *Parody*, 81-82. We have added the concept of “sayings” into Rose’s purely literary discussion.
norm or it may confront a distortion of the norm if the satirist desires to protect the norm, “the parodist may also recreate or imitate certain norms or their distortions in order to attack or defend them in the parody text.” While parody can be used in satire, parody per se will “quote, allude, or imitate the original text” or saying in order to transform the original by incorporating it into the new product. Therefore, parody is much more closely connected to the original text or saying than is satire.\textsuperscript{91}

Literary and rhetorical forms of parody differ from \textit{irony} in several ways. Although all of the forms signify that the reader or hearer must attempt to understand the dual meanings contained within the message, irony is typically defined as “meaning something different from what one says.” However, Rose expresses this idea in terms of codes that must be decoded. Irony is defined as an ambiguous statement that includes one “code containing at least two messages.” The first message is what is easily “perceived but ironically meant.” The second message is “the concealed message of the ironist to an ‘initiated’ audience.”\textsuperscript{92} In contrast, parody has “at least two distinct codes with two distinct sets of messages from more than one author.” Inherently, parody contains the code of the original author in the parodied text and the code that the parodist creates in the new text. When a parodist combines and then noticeably contrasts a well-known text with its new version, the two codes are contrasted in such a way that the audience notices

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 83-86. 
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 87.
the incongruity. The process results in a transformation of the meaning of the original text in its new context.\textsuperscript{93}

Another author who discusses parody in terms of the transformation of the original text is Gérard Genette.\textsuperscript{94} Genette defines what he terms minimal parody as “taking up a familiar text literally and giving it a new meaning, while playing, if possible and as needed, on the words.” \textsuperscript{95} He also defines what he calls elegant parody as “a quote deflected from its meaning or simply from its context.” In both minimal parody, which can be as simple as an intertextual pun, and elegant parody, the original text is distorted to some degree and given a new meaning. For Genette, this most simple form of parody is the closest to the etymology of \(\piρ\rhoδια\) and its cognates and has been “appropriated by rhetoric: it has been considered a figure of discourse (whether literary or not), rather than a genre, a category of works.” \textsuperscript{96} As to whether or not parody should be equated with burlesque, Genette seeks to solve the problem of overlapping terms by stating, “I propose therefore to (re)baptize as parody the distortion of a text by means of minimal transformation.” Burlesque travesty, on the other hand, is understood as a “stylistic transformation whose function is to debase.” \textsuperscript{97} For Genette, burlesque travesty and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 88-89.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 16.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 18, 143.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., 25. It is also important here to note that when Genette translates Scaliger’s often-quoted definition of parody, he translates \textit{ridicula} with the most appropriate meaning of “capable of arousing laughter.” Therefore, Genette’s translation accurately stresses the connection between rhapsody and parody and leaves

40
\end{flushleft}
parody transform, rather than imitate, the original text, also called the hypotext. However, the mood of parody could range between being playful, satirical, or serious.98

What is similar in Rose’s and Genette’s understanding of parody is that both of these authors stress the transformative nature of parody. When the original or hypotext is parodied, it is also transformed in the new context and given a new meaning. Although the words of the hypotext are changed, they are still recognizable to the audience. And in their new context and in the “mood” that the author of the parody utilizes, the words are given a new meaning and a different function from what the original author intended. That function could be satirical, playful, serious, ironic, polemical, or humorous.

Considering not only the transformative nature of parody, but also the nature and purpose of ancient parody, we are now in a position to turn to the numerous handbooks, encyclopedias, and lexicons that have been produced in the study of ancient rhetoric and literature, along with the definitions of ancient parody presented in the classical lexicons that are not limited to the field of rhetoric. We will compare these definitions of ancient parody with the rhetorical definitions of the term.

1.3 Encyclopedic Definitions of Rhetorical Parody

Although, at first glance, it appears that many of the recent handbooks and

---

98 Ibid., 28. Genette developed a chart in an attempt to assign a mood to each genre and to establish the relationship of each to the hypotext; however, he readily admits that the distinctions between the various moods (ironic, playful, humorous, serious, polemical, and satirical) are easily blurred.
encyclopedias on ancient rhetoric fail to include parody in their discussions, a closer investigation reveals that several such works do acknowledge that parody was recognized and used by ancient orators as a way of strengthening an argument. Heinrich Lausberg includes parody under the Latin term *sermocinatio* and the Greek term προσωποποιία. Lausberg defines *sermocinatio* as the formulation “of statements, conversations and soliloquies or unexpressed mental reflections of the persons concerned.” These “persons concerned” can either be invented or historical, and the formulated material is used to characterize them. According to Lausberg, *sermocinatio* or προσωποποιία is connected to the rhetorical quality of vividness and is “most emotive.”

After noting that the linguistic form of *sermocinatio* or προσωποποιία is typically direct speech and giving numerous examples of the three basic types of direct speech normally used, Lausberg lists several “borderline cases” of *sermocinatio* or προσωποποιία that do not fit within the most common forms. Included among such cases is the production of “writings, which, with the reciprocal counterfeiting of a piece

---


101 Ibid.

102 Ibid. §§821-23.

103 Ibid., §820.

104 Ibid.

105 Ibid., §824.
of writing by the opposing party, comes close to literary parody.” In support of his statement, Lausberg quotes Quintilian’s description of \( \pi \rho \omega \delta \eta \) as a type of \( \pi \rho \sigma \omega \pi \omega \pi \omicron \omicron \iota \kappa \alpha \) in which sayings as well as writings are typically produced in imitation of other writings.\(^{106}\)

Although Lausberg is correct in his understanding that Quintilian defines \( \pi \rho \omega \delta \eta \) as a stylistic device in argumentation in which the written documents of one’s opponent are taken up and used to one’s advantage, Lausberg’s reference to the “reciprocal counterfeiting” of a written document implies that some form of deception is inherent in parody. Such a connotation is not suggested by Quintilian’s wording. On the contrary, Quintilian describes \( \pi \rho \omega \delta \eta \) as a rhetorical term, but his use of \textit{abusive} should be translated as “catachrestically” or “loosely” rather than with the later ecclesiastical meaning of “abuse” or “not in good earnest.”\(^{107}\) Quintilian, as noted above, does indicate that in parody the document of the other side is changed in order to use wry humor for the purpose of undermining the opponent’s case. So while parody does imitate an original in

\(^{106}\) Ibid., §824.6. Quintilian, \textit{Inst.} 9.2.35 defines \( \pi \rho \omega \delta \eta \) as: \textit{nomen ductum a canticis ad aliorum similitudinem modulates abusive etiam in versificationis ac sermonum imitatione servatur} (“a term drawn from songs resembling others played upon catachrestically and so observed in imitation of verse and prose”).

\(^{107}\) Lewis and Short (\textit{A Latin Dictionary Founded on the Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary} [Oxford: Clarendon, 1879] 14) cite \textit{Inst.} 8.6.35 and 9.2.35 in defining \textit{abusive} as “by an improper use” in distinction from the later meaning “slightly, not in good earnest” for which they cite a fourth-century C.E. historian, Ammianus Marcellinus. Additionally, Lewis and Short make a distinction between the rhetorical meaning of the cognate noun \textit{abusio} as “a harsh use of tropes, Gr. \textit{kata\-\epsilon\chi\rho\rho\varsigma\upsilon\zeta\varsigma}” and the later ecclesiastical meaning that implies “abuse.” Quintilian (\textit{Inst.}8.2.5) is again cited to support the rhetorical meaning of \textit{abusio}. In \textit{Inst.} 8.2.5 and 8.6.34-35, Quintilian uses \textit{abusio} as the equivalent of \textit{kata\-\epsilon\chi\rho\rho\varsigma\upsilon\zeta\varsigma} and explains that it is a device employed in order to describe an entity that has no name of its own by improperly using a similar word. \textit{OLD} (28) also defines \textit{abusive} as “catachrestically” or “loosely.” From these definitions, \( \pi \rho \omega \delta \eta \) apparently was not understood by Quintilian as an inherently deceptive form of argumentation.
the same way that counterfeiting does, the purpose of rhetorical parody is not to defraud an opponent or an audience or to dissemble one’s own motives. Rather, the purpose of rhetorical parody is to expose the inconsistency or the absurdity of an opponent’s argument or to wittily expose the opponent’s motives with comments that bite or sting.

Although Lausberg’s references to *Inst.* do not support connecting rhetorical παρωδία in argumentation to a deceptive intent on the part of the speaker, his description is important for our discussion since Lausberg acknowledges that a contemporary of Paul classified ancient parody (παρωδία) as a form of προσωποποιία. As such, Quintilian appears to view ancient parody as a rhetorical device that expressed emotion and added vividness to an argument.

Also important is Lausberg’s acknowledgement that παρωδία has a literary component. And he is correct in citing Quintilian’s definition of παρωδία in support of this position. Lausberg has correctly observed Quintilian’s statement that παρωδία is an emotive figure in which the words of an opponent’s written document are altered by an orator and used to gain a rhetorical advantage over an opponent.¹⁰⁸

In addition to Lausberg, Peter Stocker discusses ancient rhetorical parody in a recent reference work on rhetoric.¹⁰⁹ He begins his general definition of “Parodie” by stressing the literary nature of parody, which he understands as “Der intertextuelle Bezug eines Textes auf Einzeltexte oder textübergreifende, Merkmahl ganzer Textklassen” (“the

---

¹⁰⁸ See 1.1 above.
intertextual reference of a text to a particular text or a general textual characteristic feature of a whole textual genre”). He considers an intertextual reference to be parodic if certain conditions are met. First, “die Vorlage in augenfälliger Weise imitiert wird” (“the Vorlage is imitated in an obvious way”). Second, “und die imitierende Text ausserdem an sich komisch ist und/oder durch den Bezug auf die Vorlage eine satirische Funktion hat” (“and the imitating text in addition is actually amusing and/or by the reference to the Vorlage has a satirical function”) Third, “die Komisierung beruht im wesentlichen auf einer Verletzung des aptum durch Inkongruenz und/oder Übertreibung” (“the satirical function must be based essentially upon a violation of appropriateness through incongruity and/or exaggeration.”)

His first requirement is a constant factor in all forms of parody. The original text must be recognizable. His second requirement demonstrates that parody may conceptually encompass a wide range of options, and Stocker refuses to define the concept in its narrowest sense. Therefore, parody can be merely amusing or it can have a satirical function in the sense that it seeks to correct some error or vice. Especially important for this discussion is Stocker’s use of the Latin term, aptus, in his statement describing the possible satirical function of parody: “Verletzung des aptum durch (A) Inkongruenz und/oder (B) Übertreibung.” By using the technical Latin term, Stocker is making a specific reference to the rhetorical principle of “fitness” or “appropriateness of

---

a discourse” for a particular situation encountered by an orator. Therefore, Stocker is highlighting the rhetorical nature of parody in the section of his article in which he defines the basic concept; however, he is also noting that parody is a departure from what one would normally expect, though that departure could be characterized either by incongruity or exaggeration.

Within his historical overview of parody, Stocker notes that the ancient form of parody should be viewed separately from its post-Renaissance counterpart, which was defined by Scaliger as the singing of a song in which the words were so changed that the sense of the original was made into something ridiculous. Since a discussion of Paul’s possible use of parody in Galatians should approach the subject on the basis of the ancient, rather than the post-Renaissance, definition of the term, we need to follow Stocker’s lead and attempt to define ancient parody, as we have repeatedly insisted, in a way that does not allow the post-Renaissance connotation of ridiculousness or absurdity to cloud our understanding of the ancient use of the rhetorical device.

Thus, Stocker points out that by the time of Aristotle parody was recognized as a textual term referring to a “deviating quotation style” and that it was connected to poetry and rhetoric since ancient orators frequently parodied lines of poetry. But by the time of Quintilian the term was used for words drawn from non-poetic texts. Therefore, the ancient conception of parody, as a term that referred to an altered quotation of a poetic

111 See Lewis and Short, 138 and Cicero, De or. 3.55.210-12.
112 “Parodie,” 6:642.
113 Note that Quintilian (Inst. 9.2.35) mentioned both verse and prose. See 1.1 above for the quotation.
text, appears to have broadened sufficiently by the first century C.E. to include the altered quotation of any well-known text. Stocker’s assessment is in line with Quintilian’s statements in *Inst.* 9.2.34-35 that were discussed above. My only disagreement with Stocker on this point is that he seems to imply that Quintilian equated parody with *imitatio*, as a technical term.\textsuperscript{114} While Quintilian certainly stressed the imitative nature of parody and his description of parody could be classified as a form of *imitatio*, his separate discussion of *imitatio* included much more than parody.\textsuperscript{115}

As mentioned earlier,\textsuperscript{116} *KlPauly* does not include an entry for παρῳδή, but the older work upon which it was based does discuss rhetorical parody under its listing for “Parodos.” Although the combined entry for παρῳδός and πάροδος under “Parodos” does seem inappropriate, Paul Maas presents an overview of παρῳδός as a “writer of Homeric parodies,” and he traces the history of parody, noting its original place in Greek Old Comedy. However, at the conclusion of his article, he points the reader to the entries under “Cento,” “Paratragödie,” and “Silloi” for a wider understanding of the concept of parody, and, most important for my investigation, he notes that παρῳδία was used as a rhetorical term. Maas maintains that παρῳδία is correctly understood as standing in contrast to κόλλησις, which he defines as an “unaltered quotation.”\textsuperscript{117} In support of his

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{115} For Quintilian’s understanding of *imitatio*, see *Inst.* 10.2.1-28, especially his statement: *Imitatio autem (nam saepius idem dicam) non sit tantum in verbis* (“*Imitatio* furthermore [I will often say the same] may not be only in words”), here 10.2.27.

\textsuperscript{116} See n.99 above.

\textsuperscript{117} PW (1949), “Parodos (παρῳδός),” 18.4:1684-86.
understanding of rhetorical parody, Maas cites Hermogenes’ reference to \( \pi\alpha\rho\varphi\delta\acute{\imath}\alpha \) in \textit{Meth.} 30, which we have discussed above. Therefore, Maas’s understanding of the contrast between \( \kappa\acute{\omicron}\lambda\lambda\eta\sigma\varsigma \), an unaltered quotation within a speech, and, \( \pi\alpha\rho\varphi\delta\acute{\imath}\alpha \), a rhetorical term that described an altered quotation, is an accurate one based on Hermogenes’ description of \( \pi\alpha\rho\varphi\delta\acute{\imath}\alpha \) and the additional evidence from Quintilian that ancient forms of parody, although referred to as \( \pi\alpha\rho\varphi\delta\eta \), could include the altering of well-known words for rhetorical effect.

But even though Maas’s understanding is the correct one based on the ancient evidence, more recent scholarship seems to have ignored this fact. For example, George Kennedy makes the following comment regarding the definition of \( \pi\alpha\rho\varphi\delta\acute{\imath}\alpha \) in \textit{Meth.} 30: “Another unusual usage; the word means ‘parody’ as below in ch. 34.”\textsuperscript{118} Kennedy refers to “another unusual usage” because he feels that a lack of cohesiveness in the treatise may be the result of later editing, or even the result of a later editor adding the last chapters from other sources. He even points to this “unusual” definition of \( \pi\alpha\rho\varphi\delta\acute{\imath}\alpha \) as a contributing factor in his assessment of the unity of the treatise.\textsuperscript{119}

However, the definition of \( \pi\alpha\rho\varphi\delta\acute{\imath}\alpha \) given in \textit{Meth.} 30 is not an “unusual use of the term” as long as we understand that one form of ancient parody was the witty alteration of a quotation for a polemical and subversive effect. Support for this position can be found within the text of \textit{Meth.}. In \textit{Meth.} 30, Hermogenes explicitly stated that his

\textsuperscript{118} Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises From the Hermogenic Corpus (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 255, n.61.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 203.
topic for the section was Περὶ χρήσεως ἐπὶ ὤν ἐπὶ ἤγο τὸ λόγο. Considering that the
definition of παρῳδία that he presents within this chapter fits quite appropriately within a
discussion of “the use of verses in prose,” it seems that our best opinion is to realize that
one of the definitions of ancient parody was the rhetorical use of an altered quotation,
rather than categorically to dismiss Hermogenes’ definition of παρῳδία in Meth. 30 as “as
an unusual use of the term.” It is my opinion that the reluctance of modern scholars, such
as Kennedy, to recognize that ancient parody could take the form of an altered quotation
has more to do with the post-Renaissance understanding of “parody” as denoting
ridiculousness than it does with the definition of the rhetorical term in ancient sources,
especially considering that there is some similarity between Quintilian’s παρῳδή and
Hermogenes’ παρῳδία.

Although the above-mentioned sources seem to be the only relatively recent
handbooks and encyclopedias that present a definition of ancient parody, there is one
eighteen-century source, Ernesti’s Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae, that
defines parody in terms of its ancient varieties. Ernesti begins his definition of παρῳδία
with the same example from Hermogenes mentioned above, describing the term as the
“adaptation of a previously recited line from a certain poet” that an orator utilizes within
his ordinary speech in such a way that the process could be described as “stitching
together” a portion of the “song” with the “prose that follows.”  

But, for Ernesti, “there is another kind of parody” in which an orator mispronounces or changes a single word in a quotation in order to produce a comic effect. For this type of parody, Ernesti cites Hermogenes’ second description of παρωδία (Meth. 34). And, according to Ernesti, Joannes Tzetzes, a twelfth-century grammarian, referred to this type of parody as παραγγαματικισμός, noting that, from Hermogenes, we learn that what is in a word can “far exceed the thing itself.”  

He then quotes Quintilian, stating: Adiuvant urbanitatem et versus, ficti novis versibus similies, quae παρωδία (“And verse contributes to urbanity/wit, lines can be made like well-known ones, which is called παρωδία.” Both Quintilian and Hermogenes do refer to this type of parody.

As mentioned above, for Quintilian, παρωδή was an orator’s wordplay on a written document that had been previously submitted by an opponent. Therefore, παρωδή was understood as a form of προσωπολόγια that did not inherently connote contempt for the hypotext even though the imitative wordplay did ridicule one’s opponent via subversive humor. Ernesti makes no reference to Quintilian’s description of παρωδή within his listing for παρωδία even though he includes Hermogenes’ definition of


121 Ibid.

122 Ernesti cites Inst. 6.3.97; however, he either had a different version of the text than that presented in LCL or he has conflated 6.3.96 and 97 in his quotation of Quintilian’s definition of παρωδία. Unless, specifically noted, I have based my discussion of Quintilian’s text on the Greek text presented in Quintilian, The Orator’s Education, Books 1-12 (trans. Donald A. Russell; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).
that describes a similar process of altering a well-known text in order to counter an opponent’s argument. I can only assume that Ernesti restricted his listing for παρωθία to those sources that used the same Greek word even though he included both types of parody, the altered quotation and the urbane witticism, in his discussion. In Ernesti’s entry for παρωθία, we see that his inclusion of Quintilian’s definition of παρωθία as a way that an orator could use laughter or wit to strengthen an argument is a further discussion of the same understanding of παρωθία that Hermogenes used in Meth. 34.

Therefore, just as with our review of the primary texts, Lausberg, Stocker, Maas, and Ernesti note that rhetorical parody is a method of argumentation in which an orator takes up a well-known saying or previously submitted document and alters the wording of the saying or document in order to use it against the opponent. Additionally, their investigations of rhetorical parody indicate that they interpret the ancient sources as describing two forms of parody, which we described above. With the exception of the brief reference to Scaliger by Stocker,123 there is no discussion of ancient rhetorical parody as inherently characterized by buffoonery or absurdity.

1.4 Lexical Definitions of Ancient Parody

The short entry for παρωθεω and its cognates in LSJ goes a long way in explaining

the association of parody with burlesque.\textsuperscript{124} Although the verb is defined in a neutral way, “write by way of parody,” several of the entries for the cognates include the word “burlesque” in their definitions. For παρωδή LSJ makes reference to Quintilian, \textit{Inst.} 9.2.35; however, no discussion of abusive imitation is presented. Rather, LSJ merely equates παρωδή and παρωδία without mentioning any further characteristics. Παρωδία is then defined as “burlesque, parody,” and the references listed are from Aristotle and Athenaeus.\textsuperscript{125} Aristotle and Athenaeus do refer to the theatrical parody that was typical of Greek comedies and was ludicrous, risqué, and vulgar, thus, making the term “burlesque” quite appropriate for this type of παρωδία as it originally existed in Old Greek Comedy.\textsuperscript{126} LSJ does include an entry for the adjective παρωδός,\textsuperscript{127} which lists one passage in Euripides (\textit{Iph. aul} 1147) that employs the word. It is defined as: “singing indirectly, obscurely hinting;” however, the entry equates παρωδός with ἄινγα and notes that the connotation of the word is “darkly” as in “dark riddles.” While LSJ’s first definition of the adjective could very likely refer to the rhetorical use of the term, the lexicon obscures the meaning of the word by describing it as synonymous with “dark riddles.” What is even more interesting is that BDAG does list two meanings for

\textsuperscript{124} “παρωδέω,” 1344.
\textsuperscript{125} LSJ cites Aristotle, \textit{Poet.} 1448a.12-13, in which Aristotle notes that the first writer of parodies was Hegemon of Thasos, and Athenaeus, \textit{Deipn.} 15.698b, in which Athenaeus discusses the many writers of parodies and explains that parody was employed in Old Comedy.
\textsuperscript{126} Aristotle further describes the obscene and scurrilous use of songs in tragedy and describes laughter “as a part of the shameful” in his discussion of comedy (\textit{Poet.} 1449a).
\textsuperscript{127} “παρωδός,” 1344.
The first is as LSJ defines it; however, the second definition is extremely close to Quintilian’s rhetorical definition of παροδή. BDAG defines this connotation as an “indirect mode of communication” that carries the idiomatic meaning of “indirectly.”

The only other citation from a rhetorical source in the entry is from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Dem. 54) in which LSJ correctly defines παροδικός as “burlesque.” So, LSJ accurately represents parody as a form of burlesque that was typical in Greek comedy; however, there is not mention of the imitation of an opponent’s document that is played upon abusively. And unless one is assiduous enough to notice that a supplemental entry exists for παροδός, there is apparently no clear and unmistakable description in the standard Greek lexicon for the rhetorical type of parody that the rhetoricians, discussed above, applied to the cognate group.

However, the supplement also includes an entry for παρόδης, which states: “defined as ὅταν ὁ ῥήτωρ κύλον ἄρχειον τίθησι καὶ χωρίον ἐαυτοῦ i.e., when the rhetor quotes a passage of classical literature and adds his own continuation.” LSJ cites a scholium on On Rhetoric by Aristides (462 D), a second-century C.E. rhetor, as the source for the definition. So, although this interpretation by the scholiast is slightly

---

128 “αἰνιγμα,” 27.
129 Although παροδικός is an adjective and it appears that LSJ has incorrectly offered a nominal form as a definition, in actually “burlesque” can also be used as an adjective. In discussing the superior method of delivery that Demosthenes possessed, Dionysius asks in relation to the orator’s words concerning the campaigns of Philip, “Is it possible for these things to be said in pleasure in parodic songs as history?” Dionysius’ point is that the subject was too serious for the burlesque nature of parody.
130 LSJSup, “παροδός,” 243.
131 LSJSup, “παρόδης,” 243.
different from the rhetorical definitions of parody mentioned above, LSJSup does include an acknowledgment that παρῳδός was employed in rhetoric and that παρῳδήσις was a technical rhetorical term, at least by the time of the scholiast, if not by the second century C.E. Additionally, the definition of παρῳδήσις does not describe anything that could be considered burlesque or risqué.

The entry for παρῳδέω in PGL follows a similar line of thought. Two possible definitions are given, but neither is associated with humor or burlesque. First, παρῳδέω is defined as to “cite with alteration,” and the words of Gregory of Nyssa (Eun 2.270.24) are quoted: εἴπωμεν τὸ τοῦ προφήτου μικρὸν παρῳδήσαντες. (“let us speak parodying the prophet a little”). The second definition is to “express figuratively” (cat.Lc.22:44).

Although there is not an entry for parōidia in the OLD, Lewis and Short define the term as “a reply returning nearly the same words or the same turn, a parody” for which they reference Cicero (Verr. 1.10.29). While this passage from Cicero does quote a line from the poet, Naevius, the word “parody” is not specifically used by Cicero. However, a note in the commentary on the Verrine Orations by Pseudo-Asconsius claims that Cicero is parodying (de qua parodia Cicero dixit) the poet in Verr. 1.10.29. Apparently, Lewis and Short agree with Pseudo-Asconsius’s notation since they cite it in support of their definition.

132 “παρῳδέω,” 1046.
So while the main entries in LSJ are dominated by the interpretation of parody as a form of burlesque, the rhetorical use of the term does not seem to carry that type of connotation, at least from Cicero through the scholiast’s entry for a second-century C.E. rhetor. Neither do we find any reference to a risqué meaning for the patristic entries. In light of the supplemental entry in LSJ, it seems safe to conclude that although one of the meanings of “parody” did describe the risqué and burlesque style that typified Greek Comedy, the term was certainly not limited to this usage. Parody was also a rhetorical term referring to an altered quotation that was used in argumentation. Although rhetorical parody was comedic in the sense that it wryly altered and employed an opponent’s document or quotation for one’s own advantage, it did not describe buffoonery or the risqué type of humor present in Greek Old Comedy.

1.5 A Working Definition of Ancient Rhetorical Parody

It is important to remember that we are presenting a proposed definition for ancient rhetorical parody. As such, this definition will not accurately describe other forms of ancient parody, even those that were contemporary with Paul, e.g., the theatrical parody portrayed by Philo (Flacc. 36-40). Although Philo’s depiction of a buffoon dressed up and paraded in mockery of Agrippa is concrete evidence that the type of parody Quintilian spurned, that connected with the stage, was a popular form of entertainment in the first century, this type of ψευδόπολίτα stands in stark contrast to the urbane wit of the orator. First, parody should be understood as either an altered quotation of a recognizable text or saying or a newly created saying that closely resembles and
imitates a recognizable one. Second, parody should be understood as a stylistic rhetorical device that is classified under προσωποποιία, which is an emotive figure,\textsuperscript{133} and adds vividness and persuasiveness to an argument by way of incongruity. In an effort to persuade an audience, this recognizable text or saying is imitated, transformed, and given a new meaning that may be quite incongruous with its original meaning. Rhetorical parody can be satirical with the intent to correct some error or vice; it can also be ironical, or even polemical.

From the discussion above, it is obvious that by the first century C.E. rhetorical parody was the practice of making up or altering an existing saying or text. While rhetorical parody entailed imitation of the hypotext, its purpose was to counter an opponent’s claim and gain the advantage in a dispute. A burlesque connotation is clearly rejected. Rather, as Quintilian indicated, rhetorical parody was a form of refined witticism and was a part of the everyday conversation of the educated. Therefore, while rhetorical parody was practiced by orators, it was also part of the everyday conversation of the literate portion of society.

As both Genette and Quintilian note, parody, in the terminology of rhetoric, should be understood as a figure of thought or discourse, and as such it is a “departure from the simple ways of making a statement” (Inst. 9.2.1). It should also be understood as a type of προσωποποιία, designed to add intensity to an argument by way of exaggeration,

---

\textsuperscript{133} Quintilian, Inst. 9.2.26.
surprise, emphasis, or making a statement that secretly stings (*Eloc.* 260). While rhetorical parody could be understood to be a type of paraphrase, it is more than paraphrase since it transforms the hypotext. As mentioned above, rhetorical parody’s transformational function could be satirical, playful, serious, ironic, polemical, or humorous.

With this understanding of first-century rhetorical parody, we can begin to investigate Paul’s altered quotations of Scripture in Galatians. However, in an effort to further clarify our proposal that Paul employs rhetorical parody in an emotional effort to convince the Galatians of the truth of his gospel, as opposed to the “pseudo-gospel” advocated by those who were troubling the Galatians, we need to justify our use of the term “parody” as the best possible term by which to describe Paul’s rhetorical method in scriptural quotations. Considering the number of discussions that center on Paul’s use of irony, we need to delineate the reasons that justify our choice of parody, rather than irony, to describe Paul’s scriptural quotations in Galatians.

First, this chapter has emphasized the intertextual nature of rhetorical parody, whether that intertextuality is based on an original text or an original saying. In parody, the parodied subject must be recognizable to the audience in order to produce the required incongruity. Since we will be discussing Paul’s parody of Scripture in Galatians, the intertextual basis for Paul’s altered quotations is, of course, a Greek text of the

---

Scriptures. Although Paul’s parody of these Scriptures may well be ironic and/or polemical, his altered quotations are just that – altered quotations. And the fact that Paul’s scriptural quotations are *transformed quotations* is the main reason why *παραφύβλι* is a more accurate description than *εἰρωνεία* for Paul’s method of argumentation in Galatians via Scripture.

The primary sources and other discussions of parody that were mentioned above all stressed that parody alters and *transforms* an existing saying or text. In contrast, as mentioned above, irony can be a statement that means “something different from what one says.” But there is no requirement that irony be based on any existing saying or text. Therefore, as Rose indicates, irony has only one code. Returning to Lausberg’s rhetorical handbook, it is obvious from his descriptions of *ironia* or *εἰρωνεία* that although the rhetorical device can be classified as a figure, or as the *contrarium* level of metaphor, or as a sub-category of *allegoria*, there is never any requirement that irony, in any of these uses, must be *based on a well-known saying or text that serves as a hypotext*. In fact, there is no ancient source that indicates any such requirement for irony. Therefore, although Paul most likely makes the most of irony in Galatians, parody is a much more precise rhetorical term for Paul’s imitation and alteration of scriptural passages in the letter, especially since his scriptural quotations were apparently intended

135 Quintilian describes irony as a form of allegory in which the opposite of what is intended is said (*Inst.* 8.54-56).

136 Lausberg, §§582, 896, 902-4.
to add a polemical element to his argument and were definitely transformed and given a new, and sometimes shocking meaning, in the context of his letter.
2. Historical Overview of Select Rhetorical Studies on Galatians

Although the majority of commentators presently disagree with Hans Dieter Betz’s proposal that Galatians should be classified as an apologetic letter in which “the addresses are identical with the jury,” Paul is “the defendant, and his opponents the accusers,”¹ most note the importance of Betz’s commentary in initiating an increased interest in studying the letter in light of the characteristic components of Greco-Roman rhetoric.² The increased interest in rhetorical criticism has also raised the question of


² Ben Witherington’s reference (Grace in Galatia: A commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Galatians [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], xi) to Betz’s work is characteristic of such notations: “Since H. D. Betz’s landmark commentary on Galatians in 1979, this document more than any other NT document has been subject to rhetorical analyses of various sorts and with varying degrees of success.” Additionally, C. Joachim Classen (“St. Paul’s Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric,” in Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference [ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; JSNTSup 90; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1993], 265-91, here 265) acknowledges the importance of Betz’s work including his lecture at the 29th General Meeting of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas in August,
whether or not earlier commentators, especially ones from the patristic age, noted that Paul employed rhetorical features in Galatians. Additionally, the rhetorical study of Galatians has produced several related discussions including: 1) the relationship, if any, that existed between epistolary theory as it was commonly practiced in the Greco-Roman world and rhetorical theory as it was presented in the ancient handbooks, 2) the extent, if any, of Paul’s formal knowledge of rhetoric as a discipline, and 3) the exegetical value of rhetorical analysis for understanding Paul’s letter. This chapter will present a brief history of the rhetorical study of Galatians and will review how contemporary scholarship has attempted to deal with the related issues.

2.1 Paul’s Rhetoric in Galatians According to Patristic Writers

Many recent studies on Galatians have assessed the patristic view of Paul’s writing style solely on the basis of general statements made by patristic exegetes who described the vulgar writing style exhibited within the New Testament as a whole. Although the most ancient forms of exegesis stressed the unity of Scripture, the best

---


4 See, e.g., R. Dean Anderson, Jr., Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul (rev. ed.; CBET 18; Leuven: Peeters, 1998) and the works mentioned in the previous note.

5 See e.g., Kern, 170-72.
manner in which to make an accurate assessment of patristic opinions concerning Paul’s rhetorical abilities is to assess whether patristic statements concerning the lack of stylistic quality are specifically referring to Paul’s epistles or are referring mainly to the gospels or to the New Testament in general. Additionally, any study of patristic criticisms of pagan philosophy and rhetorical practices should distinguish between, on the one hand, comments applicable only to rhetorical practices and philosophical knowledge that sought to deceive an unsuspecting public and, on the other, comments that condemn all types of persuasive rhetorical methods.

Since the Apostolic Fathers do not discuss the writing style of the New Testament texts or the rhetorical quality of Christian preaching, two early representative assessments that are important for our study are those of John Chrysostom and Augustine. Since both Chrysostom and Augustine were trained rhetoricians who respected the spiritual value of Paul’s letters and sought to use their rhetorical skills in an edifying manner for the church, they are valid assessors of Paul’s rhetorical abilities. And regarding Chrysostom, Margaret M. Mitchell notes: “His abundant comments on Paul’s rhetorical proficiency and crudities are of paramount importance for current research into

---

6 Although 2 Clem. 13.3 might be considered as an exception, it seems best to interpret τὰ ἐθνῶν γὰρ ἀκούσων τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμαρτίας καὶ μεγάλα ἔρμαζει (“For when the nations hear the sayings of God from our mouths they are amazed at their beauty and greatness”) within the context of the homily’s insistence that the congregation’s actions be consistent with its speech. Therefore, the “beauty and greatness” of the command to love one’s enemies, which the author of 2 Clement quotes as an example of the sayings heard by those outside the congregation, should be attributed to God as the author of the message rather than to human skill in speaking the words. All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.
the rhetoric of Paul’s epistles.” One of the most interesting assessments of Paul’s rhetorical abilities and writing style is found in John Chrysostom’s On the Priesthood. Along with general advice for priests, Chrysostom stresses the importance of speech in confronting theological heresies and the great need for those responsible for teaching correct doctrine to develop skill in powerful speaking. The work evinces Chrysostom’s own talents as a skilled rhetor. Chrysostom’s assessment of Paul’s rhetorical ability occurs when he responds to Basil’s objection that eloquent rhetoric did not seem to be important to Paul since the Apostle confessed that he was inexpert in speaking when he wrote to the Corinthians (2 Cor 11:6). Chrysostom counters this objection by first

---


8 John Chrysostom, Sac. 4.5-7 (PG 48.668-72). Mitchell (Trumpet, 283) notes that the work was composed early in Chrysostom’s ministry at Antioch, most likely ca. 392.

9 A laudatory view of Chrysostom’s writing style in comparison with that of Gregory of Nazianzus is presented by Graham Neville, Saint John Chrysostom: Six Books on the Priesthood (London: SPCK, 1964), 14. Neville comments: “Chrysostom, on the other hand, has a style branded with the imprint of the schools of rhetoric. His sentences are often elaborately constructed, far more syntactical than Gregory’s, and loaded with internal contrasts and verbal duplication.”

10 Sac. 4.5 (PG 48.668). Basil phrased his objection as a question: Τί οὖν Παύλος, φησίν, οὐκ ἐποίησε οὕτως καταρθωθῆναι τὴν ἁρετὴν, οὐκ ἐγκαλύπτεται ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ λόγου πενίᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαφθόνη ὠμολογεῖ ἴδιωτην ἑαυτὸν εἶναι, καὶ ταύτα Κορινθίους ἐπισέλλω, τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ λέγειν θαμαζόμενοις, καὶ μέγα ἐπὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖοι; (“Why then did Paul say he was not eager to accomplish successfully this virtue nor did he conceal the poverty of his speech, but he even explicitly confesses to be inexpert himself, even writing these things to the Corinthians who were admired for their speech and took great pride in it?”) The identity of Basil is unclear; however, the majority of scholars maintain that this Basil should be understood as Basil, the Bishop of Raphanea, who participated in the Council of Constantinople in 381. For a discussion of the possible theories of Basil’s identity, see W. A. Jurgens, The Priesthood: A Translation of the PERI HIEROSYNES of St. John Chrysostom (New York: MacMillan, 1955), ix-x. Interestingly, Reinhart Staats (“Chrysostomus über Die Rhetorik des Apostels Paulus,” VC 46 [1992]: 225-40) proposes that Basil is a fictitious character who represents a group of ascetics who were, at the time, still within the pales of the Church. Staats views the conversation between “Basil” and Chrysostom as an attempt to deal with the early stages of the Messalian controversy. The Messalians were condemned as heretics at the Council of Ephesus in 431 C.E. However, Staats maintains that the Messalians should more accurately be described as “pietists” rather than “heretics” (226). Mitchell (Trumpet, 283) believes that those who
noting that those who assume that Paul actually meant that he was inexpert in speaking
when he said εἰ δὲ καὶ ἴδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῇ γνώσει (“now even if [I am]
inexpert in speech, certainly [I am] not in knowledge”) are not able ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσας τῶν ἀποστολικῶν φρενῶν τὸ βάθος, μηδὲ συνιέναι τὴν τῶν ῥημάτων διάνοιαν (“to examine accurately the depth of the apostle’s thinking nor to understand the meaning of the
words”).

But in order to address those who believed that Paul’s statement should be taken
at face value, Chrysostom begins by stating:

ἀλλ’ οὗτος μὲν ἡμᾶς εἰς καριῶν ὁ λόγος ἀναμενεῖ, τέως δὲ ἐκεῖνο φησὶ· θῶμεν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἱδιωτὴν τούτο τὸ μέρος, ὥσπερ αὐτοὶ βουλοῦνται· τί οὖν τούτο πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς νῦν· Ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ εἶχεν ἰσχὺν πολλῷ τοῦ λόγου μείζονα καὶ πλείονα δυναμείην κατορθοῦν.

But let this saying wait for us for a time while I say this; Let us suppose that he
was inexpert in this matter, the very thing that they desire. What, therefore, does
this have to do with these men now? For he had a strength much greater than
speech and was more capable of setting things right.

Therefore, Chrysostom proposes that, if Paul actually were lacking in rhetorical abilities,
the powerful effect of Paul’s preaching must be understood as a demonstration of the
power of God. Additionally, Chrysostom points out that the demonstration of God’s
power that was evident in Paul’s ministry included not only the powerful effects of his

appealed to “Paul’s lack of rhetorical skill” did so “to excuse their own poor education and unwillingness to
learn.”

11 Sac. 4.6 (PG 48.668).
12 Ibid., 4.6 (PG 48.669).
preaching, but also a list of miracles that Paul performed. However, at the end of this discussion, Chrysostom comments:

'Alla gar ouk oida pws ton andra proikhthn idrizein. Ta gar katatheta mata autou pantα meν υπερβαινει λογον, ton de hemeteron tosootou, osou kai hemas oi legein eidoites.13

But I do not know how I was induced to insult the man. For while all of his accomplishments surpass speech, and as well [his accomplishments] so far [surpass] our [speech] even as much as the ones knowing how to speak [surpass] us.

The above quotation is important in understanding Chrysostom’s views on Paul’s rhetorical abilities. Although Chrysostom had received a formal education in rhetoric and his great rhetorical skills resulted in his surname “golden mouth,” he compared himself unfavorably to those who were professional orators by making a distinction between hemas and oi legein eidoites. Taken at face value, Chrysostom’s words would mean that he also was idiothē τω λόγῳ even though he, earlier in this same text, referred to his previous occupation as a lawyer who spent his time in the law courts.14 After comparing himself unfavorably with professional orators, he then returns to a discussion of 2 Cor 11:6, in which he reasons that even if Paul were unskilled in rhetoric, he had knowledge in terms of correct doctrine, which Chrysostom referred to as “the crown of eulogies”:

'Emo de ei men tin leiotēta Ios克拉托ς aπητου, kai ton Dhmosehνon ὄγκον, kai tin θουκυδίδου σεμνότητα, kai to Plátωnος ύψος, ἔδει φέρειν ἕις μέσου ταύτην τοῦ Παύλου τὴν μαρτυρίαν· νῦν δὲ ἐκείνα μὲν πάντα ἀφῆμι καὶ τὸν περιεργὸν τῶν ἐξωθεὶν καλλωπισμόν, καὶ οὐδὲν μοι φράσεως οὐδὲ ἀπαγγελίας μέλει. 'All ἔξεστοι καὶ τῇ λέξει πτωχεῖν, καὶ τὴν συνθήκην τῶν ὀνομάτων

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., 1.3 (PG 48.643).
Now if I were demanding the smoothness of Isocrates, and the sublimity of Demosthenes and the height of Plato, it would be necessary to bear this witness of Paul among them. But now I let pass all those things and the superfluous ornamentation of the pagans, and nothing about enunciation or recital is a concern to me. On the contrary, let it even be permitted to be poor in style and someone’s composition of phrases to be simple and plain, only do not let anyone be inexpert in knowledge and in the accuracy of the doctrines; and do not let anyone, in order that he may cover up his own laziness, take away from that blessed one the greatest of treasures, namely the crown of the eulogies.

According to Chrysostom, maintaining correct doctrine is of the utmost importance in Christian discourse. For this reason, he stresses the distinction that Paul made between λόγος (“speaking”) and γνώσις (“knowledge”). However, Chrysostom, at the same time, clearly values oratorical skills and assumes that the development of such skills is the duty of priests. Chrysostom’s choice of historical figures in the above quotation is quite interesting since he includes two of the greatest Greek orators, a noted historian, and a renowned philosopher. Although he could have chosen these figures because they represented the highest levels of the three recognized “genres of literary

---

15 Sac. 4.6 (PG 48.669).
16 Approximate dates are: Isocrates (436-338 B.C.E.), Demosthenes (384-322 B.C.E.), Thucydides (fifth century B.C.E.), and Plato (c. 429-347 B.C.E.). For more information on each of these individuals, see The Oxford Classical Dictionary (ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth; 3d ed. rev; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
17 Here, Chrysostom uses γνώσις to refer to “knowledge of God” or “Christian doctrine.” See “γνώσις,” PGL, 318-19.
prose,” which were “oratory, historiography, and philosophy,” one would have to question why two orators are mentioned. It seems likely that Chrysostom chose the four individuals in order not only to compare Paul to those who were recognized leaders in each of the three genres of prose, but also to compare Paul to orators who represented different styles in classical rhetoric. Isocrates emphasized, according to George Kennedy, “written rather than spoken discourse, epideictic rather than deliberative or judicial speech, style rather than argument, amplification and smoothness rather than forcefulness.”

Dionysius of Halicarnassus also characterized Isocrates’ style as one that displayed “smoothness” when he described his oratory as: ἐν δὲ τῇ συνθέσει τῶν ὀνομάτων τὸ λείων ἐκεῖνο καὶ εὐπρεπές ἔχων (“having that smoothness and majesty in the composition of expressions”).

On the other hand, Demosthenes was known not only for publishing his “deliberative speeches, which could then be read and could continue to influence public policy,” but also for the forcefulness of his speeches. By choosing to compare Paul to both the master of smoothness and the master of forcefulness, Chrysostom is setting Paul’s rhetorical abilities in contrast to the highest standards in diverse styles of classical oratory.

---

19 Ibid., 49.
Therefore, Chrysostom candidly acknowledges that Paul’s abilities pale in comparison to the finest of Greek orators. However, the above quotation does not degrade Paul’s rhetorical abilities in any manner. In fact, when Chrysostom’s actual words are studied closely, it is evident that he does not actually state that he considers Paul’s style to be poor or Paul’s composition to be plain and simple. Rather, Chrysostom is acknowledging that a poor style and plain and simple compositions are permitted, but it is not permissible for a priest to be ἰδιωτής in either knowledge or doctrine. And, importantly, Chrysostom immediately goes on to explain that before Paul performed any miracles he obtained results because of his rhetorical abilities. Among the numerous examples presented to demonstrate the power of Paul’s oration, Chrysostom notes Paul’s discourse during the incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11-16) and asks:

Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἰουδαῖζειν ἐπιχειροῦντας ἐν Ἄντιοχείᾳ πόθεν ἠγουνίζετο καὶ συνεζήτητε;?

How did he contend and dispute with the ones attempting to live as Jews in Antioch?

Having already established that Paul ἐνταῦθα . . . οὐδὲν τοῦ θαυματουργεῖν ἠξέχασε, ("at that very time . . . had not yet begun to work miracles"), Chrysostom sums up his list of examples evincing Paul’s rhetorical abilities by confirming that the results Paul obtained

---

22 Mitchell (Trumpet, 287) notes the astute manner in which Chrysostom adopts the position of his opponents in order to make his point.

23 Sac. 4.7 (PG 48.669). Chrysostom phrases this as a rhetorical question: οὐκ ἐπειδὴ κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκη τὸ λέγοντα ("Was it not because in relation to force [he was] unique in speech?").

24 Ibid.
Next, Chrysostom presents examples of Paul's rhetoric after he began to perform miracles and asks:

"Ὅταν οὖν καὶ πρὸ τῶν σημείων καὶ ἐν μέσοις αὐτοῖς φαίνεται πολλῷ κεχρημένος τῷ λόγῳ, πῶς ἔτι τολμήσουσιν ἰδιώτην εἶπείν τὸν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι καὶ δημηγορεῖν μάλιστα θαυμασθέντα παρὰ πάσιν;"

When, therefore, he seemed to many to have been endowed with the ability for oration, both before his miracles and while he was performing them, how dare they still call him inexpert – indeed the person who was most greatly admired by all because of his discourses and public speeches?

Chrysostom further praises Paul's rhetorical abilities by noting that Paul is referred to as Hermes in Acts 14:12:

Διὰ τί γὰρ Λυκαόνες αὐτὸν ὑπέλαβον ἐίναι Ἕρμην; Τὸ μὲν γὰρ θεοὺς αὐτοὺς νομισθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων ἐγένετο, τὸ δὲ τούτον Ἕρμην, οὐκ ἔτι ἀπ’ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου.

For why did the Lycaonians suppose him to be Hermes? To be sure, they [Paul and Barnabas] were believed to be gods because of the miracles. But the idea that Paul was Hermes did not occur because of those [miracles], but because of [Paul's] oration.

Chrysostom's point is clarified when it is recognized that Hermes was frequently viewed as the patron of orators, a role that was well documented by ancient authors.

---

25 Ibid. Since Chrysostom is praising Paul’s rhetorical abilities, the negative meaning of δημηγορία as "claptrap" or "idle talk" is precluded by the context, and, therefore, the positive sense of the word as "oration" or "public speech" is implied. However, it is also possible that Chrysostom intends δημηγορία to denote its technical sense of “deliberative rhetoric” as opposed to δικανική (“judicial rhetoric”). See LSJ, “δημηγορία,” 385 and “δημηγορία,” PGL, 341.
26 Sac. 4.7 (PG 48. 670).
27 Ibid.
28 Plutarch (45-120 C.E.), Heraclitus (fl. late first – early second century C.E.), Aelius Aristides (117-180 C.E.), and Iamblichus (c. 245- c. 325 C.E.) record Hermes’s connection with oratory and eloquent speech.
Not only does Chrysostom praise Paul’s rhetorical abilities, but also he refers to the excellent quality of his letters by asking:

Τίνι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπατώλων ἐπεισεκτήσειν ὁ μακάριος οὗτος; καὶ πόθεν ἀνὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἀπασαν πολίς ἐν τοῖς ἀπάντων ἐστὶ στόμασιν; πόθεν οὐ παρ’ ἡμῖν ἡμόν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ Ιουδαίοις καὶ “Ελλησί μᾶλιστα πάντων θαυμάζεται; οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς τὼν ἐπιστολῶν ἀρετῆς . . . ;

And in what way indeed did this blessed one have the advantage over the other apostles? And why thereupon is he often on the lips of everyone in the whole inhabited world? Why is he most admired of all not only by us, but also by Jews and Greeks? Is it not because of the excellence of his epistles . . . ?

In light of Chrysostom’s positive assessment, how should Paul’s admission that he was ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ be understood? It seems best to assume that ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ

Plutarch (Max. princ. 777B) states: ἐνδιάθετος λόγος (“immanent thought”) is ἡγεμόνος Ἑρμοῦ δώρον (“the gift of Hermes, the leader”). The context of Plutarch’s statement is important for the connection of Hermes with speech. Plutarch discusses the philosophical claim that speech should be understood as composed of two conceptual realities, inner thoughts and utterance. Plutarch, however, thinks this overused statement has become ἑωλῶν (“stale”) because it misses the point that inner thoughts and their expression are inherently tied together. Heraclitus (Allegoriae Homericæ 55.1) expresses a similar understanding of Hermes’s role in thought and utterance: Λητοί δὲ ἄνθρωποι Ἑρμῆς, ἐπειδὴ ὁ μὲν οἷον ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος ἐστὶ τῶν ἑνὸν ἐρμηνεύει διάλογον (“Now Hermes has opposed Leto because he [Hermes] is nothing else but speech, the interpreter of inner expressions”). Heraclitus (ibid., 72.4) also states: Ἑρμῆς τοιοῦτος ἐκηγοροῦσιν . . . ὁ ἐμφρων λόγος (“Hermes . . . that is intelligent speech”). Aristides asks in Or. 49: τί καλότει καὶ ῥητορικὴ τῆς Ἑρμοῦ τιθέναι δωρεάς, ἢν γε τῷ διττῷ χρῆ θείαν καλέων καὶ τέχνης κρείττως (“What would prevent rhetoric from being reckoned as a gift of Hermes, precisely a gift that ought to be called divine and greater than art?”). His question defends rhetoric against those who attacked its use on the basis that rhetoric was not an art. In the same work (Or. 53-56), Aristides defends oratory against those who thought that it was a shameful practice by stating, “Hermes attributed” oratory to himself. Additionally, Iamblichus (Myst. 1.1) refers to Hermes as θεὸς ὁ τῶν λόγων ἡγεμόν (“the god in authority over discourse”). For a full discussion of the various roles connected with Hermes, see Madeleine Jost, “Hermes,” in The Oxford Classical Dictionary (ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth; 3d ed. rev; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 690-1.

29 Sac. 4.7 (PG 48.670).
30 The main purpose of this question at this point in the discussion is to determine the most likely meaning of the phrase in relation to Paul’s rhetorical abilities. The fuller, exegetical meaning of the phrase, as it relates to Paul’s argument in 2 Cor, will be discussed in the following chapter.
means that Paul was not a professional orator.\footnote{See LSJ, “ἰδιώτης, III.1,” 819.} There is ample evidence from ancient writers that ἰδιώτης was used to refer to a layperson in contrast to professionals in various occupations, and several of these examples use the term to refer to a layperson in contrast to a professional orator. For example, Isocrates uses the term in this manner in his discussion of τὴν περὶ τοὺς λόγους φιλοσοφίαν (“the philosophy concerning oratory”).\footnote{Paneg. 10. In 380 B.C.E., Isocrates delivered this speech in an effort to inspire Athens to unite with the other Greek states in order to gain their freedom from Persian control. The highly polished nature of the speech was intended to appeal to the noble nature of the Athenians and to convince them that they should not continue to allow themselves to be subjugated by barbarians. See, Isocrates (trans. George Norlin, LCL: Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), 1.xxxi-xxxvi.} He praises an orator who is wise enough to develop great skill in forming highly polished phrases, and he criticizes those who fail to understand the value of such an art when he notes: Καὶ τοις επιτημῶσι τῶν λόγων τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἰδιώτας ἔχουσι καὶ λίαν ἀπηκριμβωμένοις (“And indeed certain ones criticize the speeches that are above laypeople and have been highly polished”).

In addition, Hyperides provides an explicit example in which the term, ἰδιώτης, denotes a layperson in contrast to a professional orator (ῥήτωρ).\footnote{Hyperides lived from 390 until 322 B.C.E. For information about the trial, see Minor Attic Orators (trans. J.O. Burtt; LCL: Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 2.462-63.} In his speech, In Defence of Euxenippus, Hyperides argues that the impeachment charges brought against Euxenippus, a private citizen of Athens, are invalid on the basis that the impeachment law applies only to professional orators (οἱ ῥήτορες) who use their public speaking abilities to convince the public to take an ill-advised action. And Hyperides insists that
the impeachment law does not apply to private citizens (οἱ ἴδιωται).\textsuperscript{34} While these examples from Isocrates and Hyperides are from the fourth century B.C.E., there apparently was not a significant change in this possible connotation of ἴδιωτης over the centuries. Alexander, the son of Numenius, who was a renowned rhetor during the time of Hadrian, stated: έι μὴ ἦν διανόημα τὸ μὲν κατὰ φύσιν, τὸ δὲ ἐσχηματισμένον, οὔτε ἀν τῶν ἴδιωτῶν οἱ ῥήτορες διέφερον οὔτε ἀλλήλων (“If there were no natural thought on the one hand and figured thought on the other hand, orators would be no different than laypeople, nor would they be different from one another”).\textsuperscript{35}

Therefore these three orators, two of them presenting their speeches in the fourth century B.C.E. and the other one writing in the second century C.E., apparently understood that ἴδιωτης could denote a layperson as opposed to a professional orator.

Chrysostom, writing in the fourth century C.E., apparently had no problem admitting that Paul was ἴδιωτης τῷ λόγῳ and yet, at the same time, could praise Paul’s rhetorical skills.

And, just as importantly, Chrysostom, who was renowned for his own rhetorical skills and referred to his pre-ordained occupation as a lawyer successfully using his oratorical skills to argue cases in the courts,\textsuperscript{36} could refer to οἱ λέγειν εἰδότες as having the advantage over his own rhetorical abilities. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that

\textsuperscript{34} Hyperides contrasts ῥήτορες and ἴδιωται in Eux. 4, 9, and 27. For the connotation of “private citizen as opposed to someone who made public speeches in the assembly, see LSJ, “ἵδιωτης,” 819.

\textsuperscript{35} Alexander Numenius, Περὶ σχημάτων 11.31-12.1. The quotation occurs within a subsection of Περὶ σχημάτων in which Alexander defines a figure of thought. The Greek text is from Rhetores Graeci (ed. Leonardus Spengel; Leipzig: Teubner, 1856), 3.11.31- 3.12.1.

\textsuperscript{36} Sac. 1.3 (PG 48.643).
a person who had obtained a rhetorical education, but who was not currently a practicing orator, could be referred to as ἴδιωτης merely because the person was a private citizen or a layperson.

The more important issue is the influence, if any, that Chrysostom’s disagreements with his opponents, those whom he thought wanted Paul to appear “inexpert in speaking,” might have had on his assessment of Paul’s rhetorical abilities as it is recorded in On the Priesthood. In order to be confident that his laudatory view of Paul’s rhetorical abilities was not unduly influenced by the issues that lay behind this particular discussion of 2 Cor 11:6, we need to investigate Chrysostom’s other works in which Paul’s rhetorical skills and writing style are discussed. And any discussion of the patristic assessment of Paul’s rhetoric in Galatians would need to take note of Chrysostom’s commentary on Galatians.

Chrysostom’s homily on 1 Cor 1:10-17 has been presented as evidence that he had a very low view of Paul’s rhetorical abilities and made no distinction between Paul’s educational background and that of the twelve apostles. A closer examination of

---

37 See above for an explanation of the different levels of Greco-Roman education.
38 The historical context may have been a factor in Chrysostom’s positive estimation of Paul’s rhetorical abilities since Chrysostom may have intended this part of his work to oppose those who sought to “cover up their own laziness” by quoting 2 Cor 11:6 or he may have been, as Staats proposes, dissatisfied with the opinions of a group of ascetics within the church. See the above quotation from Sac. 4.6 (PG 48.669) and the discussion of Staats’s theory.
39 Kern, 177-78. Kern sums up his discussion of this homily by stating: “Admittedly, these words describe the apostles as a group, but they appear in Chrysostom’s commentary on Paul’s words in 1 Corinthians in reaction to a debate concerning Paul’s eloquence, and as such apply to him as much as any apostle” (emphases original, ibid., 178). Additionally, Kern quotes Chrysostom’s comparison of Paul to Isocrates, Demosthenes, Thucydides, and Plato (see above) in support of his summation, apparently without realizing
Chrysostom’s homily in the Greek text reveals that a much less pejorative assessment of Paul’s abilities is actually found in Chrysostom’s words. Several times within the homily, Chrysostom credits Paul with using rhetorical means in formulating his argument and in choosing his words and phrases. First, in his discussion of 1 Cor 1:12, Chrysostom claims that when Paul states:

\[
\text{λέγω δὲ τούτο ὅτι ἑκάστος ἴμων λέγει· ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμὶ Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ.}
\]

Now I mean this, that each of you says, “I am of Paul,” or “I am of Apollos,” or I am of Cephas,” or “I am of Christ” he was well aware that the Corinthians had not previously spoken of these particular individuals. Rather, Chrysostom supposes that Paul employed a rhetorical figure in which he named Apollos, Peter, and himself as a type of innuendo for the factions under which the Corinthians had aligned themselves. Chrysostom is quoting Paul when he states:

\[
\text{Ταῦτα δὲ μετασχημάτισα ἐἰς ἑμαυτὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶ ("And I have transferred these things into a figure of speech for myself and Apollos")}.^{40}
\]

This type of transference as a rhetorical figure is well documented by ancient orators. According to Ps.-Demetrius (Eloc. 287-98), it is called ἐσχηματισμόν ψευδός and is a type of circuitous speech that allows the speaker to make a point with a concealed

---

that Chrysostom had quite a lot more to say regarding Paul’s rhetorical abilities in On the Priesthood, most of which we have quoted on the preceding pages.

---

meaning. Transference as a rhetorical figure is especially helpful in situations in which a speaker wants to be tactful or when innuendo is required because the speaker is dealing with powerful people. Rather than directly confronting or insulting a powerful person the speaker would hint at what was really meant. Benjamin Fiore proposes that Paul knew and used this figure of speech in order to help alleviate the factionalism in the churches. Whether or not Paul actually had knowledge of this rhetorical device, the fact that Chrysostom assumes that Paul knows of ἐσχηματισμένο στόχος, as a rhetorical figure, and employs it in his argument indicates that Chrysostom first credits Paul with having the necessary knowledge of the rhetorical figure in order to employ it in 1 Cor. 1:12.

Second, Chrysostom notes that by naming the three individuals Paul is using hyperbole (ὑπερβολή) in an effort not only to ensure that the Corinthians τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὅ γέγραπται φρονεῖν (“do not think above the things that are written”); but also in order to avoid naming the individuals in the churches at Corinth that were behind the factions. And third, Chrysostom holds that Paul purposely placed his own name first in the list of the three because he arranged the names κατὰ αὔξησιν (“according to amplification”). Although the definition of αὔξησις presented by Ps.-Longinus, implies that the term

41 The verb used by Ps.-Demetrius is the same as that employed by Alexander, Περί σχημάτων 11.31-12.1 quoted above.
42 See also Quintilian, Inst. 9.2.67-107.
44 Chrysostom, Hom. 1 Cor. 3.1 (PG 61.24). Ps.-Demetrius also notes that force is produced when an orator combines innuendo and hyperbole. See, Eloc. 282.
45 Chrysostom, Hom. 1 Cor. 3.2 (PG 61.24).
describes the build up of phrases and examples in which each one increases with force,⁴⁶ Chrysostom apparently understands the rhetorical method of αὐξησις to apply also to individuals who are named in order of increasing greatness. In support of Chrysostom’s view, Ps.-Longinus does state: μυρίαι γὰρ ἴδεις τῶν αὐξησεων (“for the types of amplification are myriad”).⁴⁷ However, we are not assessing Chrysostom’s proper alignment with the standard handbook descriptions of rhetorical figures, but investigating Chrysostom’s assessment of Paul’s rhetorical abilities.

By delineating the rhetorical features that Paul employed in this section of the letter, Chrysostom is implicitly acknowledging that Paul was, at least, aware of three of the rhetorical figures that were common in Greco-Roman rhetoric. Although it could be argued that Chrysostom’s rhetorical training caused him to superimpose his own knowledge of such commonly used figures as innuendo, hyperbole, and amplification onto Paul’s writing, the homily gives no indication that this is the case. Chrysostom does not state that he is analyzing Paul’s message in light of these rhetorical features, but, instead, he argues that Paul designed his letter in a way that employed these rhetorical features, presumably in order to produce the typically expected rhetorical effects on the Corinthians.

Chrysostom never implies that Paul was following any type of rhetorical

⁴⁷ Ps.-Longinus, Subl. 11.2.
handbook in order to write his letter nor does he imply that Paul had obtained any form of rhetorical education that would enable him to use these rhetorical features. However, considering that Chrysostom credits Paul with astutely employing these rhetorical features, it seems reasonable to suppose that Paul had obtained enough education to know of their existence and their value in everyday argumentation.  

After he discusses baptism, Chrysostom begins the next section of his homily with οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου, ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρός τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor 1:17b) and explains:

Τὸῦτο γὰρ αὕτιον τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι τοὺς ἀποστόλους σοφοὺς, οὐκ ἀσθενεία τοῦ χαρίσματος, ἀλλὰ ἵνα μὴ βλαβῇ τὸ κήρυγμα.

For this was the reason that the Apostles were not wise, not because of a weakness of the gift, but in order that the proclamation would not suffer harm.

Then he continues by acknowledging οἱ ἄγνωστοι οἱ ἑκατερούσης (“And unlearned men were the ones who established [the proclamation]”). However, at this part in the homily, Chrysostom questions:

Καὶ εἰ σοὶ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου, τίνος ἔσκετο τὸν Ἀπολλὼ λόγιον ὃντα ἐπεμψαν, φησί.  

_Contra Anderson, Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul, 279._ Anderson argues, “We can readily see that the church fathers generally viewed Paul’s word choice and syntax as being on an unsophisticated level;” however, Chrysostom, in this homily, apparently assumed that Paul was using the three rhetorical figures properly and with the intended rhetorical effect. However, in discussing the historicity of rhetoric, Malcolm Heath (“John Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians,” _BibInt_ 12 [2004]: 369-400, here 370) states: “If Paul was rhetorically trained at all, he was not trained in the same technical system as John.”

Chrysostom, _Hom. 1 Cor._ 3.3 (PG 61.26).

Chrysostom, _Hom. 1 Cor._ 3.3 (PG 61.26-27). In this context, the most likely meaning of ἓκατον ὅτις is “unlearned” rather than “layperson.” See _LSJ_, “ἕκατον ὅτις, 3.3,” 819.

Ibid., 3.3 (PG 61.27).
And if not in wisdom of speech, for what reason did he say that they sent Apollos who was eloquent?\(^\text{52}\)

While the twelve apostles were uneducated in order that God could display the power of the gospel to the amazement of the people and prevent error in teaching, God, by not making any distinction between persons, could also send those who were eloquent. And in the specific case of Apollos, his knowledge of Scripture, not his eloquence in speech, served God’s purpose in refuting the Jews publicly.\(^\text{53}\) Chrysostom is here quite adamant that God did not “cast out” the educated simply because they were learned or eloquent.\(^\text{54}\)

Chrysostom then ironically demands:

Σὺ δὲ ἐκείνῳ μοι δεῖξον, εἰ Πέτρος λόγιος ἦν καὶ Παύλος. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις· ἰδιωταί γὰρ ἦσαν, καὶ ἀγράμματοι.\(^\text{55}\)

You demonstrate this to me – whether Peter was eloquent, also Paul. But you are not able to do this; for they were uneducated and illiterate.

Compared to the praise that Chrysostom, in \textit{On the Priesthood}, bestowed on Paul due to his rhetorical and epistolary skills, this statement is quite surprising.\(^\text{56}\) Although ἰδιωταί could be taken to mean “unlearned” for Peter and a “layperson,” in contrast to a professional orator, for Paul, the reference to Peter and Paul as ἀγράμματοι is much more

\(^{52}\) Chrysostom could also have credited Apollos with being “educated” rather than “eloquent” by describing him as λόγιος. See LSJ, “λόγιος, 1.2 and II.1,” 1056.

\(^{53}\) Chrysostom, \textit{Hom. 1 Cor.} 3.3-4 (PG 61.27). Chrysostom is drawing heavily from the description of Apollos presented in Acts 18:24-28.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., 3.4 (PG 61.27).

\(^{55}\) Chrysostom, \textit{Hom. 1 Cor.} 3.4 (PG 61.27).

\(^{56}\) Note specifically the quotations cited above from \textit{On the Priesthood}.
problematic for any attempt to reconcile this statement with Chrysostom’s praise of Paul’s oration and letters in *On the Priesthood*.

One attempt to understand how Chrysostom could describe Paul as ἀγράμματος is offered by John A. Broadus in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*:

ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἱδιώται. Acts iv.13: there spoken of St. Peter and St. John, and by St Chrysostom here quoted from memory as of St. Peter and St. Paul. Chrysostom could have misspoken when he referred to John as Paul, and this error in memory would fit the following statements that Chrysostom makes to illustrate and clarify his reference to Acts 4:13. He explains his meaning by interpreting Luke 22:35 in a way in which Christ’s demand that the disciples not carry either βαλάντιον (‘money bag’), or πήρα (‘beggar’s bag’), or ὑπόδηματα (‘sandals’), a reference to the mission of the twelve in Luke 9:3, is deemed a temporary stipulation that was given in order that the gospel would demonstrate the power of God in Palestine. And, stating that this stipulation no longer applied to the present church, Chrysostom explained that, in the same way, no one should be cast out of the church in Chrysostom’s day because the person had been educated via pagan wisdom.

Although the possibility does exist that Chrysostom meant to describe only the disciples who were with Jesus in Palestine as ἱδιώται and ἀγράμματοι, it seems much more likely, given the discussion that follows, that part of Chrysostom’s argumentation

---

57 Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 3.8 (NPNF1 12:14).
58 Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 3.4 (PG 61.27).
depended on including Paul, along with the other disciples, in his charge that they were ἴδιωται and ἄγράμματοι. In fact, Chrysostom advises that the way to promote the gospel among pagans is to agree fully with them that the disciples, including Paul, were uneducated and illiterate when such derogatory claims, according to the pagan mind, were made. That Chrysostom’s proposal is a rhetorical device formulated to gain victory for the gospel is clear in his discussion that follows his recounting of the Lukan passages:

"Ὅταν οὖν Ἕλληνες κατηγορήσωσι τῶν μαθητῶν ὡς ἴδιωτῶν, πλέον ἡμεῖς ἐκείνων κατηγορώμεν αὐτῶν. Μηδὲ λεγέτω τις, ὅτι σοφὸς ἦν ὁ Παύλος ἀλλ’ ἐπαίροντες ἐπὶ σοφία τοὺς μεγάλους παρ’ ἐκείνους καὶ ἐπὶ εὐγλωττίᾳ θαυμασθέντας, τοὺς παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀπαντᾷς λέγωμεν ἴδιώτας γεγονέναι. Οὐ μικρῶς γὰρ αὐτοὺς καὶ κατὰ τόσο καταβαλόμεν τὸ μέρος ὁ Παῦλος ἦν ἕστα λαμπρὰ τὰ νυκτήρια.\(^{59}\)

Therefore when the Greeks charge the disciples with being uneducated, let us charge them to a greater extent than they do. And let no one say, “Paul was wise.” But while we magnify the ones among them as being great in wisdom and as being admired for their eloquence, let us say that all among us were uneducated. [It is] not small for them and by this we permanently strike down the matter; for it will be decisive, the prize of victory.

Chrysostom’s main concern in this passage is to credit the power of God, not human wisdom or eloquence, for the spread of the gospel. And, in his opinion, if that goal should entail the declaration that all Christian writers or speakers should be declared uneducated, assuming here that his all would even include the aforementioned Apollos whom Chrysostom had already acknowledged was eloquent, then the final goal of effective gospel proclamation is served. Understood in this way, it is logical that Chrysostom would substitute Paul for John in his previous quotation of Acts 4:13 rather

\(^{59}\)Ibid.
than mention Paul instead of John due to a faulty memory of the passage. And it is logical for Chrysostom to follow this discussion with not only a comparison of Plato and Paul in which Plato trumps Paul hands down, but also with his own version of hyperbole in which he describes the apostles with extremely derisive language in order to magnify the power of God in their ministries.  

Chrysostom concludes this part of his homily by stating: οὕτω τοίνυν ἀὐτοῖς καταβαλάμευν (“Indeed in this way we should overthrow them”).  

Considering Chrysostom’s reasoning behind his suggestion that Christians should readily admit that Paul, in the same way as the other apostles, was ἰδιώτης and ἀγράμματος, we can hardly assume that this homily contains Chrysostom’s actual opinion regarding Paul’s rhetorical and letter-writing abilities. To take his statements at face value would mean that Paul, being ἀγράμματος, would most likely have depended on amanuenses to a greater extent in his letters than is normally presumed. And it would mean that Chrysostom’s opinion of Paul’s rhetorical and letter-writing abilities expressed in this homily is directly opposed to his assessment of Paul regarding these same matters in On the Priesthood. Since it is unlikely that Chrysostom changed his opinion between

60 Ibid., 3.4 (PG 61.28). Chrysostom advises that all Christians should admit that all the disciples were “unlearned, illiterate, poor, worthless, weak, and obscure.”
61 Ibid., 3.5 (PG 61.28).
62 For a discussion of various theories regarding the amount of influence that amanuenses may have had on Paul’s letters, see James D. G. Dunn, Romans 9-16 (WBC 38B; Dallas: Word, 1988), 908-10 and the literature cited there. Additionally, for a discussion of the various connotations that the term ἀγράμματος may have included, see William V. Harris, Ancient Literacy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 3-12.
the writing of the two documents and it is unlikely that Chrysostom’s praise of Paul’s abilities in *On the Priesthood* was solely the product of a controversy that shaped the writing, it seems best to conclude that Chrysostom is describing Paul with the terms used in this homily in order to present his audience with a viable method of argumentation when confronted with pagans who viewed Christian literature and preaching in a less than complimentary manner.

Since so much of the preceding discussion has hinged on Paul’s confession of being ἰδιωτης τῷ λόγῳ (2 Cor 11:6), one would suppose that Chrysostom’s homily on this verse would help in clarifying his assessment of Paul’s rhetorical abilities.

Surprisingly, at first glance, Chrysostom’s homily on 2 Cor 11:1-12 appears to shed little light on the matter. This may be due to the fact that Chrysostom interprets vv.1-4 as expressing Paul’s concern that some false apostles have introduced wrong doctrines into the churches at Corinth, but he interprets the super-apostles with whom Paul is contending in v. 5 to be Peter, James, and John. However, in the process of severely criticizing those who are introducing the false doctrine (vv. 3-4), Chrysostom notes that those who are leading the Corinthians astray are doing so via ὑπόκρισις. Here it is possible that Chrysostom, in addition to noting the hypocrisy of those promoting false doctrines, is astutely playing on the word ὑπόκρισις since he immediately follows the
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63 Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 Cor.* 23 (PG 61.553-64).
64 Ibid., 23.3 (PG 61.556).
65 Ibid. See LSJ, “ὑπόκρισις,” 1886. In addition to the common connotation of “hypocrisy” or “playing a part on a stage,” the term was also used for an orator’s “delivery.”
charge of hypocrisy with the description of Apollos that occurs in Acts 18:24 as ἀνδραὶ λόγιον ὄντα καὶ δυνατὸν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς ("a man of eloquence and powerful in the Scriptures"). In contrasting Apollos to the false apostles, Chrysostom asks why Paul exhorts Apollos while he fights the false apostles. "ΟΤΙ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΕΩΣ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΤΩΝ ΔΟΓΜΑΤΩΝ ΟΡΘΟΤΗΤΑ ΔΙΕΤΗΡΕΙ ΟΥΤΟΙ ΔΕ ΤΟΙΝ ΑΝΤΙΟΝ ("Because with his education Apollos also faithfully keeps the correctness of the doctrines; but these do the opposite"). Therefore, Chrysostom does introduce the topic of oratory prior to his discussion of v. 6.

Since Chrysostom has identified the basic problem with the false apostles as one of ὑπόκρισις ("hypocrisy") producing inaccurate doctrine, but has also alluded to a term that the false apostles might have recognized as referring to "declamation," Paul’s statement acknowledging his lack of expertise in speaking, but not in knowledge, seems very likely to mean that Paul, as least in Chrysostom’s estimation, is stating a contrast between those who professionally declaim, but with incorrect doctrine, and himself (ἵνα γνώσῃ τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῇ γνώσει). Possibly this statement, in itself, is a rhetorical device in which the speaker downplays his own rhetorical abilities. That Chrysostom may have understood Paul’s expression in this way is supported by his comment on the verse: ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ ἐντὸς καταφέρει τὸ πράγμα τῷ τῆς ἐξω σοφίᾳ ("but he destroys the matter
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66 Chrysostom, Hom. 2 Cor. 23.3 (PG 61.556).
67 Note the earlier reference to Chrysostom’s understatement of his own rhetorical abilities in Sac. 4.6 (PG 48.669).
itself, the one of the outside wisdom”). Here, Chrysostom is reasoning in much the same way that he did when he suggested that Christians should agree with pagans when the pagans claimed that the apostles were illiterate, etc. In addition, Chrysostom concludes his discussion of Paul’s admission with reference to the passages that he discussed in 1 Cor in *Homily 3*.70

This review of Chrysostom’s comments on 2 Cor 11:6 has shown that Chrysostom acknowledges that Paul’s letters contained various rhetorical figures or tropes. Although Chrysostom readily admits that Paul was inexpert in speaking, both of the homilies on the Corinthian letters imply that Paul and/or Chrysostom was/were concerned with rhetorical methods that could “bring down” or “destroy” pagan arguments that were based on worldly knowledge and presented a challenge to the message of the gospel. Considering the overriding motive of destroying pagan defenses, it seems highly likely that Chrysostom’s more derogatory references to Paul’s lack of education and skill in oration were made with his own persuasive devices in mind.

Interestingly, besides the praise of Paul’s epistolary skills that is included in *On the Priesthood*, Chrysostom makes no mention of the quality of Paul’s writings in his homilies on Corinthians. In terms of analyzing Paul’s letters in light of rhetorical theory, Chrysostom definitely uses the technical terminology presented in the handbooks in

---

68 We are translating the phrase as a genitive of apposition (Smyth, § 1322) since Chrysostom immediately follows the statement with quotations of 1 Cor 2:1 and 1:17. By quoting these verses, Chrysostom is using a term that includes various forms of pagan “wisdom,” one of which was declamation.
69 See the above discussion of Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 3.4 (PG 61.27).
70 Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 Cor.* 23.3 (PG 61.556-57).
discussion of Paul’s letters. While he never implies that Paul knew the handbook
terminology or that Paul had obtained a classical education, he presents his rhetorical
analysis of the letters in a manner that implies that Paul was, at least, aware of the more
common rhetorical figures of Greco-Roman rhetoric. However, the figures that
Chrysostom discusses in relation to Paul’s letters were ones that a relatively educated
person would have been familiar with from everyday usage. So although a recent
monograph claims that Chrysostom, “casts doubt on Paul’s awareness of, and conformity
to” Greco-Roman oration, several examples of Chrysostom’s words from the
Corinthian homilies cast doubt on this conclusion. Although Paul clearly did not conform
his letters to handbook rhetoric, he frequently employed rhetorical devices, which were
commonly used by the educated, in his letters. A brief discussion of Chrysostom’s
commentary on Galatians will provide further evidence that these devices were
recognizable by those trained in rhetoric.

Although Chrysostom does not outline Paul’s letter according to any handbook
standard, he does begin his commentary by naming the προοίμιον and noting that it,
along with the entire letter, “is full of spirit and great resolution.” Before Chrysostom
gets further than the προοίμιον, he demonstrates that Paul employs a common method
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71 Kern, 181.
72 Chrysostom, Hom. Gal. (PG 61.611-82).
73 Ibid., (PG 61.611).
used to allay suspicion.\textsuperscript{74} Citing v. 2, he points out that Paul does not normally say καὶ οἱ σὺν ἡμὶν πάντες ἀδελφοὶ (“and all the brothers with me”), but usually names only one or two of his co-workers in his greeting. For Chrysostom, Paul intends the reference to πάντες ἀδελφοὶ to indicate the solidarity of Paul’s preaching with the entirety of the Church and to negate the misconception of the Galatians that Paul is alone in the message of his preaching. In this way, Paul is utilizing a standard feature of the προοίμιον, to reassure and to relieve ὑποψία (“suspicion”) even though, at the same time, his tone is quite strong.\textsuperscript{75}

Chrysostom also notes that 1:5 contains ἄμην, which is a distinct feature at the beginning of one of Paul’s letters and is not normally included in the προοίμιον of any epistles. The purpose for its inclusion, according to Chrysostom, was to signify that Paul had completed his κατηγορία (“accusation”) against the Galatians and to mark the end of the προοίμιον.\textsuperscript{76} By claiming this, Chrysostom is implying that Paul would have known that the ἄμην was marking the end of the προοίμιον and that it was an unusual feature for this section of a speech or, in this case, a letter. Therefore, Chrysostom is implying that Paul designed the wording of the exordium with, at least, a minimum amount of epistolary and rhetorical skill.

\textsuperscript{74} Quintilian discusses the importance of eliminating suspicion of the speaker in the exordium in Inst. 4.1.7-8.
\textsuperscript{75} Chrysostom, Hom. Gal. (PG 61.616).
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., (PG 61.616).
Another example indicating that Chrysostom assumed that Paul was using some degree of rhetorical skill in his style and choice of words is found in his discussion of Gal 2:5, in which Paul states:

οίς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἰξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἢνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνη πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

To whom we did not yield in submission even for a moment, in order that the truth of the gospel might remain for you.

Chrysostom comments:

"Ὄρα λέξεως εὐγένειαν καὶ ἔμφασιν.

See the nobility and significance of the phrase.

Here, Chrysostom compliments Paul because he did not refer to λόγος ("speech"), but to ὑποταγή ("subjection"), therefore, making his words more forceful since the object of discussion was, of course, subjugation and enslavement.77

In discussing Gal 2:5b, Chrysostom notes that the apostles were in agreement with “the false brothers secretly brought in” and praises Paul’s rhetorical skill in handling the situation so that the community of faith would not be jeopardized by the actions of the apostles. He praises Paul for anticipating that the integrity of the apostles would be questioned and for not stating that the apostles had acted improperly: ὃρα πῶς λύει σοφῶς τῇ ἀντίθεσιν ("see how wisely he refutes the argument"). In this comment, Chrysostom

77 Ibid., (PG 61.634).
is using the rhetorical meaning of λύω and praising Paul for his skill in using οἰκονομία ("diplomacy") in his speech to handle the situation tactfully.⁷⁸

Among other numerous examples in which Chrysostom refers to rhetorical features in the letters, he does take special note of Paul’s use of allegory in Gal 4:24. However, he corrects Paul’s terminology, stating that the method that Paul is using should be labeled τύπος rather than an allegory.⁷⁹

Throughout the commentary, Chrysostom notes Paul’s employment of rhetorical figures and uses technical terms to describe Paul’s argumentation; however, he never comments on Paul’s level of mastery in technical rhetorical skills. Based on all of the references from Chrysostom mentioned above, it seems safe to assume that, at the very least, Paul was able to employ enough stylistic features of standard rhetoric in order to enable a skilled orator, such as Chrysostom, to discover them readily in Paul’s letters. At best, Chrysostom’s praise in On the Priesthood was an accurate reflection of Paul’s rhetorical skills.

Mitchell notes that Chrysostom referred to Paul’s rhetoric in a manner consistent with the Acts’ account of Paul’s education. Chrysostom “propounds the view of Paul’s education” as being in Torah at the feet of Gamaliel because it is described in this manner in Scripture.⁸⁰ But she also notes that viewing Paul as trained in Torah, rather than in formal rhetorical education, served Chrysostom’s own rhetorical purposes. By stressing
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⁷⁹ Chrysostom, Hom. Gal. (PG 61.616).
⁸⁰ Heavenly Trumpet, 241-42.
“Paul’s humble origins,” Chrysostom could attribute Paul’s “success as an orator” to Paul’s skills as a student.”81 But she also notes: “ultimately, this portrait of Paul is not really about Paul’s person as much as it is about the ways of God.”82

Another important patristic author who comments on Paul’s rhetorical abilities is Augustine of Hippo.83 Augustine addresses the validity of rhetoric for the Christian in De doctrina Christiana, Book 2, and proposes that rhetoric or eloquentia properly used to express truth has a place in Christian life; however, since rhetoric can also be used to promote falsehoods and to instill pride in those who are accomplished in its skills, its incorrect use can produce undesirable results.84 Augustine does not doubt that the biblical texts contain rhetorical figures. In fact, he warns his readers that if any had the tendency to interpret scripture literally, the biblical texts may contain a hermeneutical challenge since they contained all the types of tropes taught by the rhetors. And he explicitly pointed out that readers who were trained in rhetoric would be able to recognize the tropes when they read the biblical texts.85 Noting that even the names of some of the tropes are included in the biblical passages, he cites as examples allegory, enigma, and

81 Ibid., 243.
82 Ibid., 245.
83 Augustine (354-430 C.E.) taught rhetoric and was a public orator prior to his conversion. See Nicholas Purcell, “Augustine,” OCD, 215.
84 Augustine, Doctr.chr. 2.132.
85 Ibid., 3.87.
parable. Interestingly, allegory and enigma are used by Paul in Gal 4:24 and 1 Cor 13:12, respectively.

However, Augustine also admits that most of what was taught in rhetorical schools in terms of eloquent speech could be learned quite easily if one listened to those who spoke eloquently. And, in fact, most of the stylistic features of rhetoric were carried out everyday by ordinary laypeople in the course of their daily lives.

Most importantly for our purposes, Augustine details some of the rhetorical features in Paul’s letters, taking special note of the figure of climax that Paul employed in Rom 5:3-5, and he comments on how *sapienter dixerit apostolus* ("wisely the Apostle spoke"). Giving another example of Paul’s eloquence, Augustine discusses 2 Cor 11:16-30, pointing out that Paul’s eloquence should even be *qui stertit advertit* ("perceived by the one who snores").

According to Augustine, Paul’s letters would allow him to demonstrate examples of all the figures that appeared in the technical nomenclature of the teachers of rhetoric. Since he holds Paul’s rhetorical abilities in such high esteem, he explains Paul’s admission (2 Cor 11:6) *etsi imperitus sermone, but non scientia* ("If I am unskilled in speaking, but not in knowledge") as an example of the apostle *concedendo*
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86 Ibid., 3.88.
88 Augustine, *Doctr.chr.* 4.8.
89 Ibid., 4.16.
90 Ibid., 4.31.
91 Ibid., 4.35.
92 Ibid., 4.44.
obtructatoribus (“giving precedence to his disparagers”), and he observes that Paul’s letters even earned the esteem of his disparagers who described his letters as weighty and powerful (2 Cor 10:10).  

Leaving his exposition of Paul’s letters, Augustine turns to a discussion of the best style of speech with which a Christian orator could address his listeners. In the process of this discussion, Augustine proposes that the orator can speak in the grand style, but cautions against the type of speech that is too extravagant, citing an early example of Cyprian to instruct the Christian orator in the way that he should not speak.  

He proceeds to demonstrate how each of the styles of speech could be used appropriately, and, throughout his entire discussion, Augustine is adamant that Christian speakers could well make use of the technical rules of rhetoric in order to further the spread of the gospel. They just must be informed and have examples of all three styles. And for these examples, Augustine again turns to Paul to provide the necessary illustrations of the proper use of each style of speech. 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 provides Augustine with the needed example of the grand style since Paul needed to take a firm stand against Christians bringing lawsuits against others in the churches, and the speech within the letter was designed to bring about the needed action on the part of hearers. The recommended style for teaching is the restrained style. The recommended style in matters in which the speaker does not need to instruct, but instead can praise students, is the
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93 Ibid., 4.46.
94 Ibid., 4. 82-85.
95 Ibid., 4.90-99.
mixed style. When the speaker is contending with opponents, Augustine explains that the grand style will serve this purpose best; however, he admits that a particular speech may incorporate features of all three styles.96

In the course of his detailed explanation of the styles and the purposes for which each is best suited, Augustine clearly recommends the persuasive methods of handbook rhetoric for the Christian preacher or orator. There is no indication, as long as one takes the necessary precautions mentioned above, that Christians should avoid technical rhetoric and the benefits that would be achieved by its study and practice. To drive home his point, he again turns to Paul’s letters to cite examples of all the styles and their proper use. Gal 4:21-6 is cited as an example of the restrained style. Interestingly, Augustine does not share Chrysostom’s objection to Paul’s description of his discussion of Sarah and Hagar as an allegory.97 1 Timothy 5: 1-2 is cited as an example of the mixed style.98 And for Augustine, the determining factor for the grand style is not merely the amount of ornamentation that the speaker uses, but it is the heightened emotion that is overflowing in the diction. Here, he cites Rom 8:28-39.99

When Augustine analyzes Galatians, he states: *tota illa espistola summisso dicendi genera scripta sit nisiin extremis partibus* (“that entire letter is written in the
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96 Ibid., 4. 104.
97 Ibid., 4. 107-10.
98 Ibid., 4. 111-17.
99 Ibid., 4.118-121.
restrained style except for the last part”). Here, we must assume by Augustine’s previous advice that when a Christian leader wants to teach a group of believers, the teacher must use the restrained style. Therefore, Augustine apparently views all but the last portion of Galatians as an example of a restrained style because Paul is instructing the churches in what we commonly refer to as the theological portion of the letter. Clearly, given all the examples from the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline corpus, Augustine leaves no doubt that Paul’s letters demonstrate the techniques of handbook rhetoric.

While he has claimed earlier that a person could learn the techniques from dealing in the marketplace or merely listening to those who speak eloquently, the question of whether or not Paul had actually had the opportunity to be trained by a teacher of rhetoric had no bearing whatsoever on Augustine’s unequivocal praise of Paul’s rhetoric and epistolary prowess. Therefore, Augustine’s assessment of Paul’s abilities in De Doctrina Christiana comes very close to Chrysostom’s laudatory assessment in On the Priesthood.

However, there are some major differences between the two. First, Chrysostom does not state that Paul specifically employs the techniques that are delineated in the rhetorical handbooks; rather, he just names what Paul is doing, leaving the reader to guess whether Chrysostom is claiming that Paul intentionally made use of the figures or whether Chrysostom is superimposing his own rhetorical knowledge onto Paul’s writing style. Augustine, by contrast, claims that Paul is employing these features and that he

100 Ibid., 4.122.
101 With this unusual assessment of Gal, Augustine appears to have forced his own rhetorical categories onto Paul’s writing.
could have easily obtained the knowledge necessary to write in this manner without a formal rhetorical education. Second, Chrysostom infiltrates a lot of his discussion of Paul’s writing style with the theological battles with which Chrysostom is himself involved. Therefore, with one so schooled in rhetoric, it might be tempting to superimpose one’s own knowledge of rhetoric onto Paul’s letters in order to strengthen one’s own case. Augustine, on the other hand, explicitly states:

*Verbis enim contendere est non curae quomodo error veritate vincatur sed quomodo tua diction dictioni praefatur alterius* \(^{102}\)

To contend with words is not to care about defeating error with truth, but about perfecting your sermon so that it is better than that of another.

However, it is hard to deny that Augustine avoids finding rhetorical principles in Paul’s letters in order to strengthen his own argument, given his determination that the theological portion of Galatians constitutes an example of “restrained” rhetoric because Paul is teaching the Galatians. In Augustine’s opinion, since Paul is teaching the Galatians and rhetoric that teaches is classified as “restrained” rhetoric, Galatians falls into this rhetoric category even though the letter is polemical.

In concluding our study of these patristic views on Paul’s rhetorical abilities and epistolary style, it appears that those who have studied rhetoric notice the plethora of figures and rhetoric techniques with which Paul makes his arguments. And, even though Augustine can state that in some cases even those who are snoring should catch Paul’s rhetorical drift, many modern commentators give only cursory attention to the rhetorical

---

\(^{102}\) Ibid., 4. 157.
features that Paul utilizes in his letters, and some deny that Paul is using them at all. However, after delineating the way that Chrysostom and Augustine referred to Paul’s language and writing style, we conclude that Paul, regardless of whether he had any formal training in rhetoric, appears to have made use of the features of Greco-Roman rhetoric.

2.2. Recent Works Comparing Paul’s Letters with Greco-Roman Rhetoric

In his 1998 monograph, Philip H. Kern claims that Paul did not use Greco-Roman rhetoric as it appears in the ancient rhetorical handbooks and, therefore, handbook rhetoric is of no help in interpreting Galatians. To support this assertion, he reviews the standard ancient handbooks and surveys the statements made by early Christian writers regarding Paul’s rhetorical abilities.

103 Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians*, 6. In addition, note Kern’s statements: 1) “This survey would then oppose the notions that Paul’s style and language were informed by Greco-Roman rhetoric and that previous ages commonly used classical rhetoric to understand the NT” (ibid., 203); and 2) “Paul wrote Galatians independently of the rules of Greco-Roman rhetoric, which ought to discourage analysis based on the handbooks” (ibid., 257-58).

104 However, Kern makes a few mistakes in his assessment. E.g., he (ibid., 19) states: “Cicero in his *De Inventione* describes rhetoric as a branch of politics – and he rebukes Hermogenes for bringing matters into oratory that properly belong to philosophy. In fact, the history of rhetoric and philosophy were hostile to one another.” Cicero could not possibly have rebuked Hermogenes for anything since Cicero died in 43 B.C.E. and Hermogenes was a rhetor in the second century C.E. Kern probably means to refer to Hermagoras of Temnos rather than to Hermogenes. Also, Kern introduces his chapter on the evaluation of the “language of Paul’s letters” by early Christian writers with this statement: “We thus challenge Mack’s assertion that history, stretching from the church fathers to Bultmann and Betz, witnessed a rhetorical reading of the text” (ibid., 168). Although Kern references Mack’s *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (ed. Dan O. Via, Jr.; GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), Kern’s inclusion of Bultmann in his reference to Mack’s position (here, 10-12) indicates that Kern has misread Mack’s references to a historical trend of reading the New Testament texts as rhetorical compositions. According to Mack, this trend persisted from the early church fathers through the nineteenth century, but a break in the trend occurred during the first half of the twentieth century due, in part, to the deletion of rhetoric from university curricula. And Mack
Additionally, two other recent works that accurately review the ancient sources are those of R. Dean Anderson, Jr. and Carl Joachim Classen. Anderson and Classen emphasize that Paul writes letters, not speeches. While Anderson notes that Galatians may be classified as a rebuke letter, he still seeks to interpret Galatians “from the perspective of ancient rhetorical theory.” And importantly, Anderson states:

The application of rhetorical terminology to what Paul does in this letter should not necessarily be taken to mean that Paul himself thought in these terms. Many methods are argumentation and figures were (and are) commonly used without any theoretical consideration.

Although Anderson determines in his final assessment that Galatians does exhibit standard epistolary features, in his opinion Paul does not employ the standard devices of rhetorical argumentation. According to Anderson, “Paul is better likened to a philosopher whose pupils have departed from his doctrines than to a defendant on trial, a prosecutor in court, or a politician in an assembly.”

specifically notes (here, 12): “The German movements of theological exegesis (Karl Barth) and existentialist interpretation (Rudolph Bultmann) were even expressly hostile toward rhetorical criticism.” Mack then describes the renewed interest in a rhetorical reading of the Old and New Testaments that occurred in the last few decades of the twentieth century (12-17). Although Mack’s comment regarding Bultmann’s position is not correct since Bultmann’s dissertation was Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die Kynischstoische Diatribe (FRLANT [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht], 1910), the point remains that the citations are in error in Kern’s work.

105 Ancient Rhetorical Theory; and Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament (WUNT 128; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 1-44.
106 Ancient Rhetorical Theory, 144.
107 Ibid.
108 Ibid., 189.
Similarly, Classen notes the presence of standard epistolary elements in Galatians; however, he agrees with Anderson that Galatians cannot be forced into one of the standard genres depicted in the rhetorical handbooks. And Classen observes:

(a) that Paul must have read a good deal of Greek literature and thus have come into contact with rhetoric applied, and (b) that he must have been familiar with the Rabbinic tradition of interpreting the Old Testament and thus have been sensitive to the possibilities inherent in language. As regards the stage in the development of rhetoric which he may or may not have known, it should be remembered that the essential insights, classifications and rules, once formulated by the Greeks, remained largely unchanged for centuries. Furthermore, one should not forget that the occurrence of rhetorical figures does not allow the inference that an author employed them because he was familiar with a theory; for they recommended themselves in practice long before any theory was ever developed (Quint. Inst.or. II 17, 5-9), and they are found in authors who were never exposed to any such theory in any form.109

From Anderson and Classen’s studies, we can note a change in the most recent approaches to the use of rhetorical theory in the study of Galatians. While some scholars still attempt to classify the type of rhetoric that Galatians best fits,110 others, including de Boer’s recent commentary, approach the study of Galatians from the standpoint of epistolary theory, while not denying that Paul could have employed some rhetorical figures with or without knowledge of the ancient rhetorical handbooks or having attained the highest level of rhetorical education.

109 Rhetorical Criticism, 28.
110 See n.1 above.
2.3 Concluding Comments

Although numerous recent commentaries and monographs still approach the study of Galatians by outlining the various portions of the letter in order to classify it according to the conventions of ancient rhetorical theory,111 a noticeable trend seems to be developing that seeks to interpret Galatians as a letter in which Paul may have used some of the rhetorical devices with which an educated person would have been familiar, whether or not that person was acquainted with the rhetorical handbooks that were studied at the highest level of Greco-Roman education. In the following chapter, we will investigate the possibility that Paul employed rhetorical parody in writing to the Galatians. As mentioned above, ancient rhetorical parody was a device that a literate person would have known and practiced in everyday conversation. Therefore, rhetorical parody, as described by ancient rhetors in the handbooks, merely reflected the actual practices of the literate portion of society.

---

111 See the introduction to Chapter One and n.1 of this chapter.
3. Examples of Rhetorical Parody in Galatians

Moving forward from the understanding of ancient rhetorical parody presented in Chapter One and the historical overview in Chapter Two, we are now ready to delineate the ways in which Paul employed rhetorical parody as a means to confront the Galatians with the truth of his law-free gospel. The consensus of current scholarship is that the Missionaries were Torah-observant Jewish Christians who were insisting that Gentile converts must also observe the Torah. Therefore, a parody based on Scriptures, in

---

1 See the working definition of rhetorical parody presented in 1.5 above.
2 The designation “Missionaries” for “the ones troubling” (Gal 1:7: οἱ ταράσσοντες) the Galatians is that of Hays, (Galatians, 185) and is used here due to the compelling reasons that he presents for rejecting other designations such as “Judaizers,” “agitators,” and “opponents.” “Missionaries” seems more appropriate than “Teachers,” the designation preferred by J. Louis Martyn (Galatians [AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997], 18 and passim), since Martyn emphasizes that the “Teachers” were conducting an evangelistic mission that included the preaching of a law-observant gospel to the Gentiles (121). Cf. James D.G. Dunn (The Epistle to the Galatians [BNTC 9; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993], 11) who uses the designation “Christian-Jewish missionaries” and Hans Dieter Betz (Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979], 7) who uses the designation “Jewish-Christian missionaries. Most recently, Martinus C. de Boer (Galatians: A Commentary [NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011], 10) refers to “the new preachers,” who were Christian Jews “insisting that Gentile believers must practice circumcision and observe the Mosaic law.” Cf. idem, “The New Preachers in Galatia: Their Identity, Message, Aims, and Impact,” in Jesus, Paul, and Early Christianity: Studies in Honor of Henk Jan de Jonge (ed. Rieuwerd Buitenwerf et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 39-60. However, de Boer (“New Preachers,” 42 n.10) acknowledges: “We could also call them ‘the new missionaries.’” De Boer stresses the newness of the preachers in order to counter Mark D. Nanos’s (Irony, 6-7) proposal that οἱ ταράσσοντες were “influencers,” who were non-Christian Jews already known to the Galatian believers, and that the Galatian conflict was “the result of intra- and inter-Jewish communal dispute” over “the meaning of Jesus Christ for Gentiles.” Since Nanos’s proposal has rightly been rejected by most commentators (see the following note) and “Missionaries” is inclusive of Martyn’s “Teachers” and de Boer’s “Preachers,” it is still the most appropriate designation for οἱ ταράσσοντες.
3 The consensus views Paul’s reference in Gal 1:7 to τινὲς εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ἰμάς καὶ θέλουντες μεταστρέψαται τὸ εἰκεγγέλλον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (“there are certain ones who are troubling you and desiring to distort the gospel of Christ”) as describing Christian Jews who were attempting to convince the Galatians that the circumcision of Gentiles was a necessary part of the gospel of Christ. For a history of the scholarship on the presumed theological and ethnic background of those referenced in 1:7; see Franz Mussner, Der Galaterbrief (3d enl. ed.; HTKNT 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 14-29; F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Galatians (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 19-32; Bernard Hungerford Brinsmead, Galatians – Dialogical Response to Opponents, (SBLDS 65; Chico: Scholars, 1982), 9-22; and Ronald
particular Scriptures that repeatedly affirmed the necessity of obedience to the Mosaic law as the proper covenant response to God’s grace and also repeatedly affirmed the necessity of a proselyte’s adoption of the law, would be the perfect rhetorical vehicle to refute any claim by Torah-observant Jewish Christians that Paul’s Gentile converts must also abide by the law.⁴ Employing rhetorical parody to transform such Scriptures would have been extremely effective since the audience hearing Paul’s letter would most likely have included the Missionaries, who would have been familiar with the hypotexts, as well as the Galatian converts. As mentioned previously, Paul’s scriptural quotations

Y.K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 3-9. However, a view that rejects this consensus is occasionally found in scholarly publications. See, e.g., Nikolaus Walter, “Paulus und die Gegner des Christusevangeliums in Galatien,” in *L’Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style, et Conception du Ministère* (BETL 73; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1986), 351-6; Nanos, *Irony*; and William O. Walker, Jr., “Does the ‘We’ in Gal 2:15-17 Include Paul’s Opponents?” *NTS* 49 (2003): 560-65. Walter (351) understands that Paul, in 1:7, is referring to “Gegenmissionare” (counter-missionaries) who had “used a missionary trick” and collected some “effective words” that “were used by Paul” in order to lead the Galatian Christians away from Christ and into Judaism. In his view, one of these effective words was εὐαγγέλιον, but the counter-missionaries were preaching “das Gegenteil eines Christusevangeliums: ein Evangelium ohne den Christus Jesus” (the opposite of the gospel of Christ: a gospel without Christ Jesus). Walter’s argument has not gained support from the scholarly community. For example, Johan S. Vos’s (“Paul’s Argumentation in Galatians 1-2,” *HTR* 87 [1994]: 1-16) statement (here, 2) is much more convincing: “First, the opponents shared with Paul the belief in Jesus as the Messiah; otherwise Paul could not have termed their message a ‘gospel’ (Gal 1:6).” Against this interpretation of εὐαγγέλιον, Nanos (*Irony*, 296-316) unconvincingly argues that Paul employs ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον (“a different gospel”) in 1:6 and μεταστρέψει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (“to distort the gospel of Christ”) in 1:7 as ironic comments in order to demonstrate the Galatians’ foolishness in accepting the influencers’ message. In light of Paul’s double anathema and his thrice-used εὐαγγελιζόμαι in vv.8-9, it seems much more likely that Paul means that the Missionaries are seeking “to distort the gospel of Christ” with the implication that they are Christian Jews. However, as Martyn (*Galatians*, 109), Vos, and others, note, Paul refers to the Missionaries’ message as “a different gospel” because they employed the term for their message. For a trenchant critique of Nanos’s interpretation of 1:6-9, see esp. the review by de Boer (*BibInt* 12 [2004]: 421-24). Additionally, for a compilation of articles representing the scholarly debate over the Galatian situation and the message of the ones troubling the Galatians, see articles included in *The Galatian Debate* (ed. Mark Nanos; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002).

⁴ Scriptures that require obedience to the covenant for Israelites and for proselytes will be discussed in detail below.
throughout Galatians were apparently intended to add to the polemical nature of his argument and were definitely transformed and given a new, and sometimes shocking, meaning in the context of his letter.\(^5\)

The exegetical work of this project will identify various perplexing statements in the portions of Galatians that are generally considered to present Paul’s rebuke of the Galatians and his defense of his gospel and to comprise his main theological arguments against the teachings of the Missionaries (1:6-5:1). As we discuss each statement, we will determine whether or not a parodic allusion to a scriptural demand for obedience to the Mosaic law might help clarify the meaning of the statement within Paul’s argument.\(^6\) In the following investigation, we will explore Paul’s probable allusions to numerous key phrases\(^7\) from Scripture that: 1) highlight the importance of obeying covenantal obligations or describe periods of covenant renewal; 2) contain explicit warnings against disobedience to the Torah, especially those that are delineated in the Mosaic discourses in Deuteronomy; 3) present individuals who exhibited zealous obedience to the Mosaic law not only as faithful followers of God, but also as examples who should be emulated; or 4) stress the equality of native-born Israelites and proselytes who seek to be faithful

\(^{5}\) See 1.5 above.

\(^{6}\) Since the working definition of ancient rhetorical parody presented in 1.5 requires a play on the words of a previously written text or well-known saying, examples of rhetorical parody in Galatians would necessarily have to be based on a Greek hypotext of Israel’s Scriptures. Therefore, all scriptural references are to the critical editions of *Septuaginta: Vestus Testamentum Graecum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939-) where extant.

\(^{7}\) As shown in 1.3 above, ancient rhetorical parody employed an altered quotation of a verse/line (στίχος) of another in a witty manner (Ps.-Demetrius, *Eloc. 150*). Since a στίχος of prose normally contained 15-16 syllables (LSJ, “στίχος,” 1646), rhetorical parody does not require reference to a sustained discourse from the hypotext.
followers of God in terms of the blessings associated with Torah obedience and the
curses associated with apostasy.

Additionally, we will explore the possibility that Paul rhetorically parodies a
passage that had been previously employed in post-exilic disagreements over the identity
of the true sons/seed of Abraham in order to invalidate the Missionaries’ teaching, which
was threatening the unity of the Galatian churches and the preservation of the truth of the
gospel that Paul had preached to his Gentile converts. As the following investigation
unfolds, we will see that numerous statements within the letter, when read as Paul’s
parodic reversal of the aforementioned categories of Scripture, indicate that the vital issue
in the theological portion of Galatians is not the ability or inability of the Mosaic law to
produce rectification and/or life. Rather, the vital issue with which Paul is dealing is
whether or not the Mosaic law is an inseparable part of God’s covenant with Abraham.
Furthermore, we will demonstrate that Paul’s rhetorical parody of Scripture indicates that
the crisis in the Galatian churches revolved around the threatened exclusion of the law-
free Gentile believers from the faith community since they were viewed by the Torah-
obedient Jewish-Christian Missionaries as apostates who unrepentantly and unabashedly
rejected the numerous demands for Torah obedience in Scripture. Faced with such a
situation in his nascent Gentile churches, Paul sought to counter the Missionaries’
insistence on Torah obedience or expulsion by employing rhetorical parody in order to:
1) redefine the characteristics of a faithful follower of God in light of the Christ event
and, therefore, demonstrate that his law-free gospel was not apostasy; 2) dispel any threat
that the rejection of the Mosaic law, along with its prescribed means of atonement for transgressions, would lead to a scripturally predicted return to slavery; and 3) argue against the confluence of the Mosaic law with the Abrahamic covenant.

In light of the working definition of rhetorical parody presented in Chapter One, Paul could have employed this widely known and rhetorically effective device without fearing that such a use of Scripture would in any way be understood as disparaging the holy writings of Israel. But at this point, it is important to describe the ways in which the use of rhetorical parody might assist Paul in his attempt to counter the teachings of the Missionaries. In addition to presenting a polemical paraphrase against the Missionaries’ teachings, parody as a rhetorical device could play a major role in an argument by dissociation.⁸ According to Chaïm Perelman, one of the typical forms of rhetorical argumentation is “dissociation, which aims at separating elements which language or a recognized tradition have previously tied together.”⁹ In the dissociative process, an “appearance,” which was previously accepted as reality and valued as such, is replaced by a different concept that becomes the new “reality.” The “appearance” is then

---

⁸ In discussing the rhetorical techniques that Paul uses in Galatians, Richard N. Longenecker (Galatians [WBC 41; Dallas: Word, 1990], cxvii) notes that Paul employs an argument by dissociation, which in the case of the Galatians entailed not only the dissociation of ideas, but also the dissociation of the Galatians from the ones teaching the “offending ideas.” Additionally, Nanos (Irony, 9-10, 32-61), claiming that the epistolary character of the letter is that of ironic rebuke, notes that Paul employs irony in order to make an argument by dissociation. However, note our discussion in 1.5 regarding the technical differences between ancient rhetorical parody and irony.

understood, not as reality, but as “the means of reaching” the new reality.\textsuperscript{10} The transformative nature of rhetorical parody, which altered a known text and gave it a new and sometimes shocking meaning in contrast to the original hypotext, would fit quite nicely into an argument of dissociation. By employing rhetorical parody, a speaker/writer could dissociate the parodied terms used in the hypotext from their original meaning and allow the readers/listeners to entertain the possibility that the parodied terms could be interpreted differently, thus creating a new meaning for the parodied terms.

In the case of the Galatians, Paul had originally preached a law-free gospel that the Galatians had accepted (1:8-9; 4:13-15). Some time after the Galatians accepted Paul’s message, the Missionaries began to preach “another gospel” (1:6-8) that required the Galatians to observe Torah, especially the rite of circumcision (4:10, 21; 5:2-4; 6:12-13).\textsuperscript{11} As a result of the Missionaries’ preaching, the Galatians had associated, or were in danger of associating, certain scriptural terms that stressed obedience to covenantal requirements, especially circumcision and possibly the whole law, with the gospel of Christ.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} The verses referenced here are limited to those in which Paul explicitly refers to requirements of the Torah that the Galatians either have adopted or are considering adopting. Commentators differ widely in citing the passages that reflect the Missionaries’ teaching: e.g., Betz (\textit{Galatians}, 7) cites 2:15-21; 3:2-5; 4:21; 5:2-12; and 6:12-17; Hays (\textit{Galatians}, 185), in addition to noting the Missionaries’ emphasis on circumcision, cites 3:10, 12; 4:8-11; and 5:16-24; and Martyn (\textit{Galatians}, 118) cites 1:6-9; 3:1-2,5; 4:17; 5:7-12; and 6:12-14 as “direct references” to ten points of the Teachers’ gospel (118-25); however, he also refers to other passages that allude to four additional points (125-26).
A parodic reversal of these scriptural terms would constitute an argument of dissociation and would provide a new interpretation of these terms in relationship to the gospel. Therefore, the meaning of these scriptural terms within their hypotext, i.e. Israel’s Scriptures, would be shown to be an “appearance” and a means of reaching the new reality, a reality brought about by God’s revelation of Jesus Christ (1:12). The audience for Paul’s rhetorical parody, therefore, would have included the Jewish-Christian Missionaries as well as the Galatian believers in Christ.

3.1 Parody of Demands for Obedience to the Law in Gal 1:6-2:21

3.1.1 Paul’s Anathemas and the Parodic Reinterpretation of Apostasy (1:6-10)

Most commentators note Paul’s omission of a thanksgiving section at the beginning of the letter, and many stress the ironic nature of ταυμάζω (“I am amazed”) along with other parts of Paul’s rebuke section (1:6-10). However, considering the

13 For a discussion of the ironic use of ταυμάζω in ancient letters, see, e.g., Nils Alstrup Dahl, “Paul’s Letter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content, and Structure” (paper presented to the 1973 SBL Paul Seminar), 12-35, 81-84; portions of this paper are now published in The Galatians Debate (ed. Mark D. Nanos; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 117-42; and Nanos, Irony, 33-56. However, Mussner (Der Galaterbrief, 53) and Dunn (Galatians, 39) understand Paul’s use of ταυμάζω as an expression of amazement and shock rather than as an indication of irony. Hays (Galatians, 204) notes Paul’s ironic use of μετατηματίζω in 1:6. Although I am referring to Gal 1:6-10 as the “rebuke section,” the designation used by Hays (ibid., 203), I am not disagreeing with those who view 1:6-9 as part of the body of the letter. For the view that 1:6-9 is not only part of the body of the letter, but also is the proposition or theme for the entire letter, see, e.g., Martyn, Galatians, 24; Robert G. Hall, “The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians A Reconsideration,” JBL 106 (1987): 277-87, here 283; George A. Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 148; and Vos, “Paul’s Argumentation in Galatians 1-2,” 4-8. Some commentators view 1:6-10 as part of the body of the letter without claiming that these verses are the letter’s proposition, e.g., Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater (KEK 7: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), 11-16; Dahl, “Letter,” 12-15, 81-84; Mussner, Der Galaterbrief, 53-62; Longenecker, Galatians, 11, 14; Sam K. Williams, Galatians (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 37-43; G. Walter Hansen, Galatians (Downers Grove: InterVarsity), 34-39;
polemical and dissociative qualities of rhetorical parody, it is likely that recognizing
Paul’s use of this device might clarify not only the importance of Paul’s double anathema
in 1:8-9, but also the relationship of the curses to the entire autobiographical section (Gal
1:11-2:21).

In terms of the relationship of the anathemas to the rest of the correspondence,
Betz insists that the anathemas must be viewed in light of Paul’s “conditional blessing
upon those who remain loyal to the Pauline gospel” (6:16), thus making Galatians a
“magical letter.”

14

and idem, Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts (JSNTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press,
1989), 43-44, 53. For the view that 1:6-10 is the exordium, while the proposition is 2:15-21, see Betz,
Galatians, 44-56; and Ben Witherington III, Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the
Galatians, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 34, 79-88. For the understanding that the letter’s proposition
is 3:1-5, see B. Standaert, “La rhétorique ancienne dans saint Paul,” in L’Apôtre Paul: Personnnalité, Style,
et Conception du Ministère (BETL 73; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1986), 78-92, esp. 82-86. For the
view that 1:6-10 should be included in the letter opening rather than the body of the letter, see, e.g., Hays,
Galatians, 199, 203-7; Dunn, Galatians, 21, 38-51; F. J. Matera, Galatians (SP 9; Collegeville, Minn.:
Liturgical Press, 1992), 12-14; and Ernest de Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the
Epistle to the Galatians (ICC 10; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921; repr., New York: Continuum, 2004),
lxxii, 18-34.

14 Galatians, 25. Betz appeals to various forms of ancient epistolography to classify Galatians not only as
an apologetic letter and a “magical letter,” but also as a “heavenly letter.” Betz supports the “magical”
designation by claiming that Paul composed Galatians as a defense of the Holy Spirit “in such a way that it
functions . . . as an efficacious display of the divine Spirit and Power,” and he supports the “heavenly”
designation on the basis that Paul “understands himself . . . as a representative of God.” However, the
consensus of current scholarship rejects Betz’s classification of Galatians as forensic rhetoric and supports
the letter’s classification as deliberative rhetoric. For discussions of the issues involved, see Witherington,
Grace, 27-36 and Kennedy (Rhetorical Criticism, 144-52), who note that exhortation sections, such as Gal
5-6, are not part of judicial rhetoric. For an alternative view, see James D. Hester, “Placing the Blame: The
Presence of Epidectic in Galatians 1 and 2,” in Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in
Honor of George A. Kennedy (JSNTSup 50; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1991), 281-307. For the view that
Galatians is an “eclectic combination of various rhetorical techniques,” see David E. Aune’s review of Betz
(RSR 7 [1981]: 323-28, here 326).
also places the entire document in the context of “sacred law.” While we, along with the consensus of scholarship, reject Betz’s proposal that Galatians is an example of forensic rhetoric, it is important to recognize that Paul’s anathemas (1:8-9) are in juxtaposition to the conditional blessing (6:16) and that the curse-blessing combination played a role in the sacred law of first-century Judaism and primitive Christianity. Therefore, we should investigate a possible connection between Paul’s curses and blessing and the curses that were pronounced on the “sons of Israel” who did not keep the law and the blessings that were promised to those who did keep the law.

Along a similar line of thought, Kjell Arne Morland has conducted an in-depth study of Paul’s anathemas in Gal 1:8-9, along with the curses in Gal 3:10, 13, and their relationship to Jewish texts of curse and blessing. In the present investigation, we do not intend to repeat Morland’s work, which combines semantic field analysis with rhetorical criticism in studying Paul’s curse terminology; however, Morland’s conclusion that Paul “alludes to deuteronomistic traditions in both curse sections, but that he combines it [sic] with Deut 13 in Gal 1 and with the Abraham tradition in Gal 3” is

---

15 Betz (Galatians, 50) provides numerous examples to demonstrate that “sacred law” traditions were prevalent in the Hebrew Bible, early Christianity, Judaism, and Roman religions.
16 Passages in the LXX that contrast the cursing of the unfaithful/disobedient/lawbreakers and the blessing of the faithful/obedient/law keepers that Paul might have alluded to in Galatians will be fully discussed below.
17 The Rhetoric of Curse in Galatians: Paul Confronts Another Gospel (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995). Morland’s study includes curse texts from the Hebrew Bible/LXX, the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, which can be reasonably assumed to be prior to or contemporary with Paul, Philo, Josephus, and Qumran.
18 Ibid., 97. Morland presents a thorough discussion of Deut 27-30 and other texts that belong to the Deut 27-30 tradition (33-68) to support his claim that Paul alludes to these traditions. However, Morland does admit that while the form of Paul’s anathemas in Gal 1:8-9 is the same as the form of the curses in the Deut
important for this study because it highlights the need to explore further the ways in
which the recognition of an allusion to the deuteronomistic curse tradition in Gal 1:8-9
might affect the reading of the autobiographical portion of Paul’s letter, especially since,
as Morland notes, Deut 13 deals with the subject of apostasy, as does Paul.\(^\text{19}\) And even
though Deut 13 prescribes the death penalty for apostates (vv. 5, 10, 16a; cf. Exod 22:19),
Morland proposes that this tradition changed over time from the influence of the
Deuternomic curse tradition (27:15-26; cf. Deut 13:16b) thus allowing for “curse and
excommunication” to be substituted for the death penalty.\(^\text{20}\)

Although Morland produces a wealth of convincing documentation to support his
basic conclusion, the present study disagrees with his proposal in one major area.
Morland notes, “The unexpected feature of the double anathema is thus not the allusion
to deuteronomistic traditions, but rather its deviations from certain vital elements therein:
Paul utters curses not on lawbreakers, but on persons who preach obedience toward the

27-30 tradition the word \(\alpha νάθεμα\) is not used in the Deut 27-30 tradition. He explains this inconsistency by
proposing, “the difference between Deut 27-30 texts using curse terms, while Gal 1:8-9 employs \(\alpha νάθεμα\),
is not important, since these traditions seem to have converged at the time of Paul” (151). Further, he points
to the combination of Deut 27-30 and Deut 13, which does employ forms of \(\alpha νάθεμα\) and \(\alpha νάθεματιζ\) in
13:16 and a form of \(\alpha νάθεμα\) in 13:18, in Josephus (\(A.\ J.\ 4.309-10\)) to support his view that Paul has
combined these same texts (ibid.).

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 152. Numerous scholars view Gal 1:6 as indicating that Paul is accusing the Galatians of
committing apostasy: see, e.g., Hays, \textit{Galatians}, 204; Dunn, \textit{Galatians}, 39-40; and Mussner, \textit{Galaterbrief},
53. A full discussion of Paul’s use of \(\mu ετατιθήμα\) in 1:6, which couches the verse in terms of apostasy, will
be presented below.

\(^{20}\) Morland, 92. For additional evidence indicating that the combination of excommunication and curse was
a common substitution for a scripturally prescribed death penalty throughout Judaism in the Second
Temple period and that it was not limited to sectarian Judaism, see William Horbury, “Extirpation and
law.”

Although “Paul draws on the dynamics of authoritative covenantal tradition to secure the truth of the Gospel of Christ” such deviations present a serious problem that, in Morland’s view, can only be understood in one way. He states:

The double anathema challenges the Galatian audience to regard the opponents as cursed persons. Such a curse cannot be overlooked once it has been uttered. The primary pragmatic aspect of the curse is that it puts before the Galatian churches a very serious choice: Either to accept the double anathema as a carrier of divine authority, and thus to isolate the opponents, or to reject it as false, and thus to question the authority of Paul himself. The curse claims to carry divine authority, and therefore it demands to be accepted as such. The only alternative is to reject it as false. Thus the situation cannot be as it was before in Galatia: Once the curse has been uttered, the churches are forced to choose between the authority of Paul and his opponents.

Morland’s emphasis on “Paul’s intention . . . to isolate the opponents from the Galatian churches” as cursed individuals and to “shock” his audience with “the opening double anathema” does not actually explain Paul’s deviations. Rather his appeal to Paul’s pragmatic intention to force the Galatians to make a choice actually sidesteps Paul’s reversal of the curse tradition. Even though Morland is correct that the anathemas certainly present the Galatian churches with a serious choice, he fails to recognize that such shocking deviations from commonly known texts are characteristic of rhetorical parody. Therefore, we propose that Paul’s reversal of the traditional covenantal curse is not surprising considering the above discussion of rhetorical parody in which a known saying or written passage is frequently transformed in a shocking way in order to

21 Ibid., 153-54.
22 Ibid., 161.
23 Ibid., 163-64.
24 Ibid., 167.
strengthen an argument and to dissociate a previous idea from the realm of perceived reality.

At this point in this investigation, it is necessary to acknowledge that Paul might be employing irony, which as explained in Chapter One does not depend on a previously well-known text or saying, in order to provide a dissociative effect. However, if we consider Morland’s claim that Paul is alluding to Deut 27-30 and Deut 13 in 1:8-9 to be plausible, the presence of a hypotext and Paul’s reversal of or deviation from the hypotext’s curse-blessing tradition would indicate that Paul’s double anathemas are more correctly described as rhetorical parody than as irony. If Paul were employing parody, rather than irony, as a rhetorical strategy, there should be other indications of parody in the autobiographical section of the letter. Additionally, a recognition of examples of parody should provide an interpretative advantage over that of irony not only in understanding Paul’s reversal of the typical deuteronomistic curse-blessing tradition, but also in clarifying the relationship of 1:6-10 to the rest of the autobiographical section of the letter and in elucidating other statements that Paul makes in the immediate context of the anathemas.

3.1.1.1 The importance of a correct interpretation of μετατίθημι in understanding Paul’s parodic reversal of the scriptural meaning of apostasy

In discussing the relationship of 1:6-10 to 1:11-2:21, a number of commentators
view 1:6-10 as part of the body of the letter.\textsuperscript{25} We will attempt to produce enough evidence below to justify this position. Nils Dahl, who considers 1:6-10 as part of the body and refers to these verses as Paul’s “ironic rebuke,” provides a wealth of evidence that ancient letters frequently expressed astonishment in the opening of the body by employing a rebuke section that began with $\theta\varepsilon\mu\mu\acute{a}\zeta\omega$ or an equivalent.\textsuperscript{26} While Paul’s use of $\theta\varepsilon\mu\mu\acute{a}\zeta\omega$ is ironic, rather than parodic, his expression of astonishment and rebuke, which includes the important statement that the Galatians $\varphi\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\varsigma \tau\alpha\chi\acute{e}\omicron\omicron\varsigma \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\tau\iota\acute{n}\iota\varsigma\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\theta\omicron$ (“are so quickly deserting”)\textsuperscript{27} the one who called them (1:6), presents the problem that Paul is addressing as one of apostasy. If we recognize that the subject of apostasy is paramount in the opening of the letter’s body, we are also more likely to recognize that this same subject plays a role in the rest of the autobiographical section.\textsuperscript{28}

This view is clearly expressed by Martyn: “Instead of striking the letter’s theme in a thanksgiving paragraph, Paul does that by rebuking the Galatians for defecting from the God who called their churches into existence.”\textsuperscript{29} Although Martyn notes that Paul uses

\textsuperscript{25} See n.13 above.
\textsuperscript{26} Dahl, “Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” 12-20. Also, see John Lee White, \textit{The Body of the Greek Letter} (SBLDS 2; Missoula: University of Montana, 1972), 79-84. For White (80), Gal 1:6-14 forms the opening of the letter body and contains four formulae that are typically contained in the opening of the body of a Greek letter. See also John L. White, “Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter,” \textit{JBL} 90 (1971): 91-97, esp. 94-95; and Terrence Y. Mullins, “Formulas in the New Testament Epistles,” \textit{JBL} 91 (1972): 380-90). Although Mullins disagrees with White regarding Paul’s employment of four standard formulae from Greek letters, the two points of agreement between White and Mullins are important for our discussion. Both White and Mullins find Paul’s expression of astonishment as part of the body of the letter and both understand Paul’s employment of the verb $\theta\varepsilon\mu\mu\acute{a}\zeta\omega$ as expressing ironic (and for Mullins even “sarcastic”, 385) amazement that the Galatians have abandoned Paul’s gospel.

\textsuperscript{27} This is the translation in the NRSV and NIV.

\textsuperscript{28} Justification for this statement will be presented below.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Galatians}, 24.
μετατίθημι only once (Gal 1:6) in his letters, he makes a distinction between “how the Galatians are likely to have understood” the verb and “what Paul intended.” Martyn claims that the “popular philosophical schools” provide “an excellent guide” for the verb’s meaning in the middle voice as “defecting from” one “school of thought” to another.30

However, a review of ancient texts using μετατίθημι in the middle voice does not support Martyn’s claim. In fact changing from one philosophical school to another would probably have been the least likely connotation that the Galatians would have assumed from hearing μετατίθημι in the middle voice since the only time that ancient texts use the verb in connection with a desertion from a philosophical school is in an articular participle that is a nickname for one philosopher, Διονύσιος ο Μεταθέμενος (Dionysius, the Renegade).31 And even the source that Martyn cites for support, Diogenes Laertius, uses a form of ἀφίστημι in describing the defection of Διονύσιος ο Μεταθέμενος from the

---

30 Ibid., 108. Martyn cites CD 1:13 (ἢν ἔφε αὐτῷ: “those who depart from the way”) and 2 Macc 7:24 as similar to Paul’s understanding of μετατίθημι. Cf. Witherington (Grace, 82) who states: “ὁ μεταθέμενος is used to refer to a person who leaves one philosophical school of thought for another.” BAGD (“μετατίθημι 2b,” 513) states: “ὁ μεταθέμενος means a turncoat who leaves one philosoph[ical] school for another one: Diog. L. 7, 166; Athen. 7 p. 281D.” BDAG (“μετατίθημι 3,” 642) also references Diog. L. 7, 166 and Athen. 7, 281 and notes that ὁ μεταθέμενος, in these references, refers to “Dionysius the Turncoat.” Gal 1:6 is also cited as connoting “desertion.” However, see the following discussion.
31 This statement is made on the basis of a search of all the forms of μετατίθημι from the fifth century B.C.E through the third century C.E. contained in TLG. Middle forms of the verb occur frequently throughout these centuries. Hereafter all references to μετατίθημι refer to middle forms of the verb unless otherwise stated. Dionysius of Heraclea (aka ‘the Renegade”) lived c. 328-248 B.C.E. See Julia Annas, “Dionysius (8),” OCD, 478.
school of Zeno to the Cyrenaics. In stating that a philosopher left one school for another, Diogenes Laertius employs μετέρχομαι (5.22, 29), ἀπέρχομαι (5.30), ἀφίστημι (5.2; 7.4, 167, 179), and μεθίστημι (5.36), but he does not employ μετατίθημι to indicate this type of defection. Diogenes does use μετάτεθετο to describe the refinement of Ariston’s views on various subjects within the Stoic school (Lives, 7.162). And Plutarch (Mor. 447F) uses μετατίθεσθαι to describe the refinement of philosophical speculations without a defection from one philosophical school to another. Understanding ὁ Μεταθέμενος as a nickname that refers to Dionysius’ denial that pain is an indifferent thing, rather than a nickname that describes Dionysius’ defection from Stoicism, is consistent with Diogenes and Plutarch’s use of μετατίθημι to describe refinements in philosophical views. And it is consistent with Diogenes’ use of other verbs to describe the actual process of defection from one school to another.

32 The relevant portions of Lives 7.166-67 are: Διονύσιος δ’ ὁ Μεταθέμενος τέλος εἶπε τὴν ἡδονὴν διὰ περιστασιν ὀφθαλμίας ἀλήθειας γὰρ ἐπίπους ὄκησεν εἰπεῖν τὸν πόνον ἀδιάφορον (“Dionysius, the Renegade, said pleasure is the goal because of a case of ophthalmia; for when he was suffering so painfully he loathed to say pain is an indifferent thing”); and ἀποστασὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ζήνωνος πρὸς τοὺς Κυρηναϊκοὺς ἀπέτραπτο (“When he deserted Zeno, he turned to the Cyrenaics”). Diogenes Laertius lived during the first half of the third century C.E. (See Herbert Strine Long, “Diogenes (6),” OCD, 474-5.) His compendium of philosophers’ lives names the sources from which he took his information. He refers to Dionysius of Heraclea as “Dionysius, the Renegade” (Lives, 5.92; 7.23, 37, 166) based on writings from Heraclides Ponticus (fourth century B.C.E. with whom Dionysius originally studied, Zeno (335-263 B.C.E.), the founder of Stoicism, and Chrysippus (c. 280-207 B.C.E.), who became head of the Stoic in 232. For all the fragments mentioning Dionysius of Heraclea, see SVF 1.422-34. Since “renegade” is an English derivative of the Latin infinitive negāre (“to say no,” “to deny,” see “negā,” OLD, 1168), “renegade” is more appropriate than “turncoat” for ὁ Μεταθέμενος because “renegade” stresses Dionysius’ change of opinion regarding pain, which was the proximate cause of his defection from Stoicism. Cf. OCD, 478.

33 Ariston (c. 320-250 B.C.E.) was a student of Zeno. Although he refined some of Zeno’s teachings in ways that Chrysippus disliked, he never deserted the Stoic school of thought. See Julia Annas, “Ariston,” OCD, 163. Most likely Plutarch wrote Moralia between 100 and 120 C.E. See D. A. Russell, “Plutarch,” OCD, 1200.
Confirmation that ὁ Μεταθέμενος should be read as a nickname for Dionysius of Heraclea comes from Athenaeus (Deipn., 10.437C) who states: Ἀντίγονος δ’ ὁ Καρύστιος ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Διονυσίου Βίου τοῦ Ἡρακλεώτου τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Μεταθεμένου . . . (“Now Antigonus of Carystus in his work concerning the life of Dionysius of Heraclea, who was called Renegade. . .”).

And Diogenes Laertius notes that some people refer to Dionysius by the nickname Σπίνθαρος (“Spark”), rather than as ὁ Μεταθέμενος. Although Diogenes Laertius and Athenaeus refer to Dionysius of Heraclea by nicknames, as do the fragments from Zeno and Chrysippus, apparently Dionysius was not consistently known by either of these nicknames throughout the Greco-Roman world. Cicero, writing in the first century B.C.E., refers to Dionysius as Dionysius of Heraclea, without ever mentioning a nickname, although he notes that the philosopher withdrew from Stoic teachings.

Therefore, since ancient sources do not use μετατίθημι in the way that Martyn claims, we cannot assume that the Galatians would have naturally thought of defecting from a philosophical school based on Paul’s use of the verb in Gal 1:6. Furthermore, when we consider that Paul accuses the Galatians of “so quickly deserting the one who

---

34 Cf. 1 Macc 2:2; Luke 22:3; Acts 10:18, 11:13, 12:12, 2, and 15:22. Athenaeus probably completed Deipnosophists in the last decade of the second century C.E. See 1.4 above. Athenaeus (Deipn. 7.281D-E) also says of Dionysius of Heraclea: καὶ Μεταθεμένος καλοῖμενος έχαίμε . . . ἀποστὰς τῶν τῆς στοὰς λόγων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἑπίκουρον μεταπρήθοσας (“and he delighted, being called Renegade, . . . having deserted the doctrines of the Stoa and having leapt to Epicurus”). Deipn. 7.279E explains that the Cyrenaics and the Thasians follow a life of pleasure, as do the Epicureans. Betz (47, n. 41) cites Deipn. 7.281D-E as supporting his definition of μετατίθημι as “desert,” but does not mention that Athenaeus employs ἀφίσσημι, not μετατίθημι, for “desert.”

35 Lives, 5.92.

36 Fin. 5.94; Tusc. 2.60, 3.18; Acad. pr. 2.71.
called you” and Dionysius of Heraclea is consistently described as having deserted the Stoics in his old age after spending many years writing numerous philosophical works supporting Stoic doctrines, the possibility that the Galatians would have associated Paul’s \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon \) with the inconsistently used nickname for one fourth-century B.C.E. philosopher seems highly unlikely.

However, Martyn is correct in opposing Betz’s claim that \( \Theta \kappa \iota \nu \mu \acute{\alpha} \zeta \omega \) and \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon \) place the rebuke within the realm of judicial rhetoric in which Paul, playing the rhetorical role of the defendant, is presenting an indignant rebuttal as if in a court setting. Rather than assuming that Paul is defending his gospel and apostleship to the Galatians because they have deserted him, Martyn proposes that “the one who called you” indicates that Paul is claiming that the Galatians have turned away from God. Although Betz understands Paul’s \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon \) as “political language” indicating that the Galatians are deserting God, he qualifies this statement by claiming that the desertion is “a shifting away from the Pauline gospel,” thus making Paul the defendant in an apologetic letter. Even though many ancient sources do confirm a political connotation for \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \iota \) indicating that those to whom it was applied were traitors, Betz’s claim that Paul’s \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \iota \) is “political language” is not supported by the evidence since the syntax of the sentences that employ \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \iota \) with a political connotation follows a particular pattern that is different than Paul’s. Additionally, Betz’s insistence on viewing

---

Paul as the rhetorical defendant downplays the importance of Paul’s statement that the Galatians are deserting “from the one who called” them.\textsuperscript{40}

In determining the particular meaning that the Galatians would most likely have understood, it is most important to note that none of the ancient sources that employ \textit{μετατίθημι} to indicate political desertion mention the person or group from which the subject is deserting, but they do consistently use \textit{μετατίθημι} with \textit{πρός} to indicate the new group to which the subject aligns.\textsuperscript{41} Since this is not the sentence structure that Paul employs, we need to compare his syntax with the syntax of ancient sources that use \textit{μετατίθημι} with different connotations.

Numerous sources employ \textit{μετατίθημι} to refer to a change of opinion, a change of one’s way of life, repentance from wrong thinking, or religious conversion.\textsuperscript{42} Jewish, pagan, and early Christian sources use the verb in connection with stating the position

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{μετατίθημι}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{40} Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 47. For the political connotation of \textit{μετατίθημι}, see, e.g., Polybius (c.200 - c.118 B.C.E.), \textit{Hist.} 1.79.4; 1.86.2; 5.77.4; 24.9.6; Diodorus Siculus (first century B.C.E.) 11.4.6; 16.69.6; 17.30.1; 19.73.5; 19.107.1; 20.34.5; 2.17.1; 29.3.1; and Plutarch (first century C.E.), \textit{Pyrrh.} 7.7; \textit{Eum.} 5.4; \textit{Marc.} 20.3. The following paragraphs will demonstrate that the sentence structure in ancient sources that employ \textit{μετατίθημι} with a political connotation differs significantly from the sentence structure in ancient sources that employ \textit{μετατίθημι} with a religious connotation.

\textsuperscript{41} Texts cited in previous note.

\textsuperscript{42} Contra Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 108. Examples connoting a nondescript change of opinion/habits include: Plato, \textit{Resp.} 1.345C; Polybius, \textit{Hist.} 36.17.10; Plutarch, \textit{Cat. Min.} 49.3; \textit{Dem.} 13.4; \textit{Nic.} 14.1; \textit{Prae. ger. rei. publ.} 813B; Appian, \textit{Hist. rom.} 3.4.29; Justin, \textit{1 Apol.} 43.6.2; Maximus, \textit{Or.} 36.3.15. Examples connoting a change for the worse include: Polybius, \textit{Hist.} 9.26.1; Justin \textit{Dial.} 47.5.5; Maximus, \textit{Or.} 5.7.10. Examples connoting a correction from wrong thinking include: Herodotus, 7.18; Euripides, \textit{Iph. aul.} 385; Polybius, \textit{Hist.} 11.25.10; 37.9.6; Diodorus Sic. 15.54.4; Philo, \textit{Praem.} 58; and Plutarch, \textit{Quaest. rom.} 283E. Examples connoting repentance/religious conversion include: \textit{Let. Aris.} 188.4 (with active participle); \textit{Josephus, A. J.} 5.110, 200; 9.265; 20.38; Cornutus, \textit{Nat. d.} 11. 7; Justin, \textit{1 Apol.} 45.6.4, 57.1.7; \textit{2 Apol.} 12.8.1, 15.2.3; \textit{Dial.} 107.2.9; \textit{Mart. Pol.} 11.1.3; Clement of Alexandria, \textit{Paed.} 3.8.3; Origen, \textit{Cels.} 1.52.13, 21; 2.13.28; 2.79.11; 4.54.8; 8.47.21.
from (ἀπό or ἐκ) which a person is converting/changing, and many of these texts mention the new opinion or religion into (usually εἰς or ἐπὶ) which the person is moving. Even though Martyn claims that the Galatians would not have shared Paul’s Jewish understanding of μετατίθημι as connoting defection/conversion away from the Mosaic law, Paul’s sentence structure in 1:6 closely follows the structure found not only in the LXX, but also in Greco-Roman texts in which μετατίθημι is used in a religious context. One only has to read a statement by Cornutus to recognize that Gentiles in the first century C.E. would have been very familiar with the religious connotation of μετατίθημι. Cornutus states: προσαγορεύοντο δὲ καὶ μείλιχον τὸν Δία, εἶμεν ἡλικτὸν ὄντα τοῖς ἄδικιας μετατιθήμενοις (“And now they address a gentle god, who is easily appeased by the ones who convert/repent from wrongdoing”). Additionally, Josephus, in narrating Jewish history to a Gentile audience, employs μετατιθήμενοι to describe those who should repent from sins in a case of suspected apostasy (A. J. 5.110) and those who were repenting from disobedience to the Mosaic law (A. J. 5.200).

In summary, based on the evidence in ancient sources, there is no reason to assume that the Galatians would have understood 1:6 in any way other than in the sense

43 2 Macc 7:24; Let. Aris. 188.4; Cornutus, Nat. d. 11. 7; Justin, Dial. 107.2.9; Mart. Pol. 11.1.3; Origen, Cels. 8.47.21.

44 Let. Aris. 188.4; Josephus, A. J. 20.38; Mart. Pol. 11.1.3; Maximus, Or. 36.3.15; Clement of Alexandria, Paed. 3.8.3; Origen, Cels. 1.52.21; 2.79.11; 4.54.8. However, Josephus, A. J. 9.265 has μεταθήμενοι πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν (“converting to piety”).

45 Galatians, 108. But Martyn does connect “defection” with “conversion consciousness.”

46 Nat. d. 11. 7. Cornutus, exiled by Nero, was a contemporary of Paul. His work employed allegory and etymology to derive Stoic principles from myths and divine names. See OCD, 94.

that Paul is accusing them of converting/repenting “from the one who called you in grace . . . to another gospel.” When the religious connotation of converting away from God is stressed as the focus of 1:6, ἐν χάριτι properly stands, for both writer and addressees, in direct opposition to the pseudo-gospel (ἐν άλλῃ ἐπιστήμῃ), which Paul states is a distortion of the gospel of Christ (1:7). Since the Missionaries’ “gospel” included Torah-observance for Gentiles, Paul is juxtaposing obedience to the Torah and grace in 1:6-7.

Given the evidence that Gentiles were familiar with the religious connotation of μετατίθημι and given that Josephus employed the verb in relation to apostasy from the Jewish law, presumably with the assumption that his words would make sense to his Gentile audience, there is no discrepancy between what Paul intended and what the Galatians most likely heard. Therefore, it is reasonable to propose that the assumption of some New Testament scholars that μετατίθημι would have been understood by the Galatians as in some way relating to a desertion from a philosophical school has most likely diminished a proper understanding of Paul’s contrast of grace and Torah in this portion of his letter.

That Paul is juxtaposing Torah and grace in 1:6-7 is further supported by the use

---

48 However, Paul would only have made such a comparison retrospectively in light of his experience with Christ. See E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 442-3. This proposed juxtaposition is valid regardless of whether the shorter reading of Παύλου, Marcion, Tertullian, etc. or one of the variant genitives qualifying ἐν χάριτι is considered to be the original reading. Martyn (*Galatians*, 109, 157) is correct to note that Paul is placing “side by side a reference to God as the one who ‘calls’ and a reference to God as the one who ‘graces’ in order to stress that God is calling the ‘nonexistent into existence.’” Also, Hays (*Galatians*, 204) connects χάρις in 1:6 with Paul’s statements regarding grace in 5:4 and 2:20-21.

49 See n.30 above.
of μετατίθημι in the LXX. The verb is employed to indicate apostasy from the distinctive customs of Judaism (2 Macc 7:24) and in cases in which the description of apostasy is stated specifically as turning away from the commandments as a consequence of allowing oneself to be influenced by the habits of Gentile associates and/or Gentile marriage partners, as in the case of Jezebel’s influence on Ahab that resulted in the murder of Naboth and the seizure of Naboth’s vineyard. If Paul were parodying the Jewish understanding of μετατίθημι as apostasy from the commandments, he would be reversing not only the use of the verb in relation to the Mosaic law as it is found in 2 Macc 7:24 and 1 Kgs 20:25, but also as it is found in secular literature (e.g., Josephus A. J. 5.110,

50 The exact phrase in 2 Macc 7:24 is μετέβημενον ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων (“converting from the fathers”) and is translated in the RSV as “turn from the ways of his fathers,” which is equivalent to turning from the distinctive customs described in the Torah. Hays (Galatians, 204) notes that Paul uses irony when he describes the Galatians’ defection toward the law in contrast to the defection away from the law as found in 2 Macc 7:24. Also, Dunn (Galatians, 39-40) notes the appearance of μετατίθημι in 2 Macc 7:24 and interprets 1:6 as Paul’s indication that the Galatians were committing apostasy. Dunn cites Mussner (Galaterbrief, 53 n. 54), who connects Paul’s adverb ταχέως (“quickly”) and the adverb ταχύ (“quickly”) describing the Israelites’ apostasy in making and worshipping the molten calf (Exod 32:8 and Deut 9:16a). Mussner (ibid.) also cites LXX Judg 2:17 as another passage that Paul could have been alluding to based on the similarity of adverbs and a reference to the unfaithfulness of Israel; however, the verb in this verse is ἔκκλινον not μετατίθημι. The similarity of the adverbs and of the subject of apostasy may enhance the possibility that Paul is alluding to the apostasy of Israel at Mt. Sinai in Gal 1:6. However, it is also possible that Paul is alluding to apostasy of a more general nature: a turning away from any of the commandments. Therefore, we are including additional references that employ μετατίθημι and discuss apostasy in broader terms than the worship of other gods. This is the connotation found in 2 Macc 7:24 and in Josephus, A. J. 5.110, 200; 9.265.

51 In the LXX, 3 Kgdms 20:25 states that Jezebel μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν (“perverted him”). While the LXX verse has an active form of μετατίθημι, MT 1 Kgs 21:25 has the Hiphil of παρακαλέω, which means “mislead,” “deceive,” or “incite.” See παρακαλέω, BDB, 694. Also, see William L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 255. In MT Deut 13:7, the Hiphil of παρακαλέω is also used to describe someone who incites an Israelite to worship other gods; however, in LXX Deut 13:7 a form of παρακαλέω (“encourage”) is used.
200; 9.265).\textsuperscript{52} However, considering the dissociative quality of rhetorical parody, such a reversal would make sense in a situation in which Gentile Christians were being urged to become subject to Torah and Paul was writing to convince them otherwise. And if Morland is correct that Paul combined Deut 27-30 with Deut 13 in forming his double ἀνάθεμα, we have further substantiation that Paul is parodying the Jewish understanding that anyone who leads the people ἐκ τῆς ὀδοῦ ἥς ἐνετείλατο σοι κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου πορεύεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ (“from the way which the Lord your God commanded you to walk in it” – Deut 13:5) should be removed (13:5) and cursed (13:16).\textsuperscript{53}

Additionally, Morland notes:

The accusation μετατίθησθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ἰματίας in 1:6 corresponds to the crime in Deut 13, which is one of πλάνες [sic πλανήται] σε ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (13:5), ζήτεων [sic ζήτησεν] ἐποστήσαι σε ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (13:10), and of ἀφιστῆται [sic ἀπεστήσαν] πάντας (13:13). Paul uses a synonymous verb and has paraphrased the reference to God. Further, the general theme of apostasy is primarily connected with the covenantal curse tradition.

The reference εἰς ἑτέρου εὐαγγέλιον in 1:6 corresponds to the apostasy in Deut 13, which is described as one of serving θεοί ἑτέρων (13:2, 6, 13).\textsuperscript{54}

While Morland is certainly correct that Paul is shaping his statements in 1:6 to reflect “the general theme of apostasy,” which is “primarily connected with the

\textsuperscript{52} Josephus’ use of μετατίθησιν is clearly connected to the Mosaic law since A. J. 5.108 refers to νόμων πατρίων (“of the laws of the fathers”), 5.200 has ἐκ τῆς περιφράσιας τῶν νόμων (“from the contempt of the laws”), and 9.266 has παρανομοῦσιν (“they are acting contrary to the law”).

\textsuperscript{53} The scriptural basis for the Missionaries’ teaching that the Mosaic law should apply to Gentile converts to Christianity, as well as Jewish Christians, will be presented below. For the consensus opinion that the objective of the Missionaries was to ensure compliance with Torah, see commentators cited in n.48 above.

\textsuperscript{54} Morland, 152. I have corrected Morland’s quotations in the first paragraph to read as the LXX does. At first glance, it appears that Morland attempted to render the verbs in their present active infinitive forms; however, his incorrect form ἀφιστῆται, which should have been ἀφιστᾶναι, made it preferable to correct the verbs to the forms in which they appear in Deut 13.
covenantal curse tradition,” we disagree with the direct correspondence that he posits between serving other gods and Paul’s “other gospel.” Although Deut 13:2, 6-7, and 13 do connect apostasy from the Lord with serving other gods, our references to 2 Macc 7:24 and Josephus cited above indicate that by the time of Paul the Jewish idea of apostasy was understood with the more general meaning of violating the distinctive customs of Judaism.\(^{55}\) And even Deut 13:18 equates keeping all the commandments with doing what is good and pleasing (ἀρεστόν) before God.\(^{56}\) Therefore, the typical Jewish and Paul’s own pre-call understanding of apostasy consisted of denying God and the covenant that included the law.\(^{57}\)

3.1.1.2 Paul’s defense of the divine nature of his gospel as a counter to any claim that he is an apostate

Since Deut 13:18 emphasizes the necessity of keeping all the commandments, Paul could be continuing his parodic reversal of the Deuteronomic curses upon those who entice the people to commit apostasy by rhetorically questioning if the Galatians presume

---

\(^{55}\) In 2 Macc 6:1-11, “apostasy” is defined as failing to keep the “laws of the fathers” and/or the “laws of God,” but keeping the Sabbath, observing feasts, and circumcision are the specific laws that are mentioned. In 2 Macc 7, “apostasy” specifically deals with the eating of swine’s flesh that had been offered to idols (vv. 1, 42); however, reference is also made to the entire “law of Moses” (v. 30).

\(^{56}\) We have italicized “all” to emphasize that Deut 13:18 refers to πάσας τὰς ἑντολὰς αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐγὼ ἑντάξασθοί σοι σήμερον (“all his commandments as many as I command to you today”).

\(^{57}\) This understanding of apostasy from the Jewish standpoint is drawn from Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 84, 147, 206, 243, 255-57, 285, 351, 353-61, 367-71, and 378. Especially important are two of his summary statements: (1) Fulfilling the commandments . . . is a privilege and obligation for those in the covenant. Those outside, even if they were born Israelites, are excluded from both the privilege and the responsibility. The commandments accompany the covenant.” (84, emphasis original), and (2) “We conclude, then, that the soteriology of the book of Jubilees is that which we have found to be so widespread in Palestinian Judaism: salvation is given graciously by God in his establishing the covenant with the fathers, a covenant which he will not forsake (1:11); individuals may, however, be excluded from Israel if they sin in such a way as to spurn the covenant itself” (370-71).
that he, the one preaching a law-free gospel to the Gentiles, is pleasing (ἀρέσκω)\textsuperscript{58} humans (1:10b), rather than God. And if Paul is continuing his parodic reversal of the Jewish idea of apostasy, which included the condemnation of anyone who deceived or enticed the people to reject the Mosaic law,\textsuperscript{59} how would a recognition of this rhetorical device affect the interpretation of 1:10a: "Ἀρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἃ τὸν θεόν; ("Am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God?")?\textsuperscript{60}

Although there is a plethora of evidence that πείθω (1:10a) was commonly used to describe deceptive forms of rhetorical persuasion and that ancient rhetors were frequently considered to be people-pleasers,\textsuperscript{61} commentators note the difficulty of interpreting ἃ τὸν θεόν in relationship to "Ἀρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω.\textsuperscript{62} One solution is to understand Paul’s πείθω (v. 10a) and ἀρέσκειν (v.10b) as interchangeable and as an indication that the apostle is defending himself against charges that he is a “people-pleaser.” In this case, as Martyn contends, Paul is contrasting pleasing humans via questionable rhetorical methods with its antithesis, namely “his apostolic labor which is directed toward pleasing

\textsuperscript{58} Paul does not use the adjective ἀρεστός in his letters; however, he does use forms of the verb ἀρέσκω (in the undisputed letters: Rom 8:8; 15:1,2,3; 1 Cor 7:32,33,34; 10:33; Gal 1:10; 1 Thess 2:4, 15; 4:1) along with the compound adjective εὐαρέστος (in the undisputed letters: Rom 12:-1-2; 14:18; 2 Cor 5:9; Phil 4:18). Especially important for understanding Paul’s connection between pleasing God and being a slave of Christ is his statement in Rom 14:18: ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ εὐαρέστος τῷ θεῷ ("for the one being a slave to Christ in this [way] is well-pleasing to God"), a concept that will be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{59} E.g., Deut 13: 5-6, 10, 13; 1 Kgs 20:25; 2 Macc 6-7.

\textsuperscript{60} This is the translation presented in the RSV. We will propose a different translation below.

\textsuperscript{61} See esp. Betz, Galatians, 54 n.103, 55 nn. 104-14; Rudolph Bultmann, “πείθω,” TDNT 6.2-3; Dunn, Galatians, 48-49; and Werner Forster, “ἀρέσκω,” TDNT 1.455-57.

\textsuperscript{62} See the numerous sources cited by Betz (Galatians, 55 n. 108), who proposes: “‘persuade God’ turns out to be a polemical definition of magic and religious quackery.” Dunn (Galatians, 50), Martyn (Galatians, 139), and Hays (Galatians, 206) reject Betz’ s interpretation.
God. “63 Alternately, Dunn does not equate πειθω and ἀπέσκεψεν. He proposes that Paul is denying not only that his previous preaching amounted to persuasive and deceptive rhetoric in which he flattered the Galatians into accepting his message (v.10a-b), but also that his law-free gospel is an attempt to persuade God (v.10a) to accept Gentiles “on easier terms (than those laid down in the covenant law).” 64 Also for Dunn γάρ has some degree of causal force, thus connecting v.10 with the anathemas in vv.8-9. 65

Martyn, however, understands γάρ as a transitional particle, and he justifies this position by stating that γάρ as a “loose connective” is “not unusual in questions.” 66 For Martyn then v.10 is a transitional sentence that is unconnected to the anathemas, and, therefore, it neither explains nor justifies them. 67 Although in questions γάρ is sometimes used to indicate a transition, this particular grammatical function is the last of many that Smyth lists for the use of γάρ in questions. 68 In questions γάρ can be used to ask “for confirmation of a preceding statement,” or it can be used to “ask a question prompted by some form of emotion.” And Smyth indicates that the latter use occurs frequently: “In questions, γάρ often marks surprise or indignation, and may frequently be translated by what, why, then, really, surely.” 69

63 Galatians, 139.
64 Galatians, 50. Heinrich Schlier (Galater, 16) also recognizes an additional meaning for πειθω.
65 Galatians, 48. Vos (“Argumentation,” 9), following Calvin, posits that γάρ in 1:10a is causal and is supporting an unexpressed sentence.
66 Galatians, 137.
67 Ibid., 136-37.
68 Smyth, §2805.
69 §§2805 and 2805a.
Considering the strong emotions expressed in the anathemas (1:8-9), it is logical that γάρ (v.10) is introducing a question that has been prompted by the emotion of the preceding verses and that Paul is continuing to counter the Jewish understanding of apostasy in v.10. Therefore, a suitable translation for v.10a-b would express not only Paul’s strong emotions, but also, following Dunn, acknowledge the different nuances that πείθω and ἀφέσκελν connote: “Now am I really attempting to persuade humans or God? Or am I seeking to please humans?” While Paul’s πείθω and ἀφέσκελν should be understood with the negative connotations that were so frequently associated with the verbs, the switch from πείθω to ἀφέσκελν should be interpreted as more than stylistic variation. Paul is not merely stating the same idea twice with different verbs; he is making two separate points. First, Paul’s πείθω is denying that he is trying to persuade humans by using the standard, and frequently questionable, persuasive methods of the rhetors, and, as Dunn proposes, Paul is denying that he is attempting to persuade God to accept Gentile Christians without the requirements of the Mosaic law. Second, Paul’s ἀφέσκελν is denying that his law-free gospel is law-free because he is a people-pleaser.

Support for different translations of πείθω and ἀφέσκελν within discussions of apostasy is provided by Josephus (A. J. 12.267-73) in his retelling of 1 Macc 2:1-28. In explaining that Mattathias preferred to die ὑπὲρ τῶν πατρίων νόμων (“on behalf of the

---

70 We are translating πείθω as a conative present. See BDF, §319, which also notes that Paul employs the conative present in Gal 5:4 and 6:12.
71 See n.61 above.
laws of the fathers”) rather than to obey Antiochus IV, Mattathias asserts that other nations might obey Antiochus’ orders “on account of fear or a desire to please (εὐαρέστησις);” however, the Maccabees “will never be persuaded (οὐδ’ . . . πεισθήσεσθαι) to forsake their ancestral religion” (12.269). Since this statement is not directly drawn from 1 Macc 2, Josephus’ words indicate that in the first century C.E. a “desire to please” was understood as a contributing factor in being persuaded to commit apostasy; however, in Josephus’ version, Mattathias says, εἰ τις ζηλωτής ἐστιν τῶν πατρίων ἔθων (“if anyone is zealous for the ancestral customs”), he/she would not commit apostasy even when others “pursued/persecuted” (ἐδίωξαν) and “were attempting to persuade” (ἐπεχείρουν πείθειν) him/her. Additionally, in 2 Macc 7:26 the mother feigns an attempt to persuade (πείσειν) her youngest son to apostatize after Antiochus tries to convert (μετατίθημι) him “from the ways of the fathers” (v.24). Although 2 Macc 7:26 does not employ a cognate of ἀφέσκω, the frequent use of forms of πείθω in relation to apostasy warrants further investigation into the possibility that Paul is employing πείθω in Gal 1:10a to mean “persuade” rather than “please.”

However, some scholars are reluctant to read πείθω (Gal 1:10a) in any way other than being synonymous with ἀφέσκειν (Gal 1:10b), and, therefore, they understand the

---

72 BAGD (“εὐαρέστησις,” 318) and PGL (“εὐαρέστησις,” 560) note that the noun, while used frequently in the context of being “well pleasing” to God, can connote being “well pleasing” in a more general sense. Although εὐαρέστησις is derived from εὐαρέστησθαι, rather than ἀφέσκω, BDAG (“εὐαρέστησθαι,” 403) mentions the morphological connection of the verbs. For Paul’s use of ἀφέσκω and εὐαρέστησθαι, see n.58 above.

73 A. J. 12.271-73.
expected answer to Paul’s questions to be that he doesn’t please humans, but he does please God.\textsuperscript{74} Those who support this position usually appeal to the following three points. First, looking to the only other passage in which Paul employs the present active of πείθω, scholars generally reject the idea that Paul’s ἀνθρωποι πείθομεν (“we persuade humans”) in 2 Cor 5:11 is referring solely to his apostolic calling, and they opt for the understanding that Paul, in the face of accusations of insincerity by his opponents, is acknowledging “we persuade humans,” but declaring that their “persuasion” is characterized by the purest motives because θεός . . . πεφανερώμεθα (“we are well known to God”).\textsuperscript{75} Thus, as Furnish notes, Paul is “responding to those who have accused him of trying to ‘persuade people’ in devious ways.”\textsuperscript{76} Second, since Paul’s πείθω in Gal 1:10a is not accompanied by any explicit phrase that explains its meaning, scholars turn to v.10b to interpret v.10a. And third, once v.10a and v.10b are deemed to be parallel, it is easy to appeal to 1 Thess 2:4 and 1 Cor 2:4 for further confirmation that Paul in Gal 1:10a expects a negative answer to his question regarding pleasing humans, but that he expects a positive answer to his question regarding pleasing God.

But several weaknesses are inherent in these arguments. First, even though Paul is probably not referring solely to his apostolic calling in 2 Cor 5:11 because he is

\textsuperscript{74} See, e.g., Martyn’s (\textit{Galatians}, 137-40) discussion.
\textsuperscript{75} Bultmann, “πείθω,” \textit{TDNT} 6.2-3; Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 138; George Lyons, \textit{Pauline Autobiography: Toward A New Understanding} (SBLDS 73; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985), 139-44. But Bultmann (2) does not view Gal 1:10a as parallel to 1:10b. For Bultmann, Paul in v.10a is referring to his apostolic preaching and is seeking to persuade men of the gospel. Therefore, the answer to v.10a is “men” because Paul is denying that he is attempting to persuade God to accept Gentiles without Torah.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{II Corinthians} (AB 32A; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 306. See also Bultmann, “πείθω,” \textit{TDNT} 6.2.
responding to charges that he uses deceptive, rhetorical methods of persuasion, he does not answer this charge with a form of ἀρέσκω and, therefore, we cannot unequivocally claim that he is referring in this verse to the people-pleasing tactics of some rhetors. By employing πείθω, it is just as likely that Paul is referring to other rhetorical methods of persuasion that were considered devious and unscrupulous, especially since, as Betz notes, the active voice of πείθω with ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες is “a definition of rhetoric.” So while some rhetors were accused of being people pleasers and Paul unequivocally denies that his preaching should be characterized as ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες in 1 Thess 2:4, he is most likely employing πείθω to mean “persuade” not “please” in 2 Cor 5:11 given not only the absence of ἀρέσκω, but also the lack of any clarifying reference to “flattery” or “greed,” which were commonly associated with sophistry. Second, since Paul uses the participle of ἀρέσκω, not πείθω, in 1 Thess 2:4, this verse, while very relevant for interpreting Paul’s meaning in Gal 1:10b-c, is irrelevant in determining his meaning of πείθω (Gal 1:10a) unless one has predetermined that πείθω and ἀρέσκω are synonymous. Third, the context of 1 Cor 2:4 indicates that Paul is negatively discussing “persuasion” or ________________________________________________________________________________________

77 Galatians, 54–55 and sources cited in nn.103-5. Also, important for this discussion is Tim Whitmarsh’s (The Second Sophistic [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005], 3 and ch. 2) study highlighting the limitation of sophistic performances, which sought to “solicit the pleasure, admiration, and respect of the audience,” to epideictic oratory.

78 Martyn (Galatians, 138) appeals to sources cited by Betz (Galatians, 54 n.103; 55 n.111) and Brian J. Dodd (“Christ’s Slave, People Pleasers and Galatians 1:10,” NTS 42 [1996]: 90-104) to read πείθω as synonymous with ἀρέσκω in 1:10. However, many sources cited by Betz indicate that “people pleasing” was only one of several rhetorical practices considered unscrupulous. Dodd (here, 90) claims: “Πείθω is commonly used with the sense ‘I conciliate’ or ‘I seek the approval of’”; however, the only source that he cites that pre-dates Galatians is 2 Macc 4:45. When read in context, πείθω in v.45 can only mean “to persuade” or “to win over” (cf. v.34) since the infinitive is used in discussing a monetary bribe made in the hope of persuading Antiochus to change his mind (v.46).
“persuasive words,” depending on whether πειθῶ or πειθός and λόγος should be read; however, Paul does not qualify his meaning in Gal 1:10a with additional words such as σοφία or λόγος.  

Also, the meaning of πειθῶ in 1:10a should primarily be determined by its immediate context rather than by Paul’s other letters. Martyn does interpret 1:10 in relation to 1:1 and 1:11-12 by claiming that Paul’s antinomy between a gospel originating from “God’s apocalyptic revelation of Jesus Christ” and a gospel from a human source adds support to his proposal that Paul is setting up another antinomy in v.10b-c in which he is juxtaposing pleasing human beings and being a slave of Christ. While Martyn is certainly correct that Paul states an antinomy in 1:1, reiterates the antinomy in 1:11-12, and juxtaposes pleasing humans and being a slave of Christ in 1:10b-c, it does not necessarily follow, as Martyn claims, that the Galatians would have taken Paul’s juxtaposition in v.10b-c as an indication that they should also “interpret the questions of v.10a as alternatives.”

Martyn’s determination that γὰρ in v.10 should play “no role in the translation” naturally leads him to interpret v.10a solely on the basis of what follows it. However, as I have shown above, the more frequent and normal use of γὰρ in questions is to express indignation, and such an expression of indignant emotion logically connects v.10 to the preceding anathemas.


80 Galatians, 139.

81 Ibid.
Therefore, Paul is establishing in vv.1, 11-12 that his apostleship and his gospel are the result of God’s revelation of Jesus Christ. The alternative to this affirmation would be that Paul’s apostleship had been created by human means and that his preaching of a law-free gospel should be considered as an apostate’s attempt to deceive others, thus encouraging them to join him in his apostasy.82 In between his two affirmations of the antinomy between God’s revelation of Christ and a gospel taught by humans, Paul employs rhetorical parody in order to use some of the Missionaries’ charges against him to his own advantage. An extremely loose paraphrase of Paul’s argument in vv. 6-10, which includes some items mentioned later in the letter, would read:

I am amazed that you are so quickly becoming apostates by converting away from God, the one who called you into grace (not into Torah obedience), to another gospel. Not that there really is another gospel, but I use that phrase because the ones troubling you are actually distorting the gospel of Christ by including obedience to the Mosaic law as part of the message, and this makes their message an entirely different gospel, a pseudo-gospel. These people claim that the gospel demands that Gentile believers must be Torah-observant. And they insist that in order for you to please God and receive God’s blessings, you must keep all the commandments, including circumcision, feast days, and everything in the law. They also claim that if you fail to observe all the commandments you will be apostates who are subject to all the curses, including enslavement, that are described in the Scriptures. I will dispute their message with the correct interpretation of Scripture in light of the death and resurrection of Christ, but initially I want you to know that even if we, or a messenger from Heaven, should

82 We will demonstrate in the following argument that Paul’s insistence on the divine nature of his apostleship and his gospel (Gal 1:1, 11-12) may be his attempt to counter a charge that his law-free gospel was the result of his own apostasy from the gospel that he received from the law-observant apostles. Therefore, his defense of his own apostleship and his gospel is not an attempt to justify the legitimacy of either in comparison to the authority of the Jerusalem apostles. Rather, Paul is asserting he had not been taught the gospel from the original apostles and that he had not corrupted their gospel with what the Missionaries considered to be the apostate notion that Gentile converts did not have to observe Torah. Since Paul received his law-free gospel via God’s revelation of Christ, he argues therefore that his preaching was not an apostate version of a gospel that demanded Torah observance.
preach to you a gospel contrary to what we preached to you, let that person be the one who is cursed! As we have said before and now I say again, if anyone is preaching to you contrary to what you received, let that person be cursed!

Now am I really trying to use deceptive speech to persuade people to accept an apostate gospel? Or am I really trying to persuade God to accept Gentiles without the requirements of the law? Or do you really think that I am seeking to please humans by not telling you everything that the gospel requires of you? If I were still pleasing humans, as I did when I persecuted believers because I thought that they were apostates, I would not be a slave of Christ. These Missionaries think that they are slaves of God, and they are persecuting and excluding you because they think that you have accepted an apostate gospel. But I am a slave of Christ.

When vv. 6-10 are read in light of the subject of apostasy, it naturally follows that Paul would reiterate the divine nature of his gospel in vv. 11-12. Therefore, while Paul is reiterating the antinomy of v.1 in vv.11-12, he is also continuing his argument from vv.6-9 in v.10 by making another parodic allusion to Deut 13. As Martyn correctly notes, Paul is just as adamant that his gospel is not from a human source as he is that his preaching is not characterized by flattery in the style of the sophists, and, importantly, Martyn interprets Paul’s εἰ εὖ θρωποίζων ἔρεσκον (“if I were still pleasing humans”) in 1:10c as referring to “his earlier consumptive zeal to please his nomistic teachers (1:14).”83 While Paul, after experiencing God’s revelation of Christ, certainly would have considered his earlier persecution of the church as evidence that he had been pleasing humans, Hays is correct that Paul’s zealous persecution of the church resulted from his pre-call determination that the followers of Christ were apostates along the line of the false prophet in Deut 13:5 who deceived the people and drove them away from following the

83 Ibid., 140.
commandments. And as Hays notes, Paul “put his zeal into action by using force against those whom he considered enemies of the Law.”

Therefore, as Hays states, Paul’s former persecution of the church was justified by his previous understanding of Deut 13. It was only in retrospect that he viewed his zealous actions as pleasing humans. And based on Paul’s own pre-call understanding of Deut 13, it is probable that the Jewish Christian Missionaries, who believed that Paul’s Galatian converts must be Torah-observant, also understood Deut 13 as dictating that they should not tolerate a person who attempted to lead the people away from the commandments, whether that person was considered to be a “false prophet” (v.5) or one of the “evil men” who “went out from you” and caused others to commit apostasy (v.13).

3.1.1.3 “Slave of Christ” as a parodic reinterpretation of the Deuteronomic curse of a return to slavery

Since most likely, as Morland maintains, Paul combines Deut 13 with Deut 27-30 in forming his double ἀνάθεμα (Gal 1:8-9), it is also likely not only that Paul in 1:10 is attempting to counter the stipulation in Deut 13:18 (cf. Deut 28:58) that a person must follow all the commandments in order to please God, but also that he is attempting, in

84 Galatians, 214.
85 Ibid. Witherington (Grace, 113) states: “Not incidentally, ‘apostate’ appears to be precisely how Saul during his time as a Pharisee had viewed those in the church of God. This in turn led to his zealous actions against such Jews.” Additionally, Dunn (The Theology of Paul the Apostle [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 352 n.71) states: “The point is not that he attributes his persecuting ‘zeal’ to his Pharisaism. Rather, his Pharisaism and his persecuting zeal were both expressions of his covenant faithfulness.”
86 The relationship of Deut 13:13 to Paul’s argument in Galatians will be discussed below.
light of the gospel, to counter the Deuteronomic curse, which threatened a return to slavery as the just punishment for rejecting the covenantal requirements (Deut 28: 41, 48, 68). An additional tie to the idea that a return to slavery would result if the people failed to be Torah-observant can be seen in the way that Deut 13 describes God not only as the one who led the Israelites out of Egypt, but also as the one who redeemed them from their previous state of slavery in Egypt. These descriptions of God are employed in the same sentences that describe the just punishment for those who entice the people to become apostate. Deuteronomy 28 describes the curses that would befall the people if they did not obey all the commandments (vv. 15, 45), and at the end of this description v. 68 states:

καὶ ἀποστρέψει σε κύριος εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐν πλοίοις . . . καὶ πραθήσεσθε ἐκεῖ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν εἰς παιδᾶς καὶ παιδίσκας καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ κτώμενος

And the Lord will return you to Egypt in ships . . . you will be sold there to your enemies for male slaves and female slaves, and he [i.e. the Lord] will not be the one who acquires [you].

87 Deut 13:5 describes God as τοῦ λυτρωσμένου σε ἐκ τῆς δουλείας (“the one who redeemed you from slavery”), and Deut 13:10 states, ἐξ οὗκ δουλείας (“out of the house of slavery”).

88 Deut 28:15 states: καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν μὴ εἰσάκουσης τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου φυλάσσει καὶ ποιεῖν πᾶσας τὰς εντολὰς αὐτοῦ ὅσα εἶναι ἐντέλλονται σοι καὶ ἔλεγονται ἐπὶ σέ πᾶσαι αἱ κατάραι αὐται καὶ καταλήψεσαται σε (“and it will be if you do not obey the voice of the Lord your God to keep and to do all his commandments, as many as I command you today; and all these curses will come upon you, and they will overtake you.”). Similarly, v. 45 stresses πᾶσαι (all) the curses will be the punishment for not obeying the commandments, ὅσα ἐνετελέσατο σοι (“as many as he commanded you”).

89 Cf. Deut 32:6; Exod 15:16; and Ps 73:2 in which forms of κτάμαι are employed to describe God as the one who purchased the Israelites from slavery. We have translated καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ κτώμενος as “and he will not be the one who acquires [you]” even though πως ἐγὼ in MT Deut 28:68 is correctly translated as “and there is no buyer.” The declaration that there is no buyer makes sense in the context of the MT verse since πως (“sell”) is in the Hithpael, which is reflexive and indicates that the Israelites will attempt to sell themselves into slavery. In LXX Deut 28:68, the article not only makes κτώμενος substantive (Smyth, §1153b), but it is also anaphoric and refers to κύριος (Smyth, §1152). At first glance we might assume that the presence of the article with the participle indicates that ὁ κτώμενος is the subject of the sentence, rather
The clear implication then is that God, who previously freed the people from their
Egyptian enslavement, would return them to a condition of slavery if they rejected the
conditions of the covenant, and importantly in the renewed enslavement God would no
longer be their master. However, after a period of punishment for their rejection of the
law, the people would again be restored as God’s δοῦλοι (Deut 32:36; 2 Macc 7:6, 33).

If Paul is again employing rhetorical parody in his phrase Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, he is
depicting the status of being a slave of Christ as a desirable and voluntary state in the
same way that the Israelites would have understood being a “slave of the Lord” as a

than the predicate nominative. However, Daniel B. Wallace’s (Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics [Grand
Rapids: Zondervan, 1996], 40-46) discussion on distinguishing the subject from the predicate nominative
when the subject is an implied pronoun and the predicate nominative is articular indicates that “he,” the
implied pronoun, and ὁ κτάμενος have the same referent (i.e. κύριος) and are completely interchangeable.
The declaration that God will not be the one who acquires the Israelites as slaves makes sense in the
context of the LXX verse since πρακθήσετε (“you will be sold”) is future passive and therefore cannot
indicate that the Israelites will attempt to sell themselves. The reference to “Egypt” in this verse symbolizes
the general condition of slavery (cf. 28:36).

Although God redeemed the people from a condition of slavery to others (Lev 26:13; Deut 13:5, 10), a
person within the covenant is often referred to as God’s δοῦλος (Deut 32:36; Ps 33:23; 68:36-7; 104:6, 25;
118:17, 23; 122:2; 134:1; 14; 135:22; Odes Sol. 2:36; 7:44; Pss Sol 2:37; 10:4; Joel 3:2; Mal 1:6; Isa 65:9;
and Jer 3:22). Additionally, non-Israelites are called δοῦλοι καὶ δοῦλοι if they become loyal to God’s
covenant (Isa 56:6). So even though God is said to have “broken the yoke” of slavery (Lev 26:13), the
Israelites were still considered to be God’s slaves. A similar understanding in terms of being a “slave of
Christ” appears in Galatians since Paul counsels believers that their freedom in Christ should lead to
enslavement to one another in love (5:13) even though they are not “again to be subject to a yoke of
slavery” (5:1). See also Dale B. Martin, Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline
Christianity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 60-68.

Cf. Rom 14:18; 1 Cor 7:22. If Paul is countering the Deuteronomic threat of renewed slavery in Gal 1:10,
this parodic use of Χριστοῦ δοῦλος does not negate the sociological implications of Paul’s other slavery
metaphors. For an overview of recent studies on Paul’s metaphors of slavery, see J. Albert Harrill, “Paul
and Slavery,” in Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity,
2003), 575-607. Harrill notes that Paul employs the metaphor of slavery in two different ways: some
positive and some negative. And most importantly he states: “Identical metaphors, however, do not always
point to the same phenomenon when used in different ways” (597).
desirable state in contrast to the horrible conditions of imposed slavery to other masters as depicted in Deut 28:15-68. Thus, he is countering the threat of renewed slavery under a master who is not the Lord as the just punishment for apostates who fail to observe all the commandments by contending that he, the one preaching a law-free gospel to the Gentiles, is in actuality a slave of Christ, and as such, therefore, could not still be pleasing humans.\footnote{In discussing “slave of Christ,” Dunn (Galatians, 50-51) states: “his readers would know well that a slave owed absolute and exclusive loyalty to his master” and Paul’s “actions as an apostle of Christ were directed by him alone.”

\footnote{Gerhard Sass (“Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus,” ZNW 40 [1941]: 24-32, esp. 31) who, after investigating the various meanings of δοῦλος in Paul’s letters, maintains that in Gal 1:10: “Paulus steht mit seinem Sprachgebrauch hier also ganz in der ATlich-prophetischen Linie” (“With his usage here therefore Paul stands totally in the OT-prophetic line”). Also, Dodd (“Christ’s Slave,” 97-99), noting that Paul employs a variety of slavery metaphors, understands Paul’s Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in Gal 1:10 as not only polemical, but also as influenced by the use of “slave” in relation to the prophets, especially Jeremiah and Isaiah.


Additionally, scholars frequently note that Paul is employing Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in order to establish that he considers himself to be a “slave of Christ” in the same manner in which the Hebrew prophets were called “slaves” of God.\footnote{In discussing “slave of Christ,” Dunn (Galatians, 50-51) states: “his readers would know well that a slave owed absolute and exclusive loyalty to his master” and Paul’s “actions as an apostle of Christ were directed by him alone.”

\footnote{Gerhard Sass (“Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus,” ZNW 40 [1941]: 24-32, esp. 31) who, after investigating the various meanings of δοῦλος in Paul’s letters, maintains that in Gal 1:10: “Paulus steht mit seinem Sprachgebrauch hier also ganz in der ATlich-prophetischen Linie” (“With his usage here therefore Paul stands totally in the OT-prophetic line”). Also, Dodd (“Christ’s Slave,” 97-99), noting that Paul employs a variety of slavery metaphors, understands Paul’s Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in Gal 1:10 as not only polemical, but also as influenced by the use of “slave” in relation to the prophets, especially Jeremiah and Isaiah.


As has been well noted, affinities exist between Gal 1:15-16 and the commissions of Jeremiah (1:5) and Isaiah (49:1, 6), and Paul’s reference to “slave” in Gal 1:10 may have been influenced by the slave references in these prophetic works.\footnote{In discussing “slave of Christ,” Dunn (Galatians, 50-51) states: “his readers would know well that a slave owed absolute and exclusive loyalty to his master” and Paul’s “actions as an apostle of Christ were directed by him alone.”

\footnote{Gerhard Sass (“Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus,” ZNW 40 [1941]: 24-32, esp. 31) who, after investigating the various meanings of δοῦλος in Paul’s letters, maintains that in Gal 1:10: “Paulus steht mit seinem Sprachgebrauch hier also ganz in der ATlich-prophetischen Linie” (“With his usage here therefore Paul stands totally in the OT-prophetic line”). Also, Dodd (“Christ’s Slave,” 97-99), noting that Paul employs a variety of slavery metaphors, understands Paul’s Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in Gal 1:10 as not only polemical, but also as influenced by the use of “slave” in relation to the prophets, especially Jeremiah and Isaiah.


Although Paul most likely saw himself as standing in the tradition of the Hebrew prophets, especially considering the prophetic
language in Gal 1:15-16, the very infrequent use of δοῦλος κυρίου in the LXX versions of the verses in which the MT has הָעֶבֶד יְהֹוָה may indicate that Paul’s Χριστοῦ δοῦλος should be understood as a double entendre. Since δοῦλος κυρίου is employed in the LXX in contexts dealing with covenantal renewal and/or the acknowledgement of sin,

---

95 Additionally, Amos 3:7, in the context of an indictment of Israel for sin (3:1), states: δῶεις σοὶ μὴ ποιήσῃ κύριος ὁ θεὸς πράγμα ἐὰν μὴ ἀποκαλύψῃ παιδίαν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς δοῦλους αὐτοῦ τοὺς προφήτας (“For the Lord God will never perform a deed unless he reveals his instruction to his servants, the prophets”). Therefore, Paul’s announcement of God’s revelation of Christ (Gal 1:12, 16) could be another example of prophetic language in addition to his allusions to Jeremiah and Isaiah in 1:15-16.

96 E.g., Dodd (“Christ’s Slave,” 98 n. 35) lists 22 verses that he claims contain “ποιήσαι; LXX δοῦλος κυρίου;” however, in actuality, only 4 of the verses cited (Josh 24:29; Judg 2:8; 2 Kg 18:13; Ps 35:1) employ δοῦλος for παῖς. Importantly, Josh 24:29 and Judg 2:8 employ δοῦλος κυρίου as a title for Joshua after he led the tribes of Israel in covenant renewal (Josh 24:1-28; Judg 2:1-7). 2 Kg 18:13 describes Moses as δοῦλος κυρίου in explaining that the Samaritans were taken captive by Assyria (18:12) because they transgressed the covenant requirements commanded by Moses, the servant of the Lord. And Ps 35:1, in the title of a psalm supposedly written by David, states τῷ δοῦλῳ κυρίου Δαυὶδ prior to describing the thought process of ὁ παράνομος τοῦ ἀμάρτανεν (“the one contrary to the law in order to sin”) in 35:2. Although Dodd (98 n. 41) does state: “On the interchangeability of δοῦλος and παῖς in Jeremiah see the parallelism of 26:27-28,” he offers no explanation for the varying Greek vocabulary in the other verses cited (97 n. 35), e.g.: Μωυσῆς ἐκέτεις τοῦ Κυρίου in LXX Deut 34:5 for MT יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל; Μωυσῆς παῖς τοῦ Κυρίου in LXX 2 Chr 1:3 for MT יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל; Μωυσῆς υἱὸς τοῦ Κυρίου in LXX 2 Chr 24:6 for MT יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל; Μωυσῆς in Josh 1:1 for MT יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. While the Greek word chosen could reflect the theological tendencies of the translator, δοῦλος κυρίου is used for δοῦλος in the LXX in verses that specifically describe Moses, other figures, or the Hebrew people in connection with the law, discussions of sin/apostasy, or with episodes of covenant renewal. Even though Moses is frequently referred to as δοῦλος μου (e.g., 2 Kgs 21:8; Mal 3:24), δοῦλον μου (e.g., Neh 9:14) or δοῦλων αὐτοῦ (e.g., Ps 104:26), the only time that he is referred to with the exact phrase δοῦλος κυρίου is 2 Kg 18:13. As a title for Moses, δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ (“slave of God”) occurs in Neh 10:30 within an account of national confession of sin and covenant renewal. Additionally, Th. Dan 9:11 states: ἔπηλθεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἡ κατάρα καὶ ὁ ὄρκος ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσών ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ ὃτι ἠμάρτουμεν αὐτῷ (“the curse went out against us and the oath, the one written in the law of Moses, the servant of God, because we sinned against it”). As a referent to Moses, παῖς κυρίου is frequently employed in verses that discuss the law (e.g., Josh 1:7; 11:15; Neh 1:7-8), as is ὁ θεράπων κυρίου (e.g., Josh 9:2), therefore indicating the interchangeability of the words as Dodd notes regarding Jeremiah; however, if Paul is parodically replacing δοῦλος κυρίου with Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, the contexts of the verses that use the exact phrase δοῦλος κυρίου become important for our discussion since parody requires a play on the hypotext’s words.
rather than as a title for a prophet,\textsuperscript{97} the phrase should be understood as an identification of a person’s status within the covenant. Therefore, an Israelite was a “slave of the Lord” as a result of God’s redemption of Israel from previous slavery in Egypt and was under the threat of renewed slavery, under a master who was not the Lord, if the covenant obligations were rejected. So while Paul does use prophetic language in relating his call, presumably because he is establishing that he stands in line with the Hebrew prophets because God has revealed his son in him (1:16), he could also be countering the Deuteronomic understanding that God’s “slave” must observe all the commandments in order to remain a δούλος κυρίου within the covenant. Considering the Torah-observant connection with which the phrase δούλος κυρίου is employed in the LXX, Paul’s emphatic placement of Χριστοῦ prior to δούλος is making a powerful statement. Paul could be referring to himself as Χριστοῦ δούλος in order to emphasize that the believer’s status as a δούλος is determined by Christ’s death on the cross rather than by obedience to covenantal requirements, which he states explicitly later by explaining that Christ “bought us back from the curse of the law having become a curse for us” (3:13).\textsuperscript{98}

3.1.1.4 Summary

Again, Martyn’s denial of any causal function for γάρ (v.10a) and his denial that

\begin{itemize}
\item The only time that one of the canonical prophets is referred to as δούλος κυρίου is in Jonah 1:9 in the context of Jonah’s admission that the storm at sea is a result of his disobedience/sin (1:12). All of the other references to a prophet as δούλος are modified by “my” (cf. Zech 1:6; Jer 7:25, 25:4), “his” (cf. Isa 49:5) or “your” (cf. Isa 63:17) rather than κυρίου.
\item For the use of ἐξαγοράζω in connection with the manumission of slaves, see F. Büchsel, “ἀγοράζω, ἐξαγοράζω,” \textit{TDNT} 1:124-28. Compare Paul’s ἐγκαθίστηκε (“you were bought”) in 1 Cor 6:20.
\end{itemize}
the Galatians would have understood Paul’s argument as relating to apostasy (vv.6-9) prevent him from tying Paul’s reference to being a slave of Christ to the Deuternomic curse that entailed a return to slavery under other masters if the covenant obligations were neglected. Therefore, Martyn understands Paul’s “striking paradox” between slavery to Christ and freedom in Christ as entailing “redemption from enslavement to the power of the present evil age” while at the same time the believer “derives power” from Christ and has “freedom from all other” masters.99 In light of Paul’s declaration that Christ “gave himself for our sins in order that he might rescue us from the present evil age” (1:4), Martyn is correct to describe freedom in Christ as the abolishment of previous “enslavement to the power of the present evil age”; however, Martyn’s “striking paradox” is actually the same paradox evinced in descriptions of the Israelites as “slaves” in their relationship to God.100

Additionally, we have shown above that the Galatians would have understood Paul’s μετατίθημι (v. 6) with a religious connotation and that the normal use of γάρ in questions ties v. 10 to Paul’s anathemas in vv.8-9. So while Martyn understands the context of the argument to indicate that Paul “sees his enslavement to Christ as his call to preach the gospel,” it seems more appropriate, considering the religious connotations of μετατίθημι and the probable causal implications of γάρ, that Paul is continuing to redefine the meaning of apostasy and to establish clearly that his preaching of a law-free gospel is

99 Galatians, 140-41.
100 See n.90 above.
not a human attempt to lead others into apostasy.\footnote{101}

Therefore, in Gal 1:6-10, Paul is parodically reversing the Deuteronomic understanding that God, who delivered the Israelites from slavery in Egypt, gave them the law, and formed them into the covenant people,\footnote{102} demands continued obedience to \textit{all} the commandments for all people, whether Jew or Gentile, who desire to please God and to avoid future enslavement. When 1:6-10 is read in this way, Paul’s \textit{μετατίθεσθε} and \textit{χάριτι} (v.6), double anathema (vv.8-9), and \textit{ἀφέσκειν} and \textit{δοθῶ} (v.10) tie these verses together in an effort to reinterpret the meaning of apostasy as it is presented in a previously written text, Israel’s scriptures. The new meaning of apostasy is “converting away from the one who called you in grace” (1:6), and, as shown above, Paul has placed grace in juxtaposition to law in order to emphasize the new reality.\footnote{103}

If the above connection with the Deuteronomic understanding of apostasy is correct, we should view 1:6-10 not only as the opening of the letter’s body, but also, as Martyn contends, the theme of the entire letter.\footnote{104} Martyn’s proposal that Paul, in 1:6, is connecting God’s calling and God’s grace in order to demonstrate that God is calling the “nonexistent into existence” is certainly correct.\footnote{105} However, although Martyn views v. \textit{Cristου δοθῶ} is to counter the Deuternomic threat of future enslavement, this does not negate the possibility that Paul is also employing \textit{δοθῶ} to indicate the concept of total obedience to Christ in his proclamation of the gospel.\footnote{106}

\textit{Deut 32:6c} questions: \textit{οὐκ αὐτὸς οὗτός σου πατήρ ἐκτήσατο σε καὶ ἐποίησεν σε καὶ ἐκτισάν σε;} (“Did not he himself, your father, purchase you, and make you, and bring you into existence?”).

\textit{Galatians}, 24, 106. As mentioned above, Martyn views vv. 6-9 as the theme of the letter; however, as Hays (\textit{Galatians}, 207) notes, v. 10 does continue the rebuke section.

\textit{See n.48 above.}
10 as transitional, this verse, in our reading, is much more than a rhetorical transition between vv. 6-9 and vv. 11-12. It is a continuation of Paul’s parodic reversal of the deuteronomistic relationship between keeping the law, pleasing God, and maintaining one’s freedom. Just as God previously purchased the sons of Israel from slavery and formed them into the covenant people, who were obligated to obey all the commandments in order to maintain their freedom from slavery, God has now called the Galatians into the “space” of grace, which is the law-free gospel of Christ (vv.6-7) effected through God’s revelation of Jesus Christ (v. 11). The new “space” of grace does not require that one keep the Mosaic law in order to please God and avoid future enslavement. Rather, it provides freedom in Christ (Gal 2:4) while, at the same time, making one a voluntary slave of Christ.

By employing rhetorical parody, Paul, in the early portion of the letter, is beginning a dissociative argument that seeks to show that the perceived reality is only an appearance and a means of reaching the newly revealed reality. The appearance is that pleasing God is contingent on Torah obedience and that apostasy from Torah results in a pronouncement of curse and a return to slavery. The new reality is that the gospel of Christ does not entail Torah obedience in order to please God and that apostasy is turning from grace. The new reality of grace does not include the threat or curse of a future

---

106 Martyn, Galatians, 24.
107 Martyn (ibid., 109) correctly interprets ἐν χάριτι as locative rather than instrumental.
108 Paul further explicates freedom in Christ and enslavement under the Mosaic law in 2:4 and 4:21-5:1, which will be discussed below.
enslavement since “Christ bought us back from the curse of the law having become a curse for us” (Gal 3:13a), which logically means the person purchased under grace is a slave of Christ. As a slave of Christ, the believer is actually in a state of freedom (2:4), but freedom in Christ entails living by the Spirit (5:16-18), which results in being enslaved to others through love (5:13), rather than living “under the law” (5:18). If this interpretation is correct, Paul’s reversal of the meaning of apostasy and his pronouncement that he is a “slave of Christ” in 1:6-10 serves as an introduction for several of the theological arguments that Paul will make later in the letter.¹⁰⁹

3.1.2 A New Paradigm of Faithfulness via Parodic Reversal (1:11-2:21)

Since we posit that in vv.6-10 Paul argues that the typical Jewish understanding of apostasy is in actuality only an “appearance” in light of the gospel of Christ, it is very likely that Paul continues his parodic argument against apostasy in the autobiographical portion of the letter (1:13-2:21). Additionally, most commentators note the theological importance of the thesis statement (1:11-12), which stresses the divine origin of the gospel via Paul’s negation of three possible misconceptions: that his gospel was κατὰ ἀνθρώπου (according to humanity), that he received his gospel para. ἀνθρώπου (from a human source), and that he received his gospel para. τῶν (from the tradition of the church).⁵¹¹ The possible connotations of παραλαμβάνω, including the reception of traditional customs and/or the acceptance of the narration of other humans, are important in any discussion of Gal 1:12. See BDAG, “παραλαμβάνω,” 767-68 and LSJ, “παραλαμβάνω,” 1315. Also, see G. Delling, “παραλαμβάνω,” TDNT 4:11-14 for a discussion of the verb’s meanings in Hellenistic, Jewish, and New Testament documents. Especially relevant is Delling’s discussion of m. Abot 1:1 (13) in which he notes the connection of παραλαμβάνω with ἐνθρόπου (received) and ἐντρόπος (handed down). Christian documents in the post-Pauline period

¹⁰⁹ E.g., Paul’s pronouncement that he a “slave of Christ” (1:10) introduces the subject of slavery, which he will again address in 4:7-11 and 4:21-5:1.

¹¹¹ The possible connotations of παραλαμβάνω, including the reception of traditional customs and/or the acceptance of the narration of other humans, are important in any discussion of Gal 1:12. See BDAG, “παραλαμβάνω,” 767-68 and LSJ, “παραλαμβάνω,” 1315. Also, see G. Delling, “παραλαμβάνω,” TDNT 4:11-14 for a discussion of the verb’s meanings in Hellenistic, Jewish, and New Testament documents. Especially relevant is Delling’s discussion of m. Abot 1:1 (13) in which he notes the connection of παραλαμβάνω with ἐνθρόπου (received) and ἐντρόπος (handed down). Christian documents in the post-Pauline period
human source), and that he was taught the gospel (αὐτὸ...ἐξὶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) in some manner. While Martyn is correct that Paul in Gal 1:11-12 is juxtaposing the reception of religious tradition with “God’s apocalyptic revelation of Jesus Christ,” the common interpretation, which maintains that Paul is denying accusations that he was taught the gospel by the apostles in Jerusalem and is now preaching a humanly distorted version of that gospel without Torah-observance, is extremely important for our discussion. If Paul is still countering the Jewish understanding of apostasy, he is asserting that he is not one of the “evil men who have gone out from you and caused all the inhabitants of the city to become apostate” (Deut 13:13). Therefore, just as others have maintained, Paul is focusing on the divine origin of his gospel in the letter’s thesis statement in order to counter the false accusations of the Missionaries that his law-free gospel had a human origin; however, in our interpretation, he is also continuing his efforts to demonstrate

indicate the continued connection of παραλαμβάνω with the reception of divine statutes, e.g., Herm. Vis. 1.3-4 stresses the importance of keeping τὰ νόμιμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ παρέλαβον ἐν μεγάλῃ πίστει (“the laws of God which they received with great faith”).

111 For a discussion of the theological significance of Gal 1:11-12, see, e.g., Bernard Lategan (“Is Paul Defending His Apostleship in Galatians?: The Function of Galatians 1.11-12 and 2.19-20 in the Development of Paul’s Argument,” NTS 34 [1988]: 411-430), who reads Gal 1-2 as “reveal[ing] a fundamental opposition between God and man which forms the presupposition of Paul’s whole argument” (421) and claims that Paul, in making the two negative statements in Gal 1:12, asserts “the contrast between man and Christ and describes the way in which the gospel was received – not in a normal human way, but in accordance with its true nature, in a way which shuns customary procedures and expectations.”

112 Galatians, 143-44.

113 See, e.g., Hays, Galatians, 210; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 65; and Longenecker, Galatians, 24-25. Although Betz (Galatians, 59) is correct to point out that Paul’s denials in vv. 11-12 are part of his rhetorical strategy, our proposal that Paul’s main emphasis is to counter the charge of apostasy makes Paul’s denial that his gospel has a human origin much more of a factor in the argument than Betz claims.

114 See previous note.
that his preaching of a law-free gospel should not be interpreted as apostasy along the lines of Deut 13.

3.1.2.1 Parodic reversal of the faithful paradigm presented in 2 Maccabees

Over twenty years ago, Beverly Roberts Gaventa noted that the autobiographical section of Galatians “cannot be reduced to a single purpose and function”;\(^\text{115}\) thus, scholarship began to acknowledge that Paul’s stress on the divine origin of his gospel was not \textit{solely} an attempt either to defend his apostleship or to assert his independence from the pillar apostles in Jerusalem.\(^\text{116}\) For Gaventa, one important function of Paul’s statements in this section of the letter is that they are paradigmatic: “Paul presents himself as an example of the working of the gospel” for the Galatians to follow by demonstrating that his own experiences indicate “the gospel’s singularity” and its insistence on the “reversal of prior value-systems.”\(^\text{117}\)

However, it is very likely that the autobiographical portion of the letter has an additional paradigmatic and parodic function. Since many commentators make at least


\(^{116}\) Ibid. Gaventa notes: “Virtually all commentators on Galatians agree that the single purpose of Chapters 1 and 2 is apologetic. As early as Chrysostom, we find the conviction that Paul shapes his argument entirely in reaction to the claim of those who degrade his apostleship because it derives not from Christ but only from the apostles” (309-10). Gaventa acknowledges the importance of Betz’s ground-breaking discussions of Galatians in terms of Greco-Roman rhetoric (“The Literary Composition and Function of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” \textit{NTS} 21 [1975]: 353-79; “Galatians, Letter to the,” \textit{IDBSup}: 352-53; and \textit{Galatians}), which prodded scholarship to reassess the relationship of Gal 1-2 to the rest of the letter; however, she opposes “the conventional notion that what Paul writes in Galatians 1 and 2 he writes entirely in order to \textit{defend} his apostolate” (311).

\(^{117}\) Ibid., 313, 326.
some reference to 2 Macc 7:24 in discussing μετατίθημι (1:6), we should investigate the possibility that Paul continues his argument of dissociation by parodically reversing other portions of 2 Maccabees, especially considering that 2 Macc 6-7 are narratives that praise those who strictly adhere to the requirements of the Mosaic law in the face of persecution, are not persuaded to become apostate, and are presented as examples to be emulated. The need for such an investigation becomes even more apparent when 2 Macc 6-7 is read in conjunction with Galatians and the numerous verbal correspondences, some of which are Pauline hapax legomena, are noted. Initially, we will compare the following words that appear in 2 Maccabees and in Gal 1:13-2:21: Ἰουδαίοι, ἀναστροφή, διώκω, ἡλικία/συνηλικιώτης, ἀναγκάζω, ὑποκρίνομαι/συνυποκρίνομαι and, ὑπόκρισις.

But before discussing these corresponding words, we need to return briefly to the context of 2 Macc 7. In 7:22 the mother of the seven brothers credits God with freely giving (χαρέομαι) her sons τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν (“spirit and life”) and “arranging in

---

118 For discussions of 2 Macc 7:24 in relation to v. 6, see, e.g., Hays, Galatians, 204; Dunn, Galatians, 39-40; Burton, Galatians, 20; and Martyn’s (Galatians, 108 n. 77) discussion of what Paul, but not the Galatians, probably thought. Note also that Hays (Galatians, 207) interprets Paul’s “still” (v.10c) as implying “that he formerly was a people pleaser” when he was a “zealous Torah observer (see 1:13-14).” Further, Hays states that Paul reverses the people-pleasing charge since “he will later accuse the Missionaries of promoting circumcision in order to avoid persecution (6:12).” Therefore, scholars have already connected the concepts of apostasy (v.6) and people-pleasing Torah-observance (vv.10-14) with persecution (6:12) without, however, suggesting that Paul is employing rhetorical parody to reverse these connections for his Galatian readers. Additionally, Stephen A. Cummins (Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2 [SNTSMS 114; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001]) argues that Paul reappropriates a common “living tradition of the Maccabean martyrs” (90), which is “a frame of reference for the analysis of Gal 1-2” (138). However, rather than discussing the correlations between the Maccabean narratives and Gal from the standpoint of rhetorical parody, Cummins focuses on Paul’s theological reworking of the Maccabean framework so that the Galatians will understand that the “outworking of God’s grace in the form of the martyred and exalted Messiah” (11) is “reconfigured and redeployed in the life and (Antiochene) ministry of the apostle Paul” (16).

order the teaching” (στοιχείωσις) in them. In 7:23, referring to God as ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης (“the creator of the world”), she explains that God will again restore their spirit and life since they were willing to disregard them διὰ τοὺς νόμους (“on account of his laws”). Antiochus’ response to her speech is to appeal to the youngest of seven brothers with words and bribes in order to entice him to convert away from the distinctive customs of Judaism (v.24). When this tactic fails, Antiochus encourages the mother “to become . . . a counselor for the salvation” of her son (v.25). And “after much urging from him” she pretends πείσειν (“to persuade”) her son to apostatize (v.26); however, she actually encourages him “to welcome death” (vv.27-29) so that God would give his life back to him because he had disregarded his own life “for the sake of his [God’s] law” (v.29). Her son then declares (v. 30): τοῦ δὲ προστάγματος ἀκούω τοῦ νόμου τοῦ δοθέντος τοῖς πατρᾶσιν ἡμῶν διὰ Μωσέως (“but I obey the commands of the law given to our fathers by Moses”). The reason the son gives for welcoming death rather than violating the law is threefold: (1) ἡμεῖς γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἀναυτὰς ἀμαρτίας πάσχομεν (“For we are suffering because of our own sins”), and suffering is God’s discipline (vv. 32-33); (2) martyrs have fallen under ἀεινάου ζωῆς (“the ever-flowing life”) of the covenant of God (v.36); and (3) ἐν ἔμοι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου (“in me and in my brothers”) “the wrath of God, which has been justly brought upon our whole race,” will come to an end (v.38).

121 Paul addresses similar issues in Gal 3:2, 5, 14, 21c.
Therefore, 2 Macc 7 expresses a Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history by explaining the persecution under Antiochus IV as God’s punishment for Israel’s sins (7:18, 32-33). Additionally, it clearly expresses the belief that God will return spirit and life to those who die as a result of their obedience to the Mosaic law and the belief that the martyrs’ deaths will bring an end to the just wrath of God (7:36-38).\(^{123}\)

However, in a recent monograph, Guy Waters states:

Evidence from 2 Macc 7 suggests that some Jews were explicitly not regarded as existing under either Deuteronomic curse or Deuteronomic exile (7:36) and that the restoration of Deut 32:36 was not universally regarded as future or present (7:6, so Jonathan Goldstein, *Il Maccabees* [AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983], 304).\(^{124}\)

Waters is arguing against two particular aspects of Odil H. Steck’s generally accepted account of the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history (*das deuteronomische Geschichtsbild = dtrGB*) and the subsequent proposals based on *dtrGB* by James M.\(^{123}\)

---

\(^{123}\) George W. E. Nickelsburg (*Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* [2d; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005], 107) notes the Deuteronomic scheme of blessing, sin, punishment, turning point, and judgment/salvation that the author of 2 Macc utilizes in recounting the history of the temple from Onias to the defeat of Nicanor by Judas (2 Macc 3:1-15:36) is the “same Deuteronomic scheme that governs the apocalyptic recitation of these events in Jubilees 23:16-31 and Testament of Moses 5, 8-10.” Additionally, Sam K. Williams (*Jesus’ Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept* [HDR 2; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975], 79-80) observes that 2 Macc 6-7 takes a theologically “significant step beyond earlier Jewish works” by explaining Antiochus’ persecution as the result of the people’s apostasy, which in turn led to God’s withdrawal of protection from Israel. “Thus, human sin and divine wrath are the ‘theological reasons’ for the martyrs’ suffering and death.” Williams also notes that 2 Macc goes beyond earlier works by explaining not only the suffering of the people as “a manifestation of divine mercy” that disciplines them, but also by claiming that the martyrs provide an example of “faithfulness unto death” as a “paradigm of virtue” for fellow Jews to emulate.

\(^{124}\) *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul* (WUNT 221; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 41-42 n.76.
First, Waters posits that Steck’s historical explanation of “Levitical transmission of Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic tradition is one among many competing scholarly hypotheses at present.”

Second, Waters notes that one weakness in Steck’s claim that dtrGB “dominated the literature of Palestinian Judaism” between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100 is evinced by the failure of Diaspora Judaism to adopt the same model. Therefore, for Waters, “an explanation alternative to that of Steck is that dtrGB, if such an entity may be said to have existed in the way that Steck has conceived it, was nothing more than one competing historical and eschatological conception among many in Jewish writings in the period under consideration.”

Nevertheless, in his effort to cite evidence for his contention that dtrGB did not permeate Jewish literature during this period, Waters appeals to at least two pieces of literature that actually uphold dtrGB. In his quotation of 2 Macc 7 above, Waters claims support from Goldstein’s commentary in stating that 2 Macc 7 provides evidence that some Israelites did not consider themselves to be under the Deuteronomic curse and that

---

125 Israel und das gewaltsame Gesick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum, und Urchristentum (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967). For scholars, other than Nickelsburg (n. 74 above), who understand the Deuteronomic scheme as playing an important role in Jewish literature and agree that Israel considered itself to be in a protracted exile, see, e.g., James M. Scott, “Paul’s Use of Deuteronomic Tradition,” JBL 112 (1993): 645-55; Donald E. Gowan, “The Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic,” in Scripture in History and Theology (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977), 205-23; and N.T. Wright, The New Testament and the People of God (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 268-79. The citation of Scott’s article should not be read as an indication that Waters’s criticism of Scott’s dichotomy between the “eschatological” and the “theocratic” interpretations of Israel’s post-exilic situation is invalid. However, these criticisms are tangential at this particular point in our discussion.

126 Waters, End, 35.
127 Ibid., 36.
128 Ibid.
the restoration of Deut 32:36 was not universally regarded as future or present. However, Goldstein’s commentary does not advocate Waters’s interpretation of the passage.

Second Maccabees 7:6 contains a preface to its explicit quotation of Deut 32:36, which states: καθάπερ διὰ τῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀντιμαρτυρούσης ώδης διεσάφησεν Μωυσῆς (“just as Moses explained through the song that is witnessing against every person”). As Goldstein notes, διὰ τῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀντιμαρτυρούσης ώδης is taken from the description of Moses’ song in Deut 31:21: καὶ ἀντικαταστήσεται ἡ ώδη αὕτη κατὰ πρόσωπον μαρτυροῦσα οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἐπιλησθῇ ἀπὸ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ στόματος τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν (“and this song will stand witnessing against every person; for it will never be forgotten from their mouth or from the mouth of their seed”).

Therefore, 2 Macc 7:6, not only quotes Deut 32:36, but also it refers to the Song of Moses with the designation given in Deut 31:21, which implies that the song would remain as a potentially efficacious witness against future sins of the people. This is clearly Goldstein’s view when he discusses “God’s relationship with the Jews” depicted in 2 Maccabees as moving through the stages of protection, punishing sin, showing mercy upon the people’s repentance, and again protecting the Israelites. And even though the narrative ends with the people in control of Jerusalem (15:37-39), Goldstein understands the complier’s message to be not only one of hope, but also one of “stern admonition” since in the future “God may punish the people if they sin.”

---

129 Jonathan A. Goldstein, II Maccabees (AB 41A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 304.
130 Ibid., 12-13.
interpretation of 2 Macc 7 therefore *affirms* *dtr*GB.

Additionally, Waters specifically mentions 2 Macc 7:36 as evidence that some Jews did not consider themselves under the Deuteronomic curse. Read in isolation from its context this verse could imply that the Israelites were not under the curse since it claims that the martyrs, “after enduring a brief suffering, have fallen under the everflowing life of the covenant of God.” However, when v. 36 is read in context, it is obvious that the martyrs interpret their suffering as punishment for the people’s sins (v.32) and that the hope of reconciliation with God (v.33) and the end of God’s wrath/discipline (vv. 33, 37-38) are, from the perspective of the martyrs, still in the future.\(^{131}\) The only way that 2 Macc 7 could support Waters’s claim “that some Jews were explicitly *not* regarded as existing under either Deuteronomic curse or Deuteronomic exile”\(^{132}\) would be to assume that the martyrdom of the brothers “stopped the wrath” of God and released Israel from any future threat of suffering caused by any sin, including apostasy, under the conditions of the Deuteronomic curse. Since Waters does not make this argument and the typical interpretation of this passage is that it does support *dtr*GB,\(^{133}\) 2 Macc 7 cannot unambiguously be cited in support of the view that some Jews did not consider themselves to be under the conditions of the Deuteronomic curse.

Also, Waters views Josephus as an example of a Jewish writer who does not

---

\(^{131}\) Note especially the future tense of *καταλλάσσω* (v.33).

\(^{132}\) *End*, 41-42 n.76.

\(^{133}\) See n.123 above.
consider the Israelites in the first century to be living under the blessings and curses of Deut 27-28. He refers to Josephus’ discussion of these chapters (A. J. 4.305-308) as a “historical survey and, apart (possibly) from his comment that ‘such were the ordinances of Moses, and the Hebrew nation continues to act in conformity therewith,’ offers no indication of the continuing significance of Deut 27-28 in his day.”\(^{134}\) However, Waters has not presented the portions of A. J. 4.305-314 that make his interpretation untenable. In what Waters deems an unremarkable historical survey, Josephus, after describing the blessings upon those who “pursued zealously together the worship of God and the keeping of the laws about which Moses said never to be lead astray” and the curses upon those who “transgress,” states:

\[
\text{ἀνέγραψε δὲ τὰς εὐλογίας καὶ τὰς κατάρας αὐτῶς, ὡς μηδέποτε ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν μᾶθησιν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου (A. J. 4.307)}
\]

And he himself engraved the blessings and the curses, in order that their lesson would never cease by [the lapse of] time

As Thackeray notes: “In Scripture the people (not Moses) are to inscribe on the future altar, not the blessings and the curses, but ‘all the words of the law’ (27: 3, 8).”\(^{135}\) Considering the substitution of blessings and curses for “all the words of the law,” Josephus’ discussion of Deut 27-28 has two possible interpretations. First, Josephus could be indicating that the blessings and curses of Deut 27-28 constituted a permanent moral admonition to the Israelites. Or second, placing more emphasis on the substitution

\(^{134}\) End, 64.
\(^{135}\) A. J. 4. 307-308 (Thackeray, LCL, 150 n. b).
of blessings and curses for “all the words of the law,” the segment that Waters quotes from 4.308 could mean that the Hebrew nation, according to Josephus, was still under the stipulations presented in the blessings and curses of Deut 27-28.

In support of the second interpretation and the view that Josephus is not merely presenting a historical survey in this passage, it is important that he includes three items in his description of Deut 27-34 (A. J. 4.302-331). First, in describing the biblical account of the people’s oath to uphold the Mosaic law (4.309-310), Josephus inserts the prohibition against family members overlooking transgressions because of kinship (Deut 13:6-8). Second, in this same passage, Josephus includes the command to destroy any city that fails to uphold the Mosaic law (Deut 13:12-17). And, third and most importantly, Josephus significantly edits the biblical description of the curses that the Israelites would suffer if they failed to keep the law and inserts that Moses “foretold as the Divinity revealed to him” the specific evils that the people would experience if they were transgressors (παραβατεῖς in 4.312). In Deut 28:15-68, the curses include invasion by enemies, famine, plagues, dispersion, destruction of their cities, and a return to slavery; however, Josephus has Moses predict that their land would be invaded by enemies, “their cities would be overthrown, their temple would be destroyed by fire, and they would be sold into slavery” (A. J. 4.312-13).

By including the two items from Deut 13:6-17 and by correlating Moses’ prediction of the specific evils that the people would suffer with the historical circumstances of the Jewish revolt against Rome, especially the destruction of the temple
by fire, Josephus then is not, as Waters claims, merely presenting a historical survey of the events presented in Deut 27-34. And, therefore, since Josephus, writing *Antiquities* in the final decade of the first century, constructs a prediction, purportedly voiced by Moses, of the fiery destruction of the temple brought about by the people’s transgressions and he inserts the prediction into a discussion of the Deuteronomic curses, *A. J.* 4.305-314 should not be cited as evidence that Josephus “did not understand the blessings and curses of Deut 27-28 to speak to the present.”

136 Waters, *End*, 65. Waters explains Moses’ speech (*A. J.* 4.312-14) as a prophecy indicating that Josephus understands Deut 28:58-68 “to speak to the present” since the final sentence of Moses’ speech states: “God who created you will restore those cities to your citizens and the temple too; yet they will be lost not once but often” (4.314). However, Waters arbitrarily makes a distinction between Moses’ prophecy that the temple would be destroyed by fire because the people were transgressors (4.312) and Moses’ final sentence. Although Waters supports his interpretation on the basis that Josephus puts the final sentence of the speech, not included in the biblical text, “into Moses’ mouth” (65), Waters fails to recognize that Josephus also “puts into Moses’ mouth” the burning of the temple as one of the evils that the people would suffer as a result of their disobedience (4.312-13). Additional evidence that Josephus interprets the plunder of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple as the fulfillment of the Deuteronomic curse is provided in several passages in his earlier work. E.g., in *B. J.* 4.386-88, Josephus, in attributing the siege of Jerusalem to the Zealots’ actions, describes the Zealots as “laughing at the things of God” and “ridiculing “the oracles of the prophets” by their impiety (4.386), which actually fulfilled the prophecies concerning Israel (4.387). And Josephus mentions specifically “a certain ancient saying of inspired men,” which predicted “the city would be taken and the sanctuary would be burned down” (4.387). Additionally, in *B. J.* 5.395-401: Josephus blames the “impiety” of the people as the cause of Roman military action against Jerusalem and the return to “slavery” (5.395); he claims that the siege was God’s punishment for the people’s sins (5.398); and most explicitly he states in 5.401: ἰδὼν δὲ τὶ τῶν εὐλογηθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ νομοθέτου πέπρακται τί ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπ’ ἐκείνου κατηγοροῦν τις δι’ ἐκεῖ τῶν ἁλῶν ἀλάντων ἀσέβειτορος ("Now for you, what have you done of the things blessed by the lawgiver and what have you omitted of the things cursed by him! How much more impious are you than the ones who were more quickly condemned."). Given that Josephus describes the burning of the temple as the fulfillment of an “ancient saying of inspired men” in *B. J.* 4.387 and that he refers to the siege of Jerusalem as the result of the people’s sins in relation to Moses’ blessings and curses in *B. J.* 5.395-401, it stands to reason that his reference in his later work (*A. J.* 4.312-13) to Moses’ prediction that the temple would be burned because the people were transgressors, strategically placed at the conclusion of his discussion of the Deuteronomic blessings and curses, is an indication that he considers the nation still to be living under the blessings and curses of Deut 27-28. If this is the case, the promise of recurring restoration that Josephus has Moses voice in *A. J.* 4.314 is nothing more than the final element of the typical Deuteronomic scheme of history. As Louis H. Feldman (“The Concept of Exile in Josephus,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* [ed. James M. 151
the nature of the curses to fit his own historical situation; however, he has clearly retained the Deuteronomic concept that failure to keep the law results in a return to slavery. And, importantly, the Deuteronomic threat of renewed slavery as just punishment for those who fail to observe all the law is one of the concepts that we see Paul arguing against in Galatians.

Additionally, since we have shown that 2 Maccabees evinces a Deuteronomic view of the narrated events, it is appropriate to discuss the similar vocabulary that occurs in 2 Maccabees and Galatians. This discussion is especially appropriate since the words mentioned above occur in Maccabean passages that highlight the importance of keeping the law, revere those who fought to preserve the Jewish way of life, and present Jewish martyrs as models to be emulated in the face of persecution. We will demonstrate below that there is a strong likelihood that Paul is employing these words from 2 Maccabees, in many cases reversing the concepts in the hypotext, in order to dissociate strict adherence to the Mosaic law, even in the face of persecution, from the necessary qualities of faithful

Scott; Leiden: Brill, 1997, 145-72, here 165) notes: “Josephus clearly says (A .J. 1.14) ‘the main lesson to be learnt from this history by those who care to peruse it’ is that God rewards those who obey His laws and punishes those who do not.” However, after reviewing texts in which Josephus displays a positive view of exile and those in which he displays a negative view of exile, Feldman attributes Josephus’ ambiguity on exile “to the various audiences that he is addressing” (171-72). And importantly, Feldman notes that Josephus (A. J. 20.166) understands that God’s punishment for Israel’s sins occurred in the destruction of the temple and the return to slavery, rather than in exile/Diaspora. The fact that Josephus did not consider exile/Diaspora per se as punishment does not negate the possibility that he considered the blessings and curses of Deut 27-28 as speaking to his day with the punishment inherent in the curses for his generation being the destruction of the temple and a return to slavery. Since Josephus was under Flavian patronage in Rome, it is not surprising that he failed to depict the exile as God’s punishment, thus implying the hope for a future restoration when the people were again reconciled with God. To Roman readers, such a view might have sounded seditious.
followers of God who refuse to commit apostasy. We will also demonstrate that Paul
intersperses these allusions to 2 Maccabees within his account of his visits to Jerusalem
in the autobiographical section of Galatians. And, as mentioned above, if Paul were
attempting to demonstrate that he was not one of the evil men described in Deut 13:13
who went out from the faithful and proceeded to lead others into apostasy, his explicit
denial of any consultation “with flesh and blood” (1:16) or with the previous apostles in
Jerusalem (1:17), his chronological enumeration of his visits to Jerusalem (1:18-20; 2:1),
and his explicit denial that he was personally known by “the churches in Christ of Judea”
(1:22-23) are primarily an attempt to clear himself of the Missionaries’ charge that he
was one of the evil men described in Deut 13:13 rather than an attempt to assert his
apostolic independence from the original apostles. By explicitly denying any contact with
the apostles or the Torah-obedient Jewish Christians in Judea before the enumerated
visits (1:18-20; 2:1), Paul could not be viewed as an apostate who went out from the
faithful and proceeded to lead others into apostasy. Therefore, Gal 1:13-2:21
accomplishes a dual purpose: (1) it presents the Galatians with a new paradigm of a
faithful follower of God within the gospel of grace, and (2) it is Paul’s attempt to clear
himself of the charge that his preaching of a law-free gospel is evidence that he is an evil
human being who not only left the ranks of the faithful, but also is leading others into
apostasy.

Returning to our discussion of the corresponding vocabulary between 2
Maccabees and Galatians, most commentators note that the term Ἰουδαιόμος occurs in the
New Testament only in Gal 1:13-14 and in the LXX only in 2 Macc 2:21; 8:1; 14:38; and 4 Macc 4:26.\textsuperscript{137} Some discussions of the term center on the distinctive cultural aspects of Judaism, which separated Jews from Gentiles, while others seek to demonstrate that Paul’s references to “Judaism” do not express anti-Judaic sentiments nor should they be interpreted anachronistically as if the early church were already separate from Judaism.\textsuperscript{138} These discussions are vital for a proper understanding of Paul’s view of Judaism and the early church’s existence within Judaism; however, we also need to investigate the relationship, in terms of rhetorical parody, between Paul’s use of Ἰουδαϊκός and the other words mentioned above, which also appear in the Maccabean narratives and stress the importance of maintaining the distinctiveness of Judaism in the midst of persecution.\textsuperscript{139}

The first step in this investigation is to understand the context in which Ἰουδαϊκός is employed in the Maccabean literature. Although the Maccabean revolt is remembered for the purification of the temple, the verses in 2 Maccabees that employ Ἰουδαϊκός praise those adhering to the law for much more than recovering the temple. Second Maccabees 2:21-22 describes Judas and his brothers as those “who received


\textsuperscript{139} This statement is not meant to imply that commentators do not discuss Paul’s words in relation to similar vocabulary in the Maccabean narratives. E.g., Dunn (\textit{Galatians}, 56-62) discusses numerous Pauline words in relationship to their use in 1-2 Macc, and Hays (\textit{Galatians}, 213) discusses Ἰουδαϊκός and Ἰηλωτής in relation to the Maccabean literature and other texts; however, neither Dunn nor Hays views Paul’s words as a parodic reversal of their use in Maccabean texts.
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appearances from heaven,” “diligently performed brave deeds for the sake of Judaism” (Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ), “pursued (διώκειν) the barbarian multitudes,” “recovered the temple,” “freed” (ἐλευθερώσαει) the city, and “set up again the law that was about to be torn down” (καταλύσεθαι). In 2 Macc 8:1, Judas and his companions “secretly entered” (παρεισπορεύομενοι λεληθότως) the villages, summoned their countrymen, and accepted (προσλαμβάνομενοι) those who had remained in Judaism (τοὺς μεμενηκότας ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ) into their corps. Second Maccabees 14:38 praises Razis, an elder of Jerusalem who was called the “father of the Jews” (v.37), because he had been brought to court concerning Judaism (κρίσιν εἰσενηγημένος Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ) and “with all earnestness (μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενίας) he risked body and life on behalf of Judaism” (v.38).

The final occurrence of Ἰουδαϊσμός in the LXX is in 4 Macc 4:26. In describing the persecution of the Jews, 4 Macc 4:26 notes that Antiochus “tried to compel” (ἡμάγαζεν) all the people “to renounce Judaism” (ἐξομυσσαί τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμόν) by “tasting defiled foods.” Although it would be convenient to posit that 4 Maccabees was composed early enough to have been known by Paul, especially since it is the only text in Paul also employs καταλύω in discussing the law in 2:18: εἰ γὰρ ἐκτενίσα ταύτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάστων ἐμαυτόν συνιστάνω. The RSV translates 2:18 as: “But if I build again those things which I tore down, then I prove myself a transgressor.” I do interpret Gal 2:18 as a parodic reversal of 2 Macc 2:22. After comparing Paul’s vocabulary with that of 2 Macc 6-7, we will discuss Gal 2:18 in relation to 2 Macc 2:21-22 along with Paul’s possible parodic reversal of the declaration that Jerusalem was free (2 Macc 2:22) in his statement that the “present Jerusalem . . . is enslaved with her children” (Gal 4:25).

The only occurrence of ἐκτενεῖα in the NT is in Luke’s account of Paul’s speech before Agrippa in which Paul declares that he “stands trial” (ἐστήκε Κρινόμενος) and is accused by the Jews for hope in the same promise of God for which the Jews are “earnestly” (ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ) worshipping God (Acts 26:6-7).
the LXX that employs πορθεω (4:23, 11:4), a range between 19-130 C.E. encompasses the two major theories regarding its date: one maintains, based on 4 Macc 4:2, that the work was composed when Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia were administered together (19-72 C.E.); and the other posits that the work’s vocabulary indicates that it was most likely composed between 90-130 C.E. Although it is impossible to determine with any certainty whether 4 Maccabees predates or postdates Galatians, the work is still important for our discussion since it is an example of a text, roughly contemporaneous with Paul, that rewrites the material in 2 Maccabees and includes a reference to the “sacred oaths of the forefathers concerning the keeping of the law” (5:29). Although this text does not specifically mention the blessings and the curses of Deuteronomy, it does stress the

---

142 In 4 Macc 4:23, ἐπόρθησεν αὐτούς (“he plundered them”) refers to Antiochus’ actions against the Jews, but the rest of the verse states: “he issued a law that if any of them were found to be living by the ancestral law (τῶν πατρίων πολιτευόμενοι νόμων) they should die.” In 4 Macc 11:4, within the description of the martyrdom of the seven brothers, the fifth brother asks why Antiochus is destroying (πορθείς) them and connects the torture to Torah in v. 5 by asking if the cause of the persecution was because κατὰ τῶν ἐνάρετων αὐτοῦ ζώμεν νόμον (“we live according to his virtuous law”). Therefore, 4 Macc employs πορθεω to describe the persecution of those who followed the distinctive customs of Judaism. The verb occurs three times in the NT: Acts 9:21 and Gal 1:13, 23. Luke employs the verb to describe Paul’s pre-call persecution of believers. In Gal 1:13, 23, Paul uses the verb in conjunction with διώκει to describe his former persecution of the church. Martyn (Galatians, 154 n. 185) notes that πορθεω is used strictly to refer to persecution carried out by Paul. Although Martyn is correct that Paul is always the subject of πορθεω in the NT, 4 Macc consistently uses the verb with Torah-observant Jews as the object while the church is always the object in the NT. Therefore, it is possible that the significance of the particular verb is the reversal of its object rather than the singularity of Paul as its subject in the NT. The reversal of the object would be significant regardless of whether Gal predated 4 Macc or vice versa.

143 For a full discussion of the issues involved in dating 4 Macc, see David A. de Silva, 4 Maccabees (Leiden: Brill, 2006), xiv-xvii. For indications that 4 Macc should be dated to the last decades of the first century C.E., see J. W. van Henten, The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 73-78. Although some scholars date the combined administration of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia from 19 to 54 C.E., see van Henten (ibid., 74) who demonstrates that the administrative union was not dissolved until Vespasian did so in 72 C.E.
importance of the historical oaths that were made to keep the law.\footnote{4 Macc 5:29 states: ὀφεῖ τοὺς ἱεροῖς τῶν προσφυγόνων περὶ τοῦ φιλαξία τῶν νόμων ὄρκους οὐ παρῆσο ("nor will I neglect the sacred oaths of the forefathers concerning keeping the law").}

Fourth Maccabees seeks to demonstrate philosophically that “reason is the complete master of emotions” (1:13) and that the human mind was given the Mosaic law so that it could rule the emotions with the “righteous and good” (2:21-23).\footnote{John M.G. Barclay, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 371-73.} In 4 Macc 5, the martyrdom of Eleazar is rewritten from 2 Macc 6 so that Eleazar declares that the law is “divine” (vv.16, 18), the law δικαιοσύνην παιδεύει (“teaches righteousness” in v. 24), and God ordained the law (v.25).\footnote{Paul L. Redditt, “The Concept of Nomos in Fourth Maccabees,” CBQ 45 (1983): 249-70, here 251.} And because the law is divine, Eleazar declares the following: he will not transgress the law even if Antiochus gouges out his eyes (5:30); he will not τὸν πάτριον καταλύσαι νόμον (“tear down the ancestral law” in 5:33); he will not be a hypocrite (ὑποκρίνασθαι in 6:17); and he will defend θείον νόμον μέχρι θανάτου (“our divine law to the point of death” in 6:21).

Returning to Gal 1:13-14, Paul states:

\footnote{13 Ἑκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὡς καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἐδώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν, καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλκυότας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.

14 For you have heard of my former way of life in Judaism, that I persecuted the church of God beyond measure, and I tried to destroy it.

15 And I was advancing in Judaism beyond many my age among my people, being far more zealous for the traditions of my fathers.}

In discussing 1:13-14, some commentators mention that ἀναστροφή, a \textit{hapax legomenon}
in the undisputed letters of Paul, occurs in the account of the martyrdom of Eleazar (2 Macc 6:23), and Dunn relates Paul’s ἐνικοῦν to the use of διώκω in the descriptions of Mattathias pursuing the uncircumcised and lawless among the Israelites (1 Macc 2:46-47; 3:5). However, Paul’s combination of ἀναστροφή, Ἰουδαϊσμός, and διώκω is particularly interesting when we note that Paul’s συνηλικιώτας (1:14), a hapax legomenon in the NT and the LXX, is a compound form of ἡλικία (“maturity/age”), which is also employed to describe Eleazar (2 Macc 6:18, 23) in the account of his martyrdom (vv.18-31).

Second Maccabees 6:18 states: Ελεάζαρος τις τῶν πρωτευόντων γραμματέων ἀνήρ ἦδη προβεβηκὼς τὴν ἡλικίαν . . . ἡμαγκάζετο φαγεῖν ὑετον κρέας (“Eleazar, one of the highest-ranking scribes, a man already of advanced age, . . . was being compelled to eat swine meat”), and 6:23 states:

ο δὲ λογισμῶν ἀστείον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ ἀξίον τῆς ἡλικίας . . . καὶ τῆς ἐκ παιδός καλλίστης ἀναστροφῆς μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ θεοκτίστου νομοθεσίας ἀκολούθως ἀπεφήνατο ταχέως λέγων προπέμπειν εἰς τὸν ἄδην.

Now adopting a refined decision and [one that was] worthy of [his] age . . . and of [his] most excellent manner of life from childhood and moreover of the holy and God-created giving of the law, accordingly he declared quickly, telling [them] to send [him] to Hades.

Since, as Gaventa proposes, Paul is most likely presenting himself as an example

147 Dunn (Galatians, 56) notes that ἀναστροφή is used to describe Eleazar (2 Macc 6:23) while Longenecker (Galatians, 27) incorrectly cites 2 Macc 3:23. The only other occurrence of ἀναστροφή in the LXX is in Tob 4:14, which states: “Be disciplined in all of your conduct.” The noun is also used in Let. Aris. 130, 216; and Epictetus, Diat. 1.9.24; 1.22.13. In the disputed Paulines, ἀναστροφή occurs once in Eph 4:22. Paul does use the verb ἀναστρέφω once (2 Cor 1:12).

148 Theodotion Daniel 1:10 does employ the adjective συνήλιξ (“equal age”) in lieu of the passive participle of συντρέφω (“grow up together”) that is in OG Dan 1:10.
for the Galatians to follow, it seems probable that Paul’s atypical vocabulary in 1:13-14 could have been drawn from the narratives in 2 Maccabees that present those who chose to die for the traditions of their fathers as honored models to be emulated. Additionally, since we know from the existence of 4 Maccabees that the narratives of 2 Maccabees were being rewritten in a timeframe roughly contemporaneous with Paul, we have evidence that the Maccabean heroes were presented as examples of faithful followers of Torah within Jewish communities in the first or early second century C.E. Therefore, if Paul were seeking to demonstrate that the quality of strict Torah adherence was in actuality only an “appearance” of a faithful follower of God, it would be logical for him to describe his own progression from belief in the “appearance” to an understanding of the new reality. By employing vocabulary associated with accepted models of the “appearance,” his description of his progression to the new reality would be impressive.

So while 2 Macc 6:18 and 23 describe Eleazar, the Maccabean model of a faithful, Torah-observant follower of God, as “already having advanced in age (ἡλικία)” and “adopting a refined decision worthy of his age (ἡλικία),” “manner of life” (ἀναστροφή), and “the holy and God-created giving of the law,” in Gal 1:13-14 Paul

---

149 Although the date of 4 Macc is disputed, its Jewish provenance is certain. Recent scholarship favors Syrian Antioch as the most probable region of origin. See de Silva, 4 Maccabees, xviii.

150 If the Missionaries had introduced the Galatians to the Maccabean narratives, Paul’s vocabulary would be even more impressive; however, we have no way of knowing whether Paul’s vocabulary was chosen specifically to counter the teaching of the Missionaries or whether the similarities between Gal and 2 Macc were the result of Paul’s pre-call understanding of a faithful follower of God.
describes his “manner of life (ἀναστροφή) formerly in Judaism” and notes that he “was advancing in Judaism beyond many my own age (συμηλικιώτης).”\footnote{151} Paul’s phrase \textit{περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής υπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παρεδόσεων} (“being far more zealous for the traditions of my fathers”) is multifaceted. As Betz states, one of Paul’s concerns is to show that his pre-call life in Judaism was impeccable in terms of Torah-observance.\footnote{152} Also, as Martyn notes Paul’s “traditions of my fathers” “gives no indication that the traditions have their origin in a revelatory act of God.”\footnote{153}

And as numerous commentators discuss,\footnote{154} “zeal” for the Law was attributed to several models of faithfulness: Phinehas, whose actions brought an end to God’s wrath and made atonement for the Israelites’ sins (Num 25:10-13; Sir 45:23; 1 Mac 2:26, 54; 4 Mac 18:12);\footnote{155} Elijah (1 Kgs 19:10, 14; Sir 48:2); Jehu, in the sense that he fulfilled the prophecy of Elijah, (2 Kgs 10:16-19); Simeon (Jdt 9:2-4); Mattathias (1 Mac 2:26-27; Josephus, \textit{A. J.} 12.271); and Onias (2 Mac 4:2). Additionally, these zealous exemplars were to be imitated by those who wished to be faithful to God as evinced in: 1 Mac 2:27, 50; Josephus (\textit{A. J.} 4.154-55) who describes the slaying of many transgressors by

\footnote{151}\textit{Josephus (A. J. 4.152)} describes Phinehas with similar words: τῶν νεωτέρων κρείττων καὶ . . . τῶν ἡλικιώτων ὑπερέχων (“being better than the young men and . . . surpassing [his] contemporaries”).
\footnote{152}\textit{Galatians}, 68 and sources cited in n. 121. See also Dunn’s (\textit{Galatians}, 60) discussion of Paul’s Pharisaic past.
\footnote{153}\textit{Galatians}, 155.
\footnote{155} Ps 105:30 does not mention zeal, but states: καὶ ἐστὶ Φινεές καὶ ἐξιλάσατο καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραύσις (“And Phinehas stood up and appeased and the destruction stopped”). MT Ps 106:30 employs ἐπελπίζω (“intercede”) rather than ἐξιλάσασθαι (“appease”). Num 25:13 and Sir 45:23 state that Phinehas ἐξιλάσατο (“appeased”) concerning the sons of Israel. Although Phinehas was a priest, there is no mention of a priestly sacrifice in these verses. Rather, it was his zealous actions that appeased.}
those who immediately imitated Phinehas and claims that those who died from the plague were the transgressors’ relatives who were considered guilty by God because they did not stop the apostasy (cf. Deut 13:6-11); and Philo (Spec. 2.253) who in discussing the inevitable punishment of a false witness notes: “For there are thousands of observers, zealots (ζηλῶται) for the laws, most accurate guardians of the ancestral customs, being merciless to those doing anything to tear [them] down” (καταλύσει). By employing Ἰούδαίοις, ἀναστροφῇ, διώκω, and a compound of ἡλικία, words associated with the “appearance” model of faithfulness, in conjunction with his declaration of his extreme zealosity for his ancestral traditions and his persecution of apostates, Paul then is clearly depicting his former life in Judaism as being consistent with the “appearance” model of faithfulness to God. As a result of his zealous faithfulness, Paul persecuted believers as apostates in the same manner in which the zealous exemplars dealt with those whom they considered transgressors/apostates in an effort to keep the apostasy from spreading and, as Hays notes, in an effort to atone for the sin that had occurred within Israel.


157 Cf. 1 Macc 2:44-47; 2 Macc 4:13-17, 6:24-28, 32; 4 Macc 6:18-19; and Josephus, A. J. 4.131-55. Galatians, 214. In addition to making atonement by pursuing apostates, there is evidence that those who willingly died for the law also envisioned themselves as making atonement for the sins of Israel (2 Macc 7:32-38; 4 Macc 6:28-29). Whether or not 2 Macc expresses the concept of vicarious death is greatly debated. See the discussion of van Henten, Maccabean Martyrs, 140-63, esp. literature cited in 141 n. 62. Williams (Jesus’ Death, 81-90) argues that 2 Macc 7:38 does not make a direct “connection between the
Following his description of his previous adherence to the “appearance” model, Paul, as mentioned above, uses prophetic language to reinforce the divine nature of his call and his gospel (1:15-16). And he argues that he could not be an evil person along the lines of the apostate in Deut 13:13, who went out from the faithful and sought to lead others into apostasy, since he had met only Peter and James and was not acquainted with other believers in Judea (1:16-24). In describing his trip to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus (2:1-10) and his encounter with Peter in Antioch (2:11-21), Paul again uses vocabulary that parodically reverses the characteristics of the faithful follower of God as depicted in 2 Maccabees. In Gal 2:1-14, he presents the characteristics of a new model of martyrs’ deaths and Israel’s deliverance.” Rather he understands the martyrs’ speeches in 2 Macc 6-7 as examples of intercessory prayers without the theological implication of vicarious expiation, and he claims that the concept of atoning death does not appear in Jewish literature until 4 Macc, which in his view predates Galatians. Van Henten’s evidence for a later date for 4 Macc. is more convincing (see n.144 above) along with his evidence for concluding: “The interpretation of 7:33, 37-38 in the context of the narrative of 2 Maccabees seems to imply that the idea of vicarious death is conveyed in 2 Macc 7” (Maccabean Martyrs, 141). Douglas A Campbell (The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 650) regards 2 Macc 6-7 as attesting “to the atoning efficacy of the deaths of the martyrs.”

Martyn (Galatians, 155) correctly observes that the Galatians would have understood Paul’s pre-call self-portrait as extremely similar to the way the “Teachers” were describing themselves.

See the discussions above and nn. 88-90, 108. The intensity of Paul’s adamant declaration that he is not lying (1:20) in his chronological account of his visits to Jerusalem is understandable if Paul is countering a charge that he is an apostate who has gone out from the law-observant believers in Judea and is spreading his apostasy to other cities. We are emphasizing, in light of his previous anathemas alluding to Deut 13, that Paul’s adamant declaration primarily relates to a charge that he is an apostate along the lines of Deut 13:13. But we are not denying the validity of interpreting 1:20 as Paul’s response to the additional charge that he was taught and commissioned by the apostles in Jerusalem and that he is now preaching a corrupt form of their teaching, so Hays (Galatians, 217) and Martyn (Galatians, 178-79).

We interpret 2:15-21 as the continuation of Paul’s portrayal of his speech to Peter. For this view, see, e.g., Hays, Galatians, 236; Longenecker, Galatians, 80-81; Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, 87-88; and Bruce, Galatians, 136-37. Martyn (Galatians, 240) maintains that Paul begins addressing the “Teachers” in 2:15. Alternately, Betz (Galatians, 113-14) understands 2:15-21 as the propositio.
faithfulness that does not require Torah-observance and then, in 2:15-21, presents the theological justification for his accusation in 2:11 that Peter κατεγνωσμένος ἦν ("was condemned") because of his withdrawal from the Gentiles.

As Martyn notes, Paul’s ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ("Now I went up with reference to revelation") in 2:2 contains the third reference to "revelation" in the letter (cf. 1:12, 16). And Martyn is certainly correct to understand the repetition of "revelation" as emphasizing that Paul views his gospel as God’s activity, especially considering that Paul immediately follows the statement with καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὑ ἡ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ξθενοῦν ("and I laid before them the gospel, which I am preaching among the Gentiles"). Since Titus, a Greek, was not “compelled to be circumcised,” Paul is telling the Galatians that he went up to Jerusalem fourteen years after his call, or fourteen years after his first visit, and that he went up in order to clarify exactly what he was preaching and by whose authority he was preaching it. But he did this “privately to the ones of repute” because he was imparting to them what God had revealed to him: the requirements of the Mosaic law were not an obligation that his Gentile converts had to accept. Paul’s confirmation that they did not compel Titus to be circumcised supports this interpretation.

Although we argue that in this section of the letter Paul is primarily demonstrating that the previous Maccabean model of faithfulness should be replaced with a new model

163 Galatians, 190.
164 Ibid.
in light of God’s revelation of Christ, this understanding does not exclude other
interpretations of Paul’s account of the Jerusalem meeting. For example, we are in
agreement with Martyn and Hays that ἀνεθέμνη in 2:2 indicates that Paul “communicated
something of his own” and does not connote that he presented his gospel for approval or
disapproval as if “the ones of repute” were an authoritative body from which Paul needed
to obtain permission to continue preaching his gospel.165 Additionally, we are not
negating that Paul met with “the ones of repute privately” in order to acknowledge their
place of authority within the Jerusalem church, but without indicating that their authority
interfered in any way with the authority that he had been given by God to preach the
gospel to the Gentiles.166 And Hays convincingly explains that μὴ πῶς ἐις κενὸν τρέχω ἢ
ἔδραμον (“lest I am running or have run in vain”) indicates that Paul understood that the
Gentile mission was part of God’s plan to create “a new eschatological people composed
of Jews and Gentiles,” thereby necessitating that the leaders of the Jerusalem church
recognize the Gentile mission as a valid work of God.167 Paul expresses hope that this
would occur (2:2) and verifies that it did (2:7-10).

In seeking to present a new characterization of a faithful follower of God, Paul

165 Martyn, Galatians, 190-1; Hays, Galatians, 223; LSJ, “ἀνεθέμνη,” B.2, 123. But James D.G. Dunn,
(The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of
Christianity [2nd; London: SCM, 2006], 169) proposes that Paul “probably acknowledged” the authority of
the Jerusalem apostles and, at the time of the Jerusalem meeting, had come “to have the matter under
dispute resolved;” however, by the “time he wrote Galatians he did not regard himself as in any degree
dependent on or subordinate to the leaders of the Jerusalem church.” Cf. Dunn, Galatians, 91-92.
166 E.g., Dunn, Galatians, 92-93; Hays, Galatians, 223; and Martyn, Galatians, 190. Betz (Galatians, 86)
proposes that Paul sought to force the Jerusalem leaders “to give post factum approval to the Pauline gospel
in the face of heated opposition.”
167 Galatians, 223.
employs ἄναγκας (2:3, 14; 6:12), συνυποκρίνομαι (2:13) and, ύποκρισίς (2:13) in order to reverse parodically the Maccabean situation in which Greeks were attempting to compel Jews to convert away from the distinctive customs of Judaism and to depict the Galatian situation in which Torah-observant Jewish believers were attempting to compel Greeks/Gentiles to live as Jews. Therefore, Paul is seeking to dissociate the law-observant characteristics of the Maccabean martyrs from the ideal model of godly faithfulness. The Maccabean martyrs refused to be compelled to forsake the Mosaic law in order to avoid persecution, which entailed suffering and death, and 2 Maccabees specifically states that Eleazar refused ὑποκριθηναι (“to be a hypocrite” in 6:21; cf. 4 Macc 6:15, 17) by pretending to adopt Greek customs, especially since ὑποκριθηναι (6:24) would not be a worthy example for others to follow and others “might be lead astray” (πλανηθῶσιν) because of his ύποκρισία (“hypocrisy” in 6:25).

By employing ἄναγκας (Gal 2:3), Paul briefly uses the example of Titus to describe a specific characteristic of the new model of faithfulness, which is that circumcision is not a necessity for a Greek believer. In the Maccabean narrative, faithful Jews were not compelled by Greeks to violate the Mosaic law, and in Paul’s narrative of

---

168 Forms of ἄναγκας are used several times in 2 Macc: to compel Jews to forsake the law (6:1); to compel Jews to partake in pagan sacrifices and processions (6:7); and to compel a Jew to eat swine’s flesh (Eleazar in 6:18; the seven brothers in 7:1). 1 Macc 2:25 employs ἄναγκας in reference to compelling Jews to sacrifice, and 1 Macc 2:15 employs the compound κατάναγκας to refer to compelling Jews to commit apostasy. Although ἄναγκας was, of course, frequently used in contexts other than those concerning distinctive Jewish customs (cf. 2 Macc 8:24, 11:11; 2 Cor 12:11), it is important that 4 Macc retains the verb, not substituting a synonym, in the retelling the story of the martyrs (cf. 4 Macc 4:26; 5:2, 27; 8:2; 18:5).
his trip to Jerusalem, the faithful Greek believer, Titus, was not compelled by Torah-observant Jews to be circumcised. Paul again employs ἀναγκάζω (2:14) to present a more general characteristic of the new paradigm of faithfulness in recounting his public confrontation with Peter over the “truth of the gospel,” which Paul insists does not include “compelling” Gentile Christians Ἰουδαίζειν (“to adopt Jewish customs”). In his account of Peter’s actions in Antioch, Paul presents Peter’s behavior as the parodic reverse of Eleazar’s behavior. While the Maccabean exemplar of faithfulness refused to “be a hypocrite” in order to avoid persecution from Gentiles/Greeks, Paul announces that Peter “was condemned” since he withdrew from the Gentiles because “he feared [persecution] from the circumcision [party]” (2:12). In 2:13, Paul tells the Galatians that Peter’s actions served as a bad example to “the rest of the Jews” who “joined him in being a hypocrite” (συναπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ), so that even Barnabas “was led astray by their hypocrisy” (συναπέκριθη συναπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ τῇ ὑποκρίσει). Therefore, Paul places Peter’s behavior in stark contrast to Eleazar’s. Second Maccabees praises Eleazar who not only refuses to

169 In 2:14, Paul contrasts living ἐθνικός (“as a Gentile”) with living Ἰουδαῖος (“as a Jew”) and then asks Peter, πῶς τὰ ἑθή ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίζειν (“How can you compel the Gentiles to adopt Jewish practices?”). Since Paul is contrasting living “as a Gentile,” with living “as a Jew” immediately prior to questioning how Peter could compel the Gentiles Ἰουδαίζειν, it stands to reason that Paul is speaking of adopting Jewish customs in general rather than employing Ἰουδαίζειν to refer to circumcision alone. This seems reasonable in comparison to Esth 8:17 that states: πολλοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν περιτέμοντο καὶ Ἰουδαίοι ἰδίω τῶν φόβων τῶν Ἰουδαίων (“many of the Gentiles had themselves circumcised and were adopting Jewish customs because of fear of the Jews”). A similar combination of Ἰουδαίζειν and περιτομή is employed by Josephus (B. J. 2.454) when he explains that the Roman commander Meltius was allowed to live by stating: τούτων γὰρ ἱκετεύουσαν καὶ μέχρι περιτομῆς Ἰουδαίσκων ὑποσχόμενον διέσωσαν μόνον (“they rescued only this one for he was beseeching and willing to submit to Jewish customs, even as far as circumcision”). Cf. Martyn, Galatians, 235, 245; Dunn, Galatians, 127-9; Betz, Galatians, 111-12; and Hays, Galatians, 232.

change his Torah-observant manner of life in order to avoid persecution, but also refuses to become a hypocrite by pretending to violate the Mosaic law because he recognizes that hypocritical actions would lead others astray. But, according to Paul, Peter, the Torah-observant Jewish Christian, is condemned because he changes his previous habit of eating with Gentile Christians and withdraws from them in order to avoid persecution from those who insist that Gentile Christians must be circumcised and live as Jews. And, most importantly, Peter’s behavior is criticized further because his hypocrisy led other Jews, even Barnabas, astray into the same type of hypocrisy.

In between the brief mention of Titus, who was not compelled to be circumcised, and the longer account of Peter, who became a hypocrite because of his fear of the circumcision party and led others into hypocrisy, Paul recounts his own demonstration in Jerusalem of another characteristic of the new paradigm of faithfulness: the characteristic of preserving the truth of the law-free gospel for Gentile believers. By explaining his own refusal to “yield in submission for a moment in order that the truth of the gospel might continually remain” for all Gentiles (2:5), Paul demonstrates what Gaventa terms the

\[171 \text{ See LSJ, “διαμείνω,” 403, which stresses the continuing and permanent connotation of the compound verb, and BDAG, 233, which cites Gal 2:5b and translates διαμείνη πρὸς as “remain continually with.” However, πρὸς with the accusative can be translated as an adverbial accusative of respect/reference or as a way of denoting “purpose, result, or destiny.” In these situations, πρὸς should be rendered as “for” (BDF, §§160, 329). See also Smyth, §1600: “To verbs denoting a state, and to adjectives, an accusative may be added to denote a thing in respect to which the verb or adjective is limited” and §1603: “For the accusative of respect the instrumental dative is also employed, and also the prepositions εἰς, κατά, πρὸς.” Cf. Rom 15:17. Also see Dunn, Galatians, 101 and Hays, Galatians, 225. As Hays (225) notes, Paul, in discussing his stand against the false brothers, is preserving the truth of the gospel “for the Gentiles as a whole, both present and future, among whom the Galatians constitute a subset.”}
“gospel’s singularity” and the “reversal of prior value-systems.” That Paul is presenting himself as a new model of faithfulness in Gal 2:1-10 may be further enhanced by his parodic reversal of the way that κατ’ Ἰδίων is used in 2 Macc 6:21. When Eleazar, the Maccabean model of faithfulness, is refusing to be compelled to eat swine’s flesh, “the ones in charge” of the pagan sacrifice encourage Eleazar privately (κατ’ Ἰδίων) to pretend to eat the sacrifice. Therefore, in the Maccabean account, the Greeks in charge meet privately with the Torah-observant paradigm of faithfulness in an effort to encourage him to violate the Jewish way of life. Paul, the preacher of the law-free gospel and an example of the new model of faithfulness, meets privately (κατ’ Ἰδίων) with τοίς δοκοῦσιν (“the ones of repute” or as NRSV translates “the acknowledged leaders”) and lays before them the law-free gospel that he is preaching among the Gentiles. Paul then demonstrates that the leaders were convinced of his argument by telling the Galatians that Titus, a Greek (Ἐλλην), was not “compelled to be circumcised” (2:3). In Gal 2:1-10, the new model of faithfulness prevails over those who would compel Greeks to adopt Jewish customs, which is the parodic reverse of Eleazar, the Maccabean model of faithfulness, who prevails over the Greeks who would compel him to violate Jewish customs.

Besides replacing the old model of faithfulness, characterized by Eleazar, with the new model of faithfulness, characterized by Paul, it is possible that Paul’s depiction of the “false brothers” (2:4) presents a parodic reversal of the actions of Judas Maccabees.

---

172 “Gal 1 and 2,” 313, 326.
and his brothers (2 Macc 2:21-22 and 8:1), who restored the people’s freedom to practice the Mosaic law. Although the word νόμος is not used in Galatians until 2:16, Paul is comparing being under the Mosaic law with being enslaved in 2:4.\(^\text{173}\) The possibility that Paul is parodically alluding to 2 Macc 2:21-22 and 8:1 with his description of the Torah-observant false brothers is enhanced when we realize that the Maccabean passages discuss the actions of Judas in conjunction with a specific reference to preserving Ἰουδαϊσμός (“Judaism”). Although Paul does not mention Ἰουδαϊσμός in telling the Galatians of his visit to Jerusalem, he includes two specific references to Ἰουδαϊσμός in his description of his pre-call life (1:13-14) and three specific references to the distinctive customs of Judaism (Ἰουδαϊσμός, Ἰουδαϊκός, Ἰουδαίζειν)\(^\text{174}\) in his public confrontation with Peter (2:14), therefore, bracketing the autobiographical section of the letter with specific references to either Judaism, being a Jew, or living as a Jew.

As mentioned above, 2 Macc 2:21-22 describes Judas and his brothers as those who “diligently performed brave deeds for the sake of Judaism (Ἰουδαϊσμόν), “pursued (διώκειν) the barbarian multitudes,” “recovered the temple,” “freed” (ἐλευθερώσατε) the city, and “set up again the law that was about to be torn down” (καταλύσατοι). And in 2

---

\(^{173}\) In support of the view that Paul is referring to the Mosaic law in 2:4, see Dunn (Galatians, 99-100) who, in discussing the “false brothers,” states: “Expressed in their own terms, the concerns of this group’s members would be . . . to ensure that the new movement within Judaism remained true to the principles and practices of the covenant clearly laid down in the Torah.” Similarly, Betz (Galatians, 91), in discussing the meaning of ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσωσιν (in order that they might enslave us), states: “What they really intended was to ensure the Gentile Christians’ salvation by subjecting them to circumcision and thus making them partakers of the Torah covenant.”

\(^{174}\) As Cohen (Beginnings, 70-81, esp. 79-81 and sources cited in nn. 30-37) observes, these terms frequently connoted ethnic or geographical distinctions; however, they also had a religious and/or cultural function by the first century B.C.E.
Macc 8:1 Judas and his companions “secretly entered” (παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως) the villages, summoned their countrymen, and accepted (προσλαμβανόμενοι) those who had remained in Judaism (τοὺς μεμενηκότας ἐν τῷ Ιουδαίῳ σώματι) into their corps. Paul describes the “false brothers” in Gal 2:4 as the ones who were “secretly brought in” (παρεισάκτους,) and who παρεισήλθον κατασκοπήσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἦν ἐχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ίησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσωσιν (“sneaked in to spy on our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, in order to enslave us”).

It is likely that Paul employed παρείσακτος and παρεισέρχομαι, which could be used with the negative connotation of “sneaking in with unworthy motives,” as a description of those who insisted on Torah obedience in order to present a parodic reversal of the praise for Judas and his companions, who gathered those who remained faithful to Torah and were described with the more neutral παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως (“entered secretly”) in 2 Macc 8:1.

Considering that Paul maintains that believers already have “freedom in Christ Jesus” and describes the “false brothers” as having an intention “to enslave” believers under the law, he presents the Torah-observant ψευδάδελφους as the reverse of the Torah-observant Maccabees whose intention was to free Jerusalem.

175 Compare παρείσακτος and παρεισέρχομαι (BDAG, 774; LSJ, 1333) with παρεισπορεύομαι (LSJ, 1334), and note that παρεισπορεύομαι was not employed to connote “unworthy motives.”

176 Hays (Galatians, 225) correctly notes that in 2:4 the “categories of freedom and slavery” are “antithetically paired” and that the terms “will reappear as a major theme of the epistle in 3:28; 4:1-11; 4:21-51; and 5:13.”
3.1.2.2 The scriptural basis for requiring Gentile believers to observe Torah

As mentioned above, 2:15-21 is a continuation of Paul’s speech to Peter, and it presents the theological justification for Paul’s accusation that Peter and the others who withdrew from the Gentiles “were not acting in accordance with the truth of the gospel” (2:14); however, before discussing this section of the letter, we need to delineate the reasons why Paul’s law-free gospel, which he was preaching “to the uncircumcised” and not “to the circumcised” (2:7), might be considered as apostasy by Torah-observant Jewish Christians. E. P. Sanders, through his meticulous review of the pertinent literature, has cogently demonstrated three points that are vital for this discussion. First, Second Temple Judaism, almost universally, presumed a relationship between law and covenant in which the Israelites’ obedience to the Mosaic law was the proper covenant response to God’s grace in electing Israel and giving the law.\(^ {177} \) Second, “obedience maintains one’s position in the covenant, but it does not earn God’s grace as such.”\(^ {178} \) Third, as we have already mentioned above, Sanders’s understanding of covenantal nomism allows for an individual member of the covenant community to become apostate if that individual does not implement the methods of atonement provided for in the law.\(^ {179} \)

Since the Missionaries who were troubling the Galatians were Torah-observant Jewish Christians, it is most likely that they, as typical Jews in the Second Temple period,

\(^ {177} \) *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 419-20.
\(^ {178} \) Ibid., 420.
\(^ {179} \) For Sanders’s eight-point summary of the basic pattern of Judaism, which he termed “covenantal nomism,” see ibid., 422. Also see n.57 above for specific references to apostates in the literature that Sanders reviewed.
viewed obedience to the law as their covenant obligation to God’s grace even though they
now accepted the further revelation that God had provided in the death and resurrection
of Jesus Christ. A literal reading of Deut 29:9-15 would support this opinion. This
passage makes it quite clear that God’s covenant was not just with the Israelites who
stood before Moses but it also applied quite specifically to future generations of the
covenant people. And most importantly for the Galatian crisis this passage specifically
mentions that a proselyte is also considered to be a part of the covenant, and, therefore, a
proselyte is just as obligated to keep the law as an Israelite is. Deut 29:9-15 reads:181

9 καὶ φυλάξει ὑμεῖς τὰς λόγους τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης ἵνα συνήτε πάντα ὡσα ποιήσετε.
10 ὑμεῖς ἐστήκατε σήμερον πάντες ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, οἱ ἀρχάγχεις ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ γερουσία ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ κριταὶ ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ γραμματεισαγωγεῖς ὑμῶν πάς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραήλ,
11 αἱ γυναίκες ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ ἱκαναὶ ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς περεμβολῆς ὑμῶν ἀπὸ ξυλοκόπου ὑμῶν καὶ ἕως ὑδροφόρου ὑμῶν,
12 παρελθεῖν σὲ ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀραίας αὐτοῦ, ὡσα κύριος ὁ θεός σου διατίθεται πρὸς σὲ σήμερον,
13 ἵνα στήσῃ σὲ ἑαυτῷ ἔς λαὸν, καὶ αὐτός ἐσται σου θεός, ὃν τρόπον ἐπέν σοι, καὶ ὃν τρόπον ὤμοισον τοῖς πατράσισ ὑμῖν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ.
14 καὶ οὐχ ὑμῖν μόνοις ἐγὼ διατίθεμαι τὴν διαθήκην ταύτην καὶ τὴν ἀράν ταύτην,
15 ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς ὡς οὖσι μεθ’ ἡμῶν σήμερον ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ τοῖς μὴ οὖσι μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὡς σήμερον.

9 And you will continue to do all the words of this covenant in order that you may understand all the things that you do.
10 You all stand today in the presence of the Lord your God, your tribal heads and

180 See n.3 above for the consensus view that the Missionaries were Jewish Christians. See n.11 above for the various opinions regarding the scope of their teachings.
181 The versification and text is that of John William Wevers, ed., Deuteronomium (VTG 3/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 317-19. As discussed above, all scriptural references are to the LXX unless otherwise noted.
your council of elders and your judges and your schoolmasters - every man of Israel,
11 Your wives and your children and the proselyte who is in the midst of your camp from your woodcutter even to your water-drawer,
12 You are entering into the covenant of the Lord your God and into his curses, as many as the Lord your God appoints for you today,
13 In order that he may establish you for a people to himself, and he will be your God, [a people to] whom he spoke the way of life to you, and [a people to] whom he swore the way of life to your fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.
14 And not with you only do I make this covenant and this curse,
15 But also with those here with us today in the presence of the Lord your God and with those who are not here with us today.

This passage stipulates not only that the covenant is everlasting for the Israelites and for proselytes who choose to live in community with the people of God, but also it establishes the equal obligation of proselytes to obey the law and be subject to the curses connected with it. Additionally, just a few verses after this passage we find a description of God’s attitude toward a person who intentionally decides that he or she does not need to obey the terms of the covenant. Deut 29:19-21 states:

19 καὶ ἂν ἀκοῦσῃ τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ἁράς ταύτης καὶ ἐπιφημίσηται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ λέγων ὡσία μοι γένοιτο ὁτί ἐν τῇ ἀποπλανήσει τῆς καρδίας μου παρεύσομαι ἵνα μὴ συναπολέσῃ ὁ ἀμαρτωλὸς τὸν ἀναμάρτητον
20 οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ ὁ θεὸς εὐλατεύσαι αὐτῷ ἄλλ’ ἢ τότε ἐκκαυθήσεται ὁ ρήματος καὶ ὁ ζῆλος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ καὶ κολληθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ ἁρεί τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης αἱ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ λόγου τούτου καὶ ἐξαλείψει κύριος τὸ δύο αὕτου ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν συμανθίων
21 καὶ διαστελεῖ αὐτὸν κύριος εἰς κακὰ ἐκ πάντων τῶν νῦν Ἰσραήλ κατὰ πᾶσας τὰς ἁράς τῆς διαθήκης τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου

19 And it will be if a person hears the words of this curse and utters in his heart saying, “May the blessings happen to me since I will walk in the error of my heart.” In order that the sinner should not jointly destroy the sinless,
20 God will never desire to be merciful to him but rather then the anger of the Lord will be inflamed and his jealousy in connection with that person and all the curses of this covenant, the ones written in the book of this law, will be associated with him and the Lord will erase his name from the covenant under heaven.
And the Lord will separate him from all the sons of Israel for evil in accordance with all the curses of the covenant, the ones written in the book of this law.

Verse 21 clearly states that “the Lord will separate” an unrepentant sinner, who refuses to recognize the binding effect of the blessings and the curses, from the rest of the “sons of Israel.” Verse 19 explains the rationale for the separation as God’s desire to protect the sinless within the community from harm. And v. 20 states that the unrepentant sinner will be subject to all the curses entailed in failing to adhere to the Mosaic law.  

In addition, I have shown above that some Jews in the first century C.E. continued to view themselves as living under the conditions of the Deuteronomic blessings and curses. Therefore, it would be logical for a Torah-observant Jewish Christian, who viewed Gentile Christians as proselytes within the Christ-believing segment of Judaism, to adopt the position that a proper adherence to Torah required a Gentile

---

182 The combination of curse and excommunication for an unrepentant sinner in Deut 29:20-21 lends support for Morland’s proposal that over time Deuteronomic tradition brought about the substitution of curse and excommunication for offences that required the death penalty according to other parts of the Pentateuch. See n.20 above. See also Karl Heinrich Rengstorff (“στέλλω, διαστέλλω, κτλ.” TDNT 7: 588-99, esp. 589-91, 597-98) who discusses στέλλω (in 2 Thess 3:6 = “separate”) and the cognates διαστέλλω (Deut 29:21) and ὑποστέλλω (in Gal 2:12 = “withdraw”) in relation to the formal excommunication in 1 Cor 5:11 (συνοικισμός = “associating with” and συνεκαθησόμεθα = “eat with”).

183 See n.136 above for a discussion of Josephus’ post-70 C.E. understanding that the destruction of the temple and the return to slavery, not the state of exile per se, were God’s punishment for disobedience under the conditions of the Deuteronomic curses. However, many scholars maintain that before the First Revolt the Jewish people continued to view themselves in a protracted exile due to Roman domination, even though geographically the Jews did occupy the promised land. See, e.g., Gerhard von Rad, “Gerichtsdoxologie,” in Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament Band 2 (ed. Rudolf Smend; Munich: C. Kaiser, 1973), 245-54; Odil Hannes Steck, “Das Problem theologischer Strömungen in nachexilischer Zeit,” EvT 28 (1968): 445-58; James M. Scott, “Paul’s Use of Deuteronomic Tradition,” JBL 112 (1993): 645-65; George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 265-70 and Wright, People of God, 268-79.

184 Dunn (Parting, 164) proposes that the circumcision of Gentiles became an issue of contention when Gentiles began “entering the new Jewish sect in increasing numbers.”
Christian to obey the requirements of the law just as a Jewish Christian must obey these same requirements. And in this way of thinking, a Gentile Christian who refused to recognize his or her\textsuperscript{185} obligation to obey the law would be subject to the curses that would come upon anyone who intentionally sinned and remained unrepentant. And those who viewed the person as an unrepentant sinner might either ostracize the sinner or separate themselves from him or her.

If there were any doubt that Deut 29 applies to Israelites and proselytes equally, several other verses in the Pentateuch clarify the matter. For example, Exod 12:43-49\textsuperscript{186} stipulates the manner in which the Passover should be celebrated, giving the regulations regarding who could partake of the Passover meal and who could not. Within this passage there is an interesting distinction between a foreigner and a proselyte. In v. 43, the foreigner was prohibited from eating the Passover meal (πᾶς ἄλλογενής οὐκ ἔδεται ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ - “No foreigner will eat from it”). In this context, ἄλλογενής means a “stranger” or “foreigner” that is not part of the community of Israel.\textsuperscript{187} In v. 44, an οἰκέτης (“house servant”) who had been purchased must be circumcised, but he could partake of the meal.

\textsuperscript{185} Deut 29:18, which is not quoted above, specifically mentions man or woman (ἀνήρ ἢ γυνὴ). Therefore, the same penalty for apostasy would apply to either a man or a woman.

\textsuperscript{186} Citations of Exod are from John William Wevers, ed., Exodus (VTG 2/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 178-80.

\textsuperscript{187} See LSJ, “ἄλλογενής,” 69; and BDAG, “ἄλλογενής,” 46. This noun is used many times in the LXX. Even though it appears that this noun refers to an Israelite in some passages, ἄλλογενής apparently is employed to indicate that the individual does not belong to the accepted group in each context (e.g., Exod 29:33 and 30:33 use the noun to indicate that someone who is not a priest cannot participate in a described activity). Note the similar usage in Jos. Asen. 4.12 in which Aseneth refers to Joseph as ἄλλογενής because he is not an Egyptian. Josephus (B.J. 2.417) employs the noun when he is discussing the cessation of making sacrifices for the Romans in the temple. In this context, the sacrifices τῶν ἄλλογενῶν are considered to be inappropriate by Eleazar and his followers.
In v. 45, a πάροικος ("sojourner" or "resident foreigner") could not partake of the Passover meal. The important factor for distinguishing which individuals could eat the meal and which were prohibited from eating it becomes clear in the remaining verses of this passage:

47πᾶσα συναγωγή ὕψων Ισραήλ ποιήσει αὐτό.
48ἐὰν δὲ τις προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ποιήσῃ τὸ πάσχα κυρίων περιτεμείς αὐτοῦ πάν ἀρσενικόν, καὶ τότε προσελέβεται ποιήσαι αὐτό, καὶ ἔσται ὅσπερ καὶ ὁ αὐτóχθων τῆς γῆς: πᾶς ἀπερίτιμος οὐκ ἔσται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
49νόμος εἰς ἔσται τῷ ἐγχωρίῳ καὶ τῷ προσελθόντι προσήλυτῳ ἐν ἴμιν.

47All the assembly of the sons of Israel will do (i.e., "celebrate") it (i.e., "the Passover").
48And if any proselyte should come to you to do (i.e., "celebrate") the Passover to the Lord, you will circumcise him, any male, and then he will approach to do it, and it will be so also [for] the native of the land; any uncircumcised [male] will not eat from it.
49There will be one law for the native and for the proselyte who comes in among you.

Numbers 9:14\(^{188}\) repeats almost the same requirement for the proselyte in relationship to eating the Passover meal and provides the same rationale for the requirement:

14ἐὰν δὲ προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ἐν τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν, καὶ ποιήσει τὸ πάσχα κυρίων, κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ πάσχα καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνταξιν αὐτοῦ, οὕτως ποιήσει αὐτὸ. νόμος εἰς ἔσται ἰμῖν καὶ τῷ προσήλυτῳ καὶ τῷ αὐτόχθονι τῆς γῆς.

14Now if a proselyte should come to you in your land, and he celebrates the Passover to the Lord, he celebrates it according to the law of the Passover and according to its covenant; there is one law for you namely for the proselyte and for the native of the land.

\(^{188}\) All citations of Num are from John William Wevers, ed., Numeri (VTG 3/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 146-47, 201, 204-206.
However, the verse preceding 9:14 provides additional information regarding the requirement for an Israelite to observe the Passover:

13 And a person whoever is ceremonially clean and is not far away on a journey and fails to observe the Passover, that individual will be ostracized\textsuperscript{189} from his people; because he did not present the offering to the Lord according to its time, that person will receive his sin.

On a literal reading of Num 9:13, a Jewish Christian who believed that a Christ-believing Jew should continue to keep the requirements of the Mosaic law would still be obligated to continue to observe the Passover on pain of being completely cut off from the community.

In addition, Num 15:13-16 requires that there will be only one law for the proselyte and the native Israelite in terms of the offering of sacrifices:

13 πᾶς ὁ ἀυτόχθων ποιήσει οὕτως τοιαύτα προσενέγκαι καρπώματα εἰς ὀσμήν

\textsuperscript{189} See BDAG, “ἐξολοθρεύω,” 315; Johannes Schneider (“ἐξολοθρεύω,” TDNT 5:170) notes the frequency of the verb as ἐξολοθρεύω in the LXX: “ἐξολοθρεύω” is commonly used in the LXX in verses in which the MT has ἀποκαταστάσας. See “ἐξολοθρεύω,” HRCS, 497-99 for a list of the occurrences of ἐξολοθρεύω in the LXX along with the various Hebrew verbs employed in the equivalent MT verses. See also BDB, “חזק,” 503-504. Elmer Smick (“חזק,” TWOT 1:456-57) notes the various connotations of the verb: while הקט means “to cut out,” metaphorically it can mean “to root out, eliminate, remove, excommunicate or destroy by a violent act.” Smick cites MT Exod 12:15 as an example in which הקט means “exclusion from the community,” and LXX Exod 12:15 employs ἐξολοθρεύω. Acts 3:23 employs ἐξολοθρεύω with the connotation, according to C.K. Barrett (Acts I, 1-14 [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994], 210), of being cut off from the people of Israel or ceasing “to be a member of Israel.” Cf. C.A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, Luke and Scripture, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 192. Therefore, I have translated ἐξολοθρεύσεται as “will be ostracized” in Num 9:13. Other LXX passages that employ ἐξολοθρεύω with the connotation of excommunication/ostracism will be discussed below.
Every native-born Israelite will do [behave] in this manner – to offer burnt offerings such as this for a sweet smelling offering to the Lord.

And if a proselyte should attach himself to you in your land or whoever should be born among you in your generations even he will make a sweet-smelling burnt offering to the Lord what manner of life you establish in the same manner the [entire] assembly will do [i.e. “offer”] to the Lord.

There will be one law for you and for the proselytes who are closely attached to you, an eternal law for your generations, as you are so will the proselyte be before the Lord.

There will be one law and one righteous deed for you and for the proselyte who is closely attached to you.

There is one more passage in Numbers that is important for this discussion. Num 15: 27-31 establishes a distinction between unintentional sins and intentional sins and a distinction between the ways that the guilty party should be handled in each case:

27εὰν δὲ φυσικὴ μία ἁμαρτία, ἄκουσίως, προσάζει αἰγα μίαν ἐναυσίαν περὶ ἁμαρτίας,
28καὶ εξελέσατο ὁ ἱερεὺς περὶ τῆς φυσικῆς τῆς ἄκουσιας καὶ ἁμαρτωλῆς ἄκουσίως ἐναντίον κυρίου ἐξελάσσασθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ.
29τῷ ἐγκχωρίῳ ἐν υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ καὶ τῷ προσήλυτῳ τῷ προσκεκλήμενῳ ἐν αὐτοῖς, νόμος εἰς ἐσται αὐτοῖς, δὲ ἂν ποιήσῃ ἄκουσίως.
30καὶ φυσικῆ, ἢτις ποιῆσε ἑν χειρὶ ὑπερηφανίας ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτοχθόνων ἢ ἄπο τῶν

Note that Paul uses the phrase ὑοδίας κυρίων (sweet smelling offering, acceptable sacrifice, pleasing to the Lord) to refer to the gift that the Philippians sent to him via Epaphroditus (Phil 4:18).

See G. Schrenk, “δικαίωμα,” TDNT 2:174-225; LSJ, “δικαίωμα,” 429; BDAG, “δικαίωμα,” 249; and R. B. Hays, “Justification, ABD 3:1129-33. Although δικαίωμα can be translated in various ways such as “judgment, punishment, penalty, justification, righteous deed,” etc., I have translated it as “righteous deed” because the passage discusses burnt offerings.
and if one person should sin unintentionally, he will bring one female goat, one year old for a sin offering. And the priest will appease for the person who sinned inadvertently and sinned unintentionally before the Lord to appease for him. For the native-born of the sons of Israel and for the proselyte the one closely attached among them, there will be one law for them, whoever sins unintentionally. And a person, from the native-born or from the proselytes, whoever commits [a sin] with a hand of arrogance, this person provokes God, that person will be ostracized from his people. Because he has disparaged the word of the Lord and he has rejected his commandments that person will be driven out for destruction, his sin is upon him.

From these regulations, it is evident that circumcision was required for any male who desired to be a part of the assembly of the “sons of Israel” and to eat the Passover meal (Exod 12:43-49). The reason given for this stipulation is that there could only be one law for the native Israelite and for the proselyte (v. 49). Any proselyte who desired to be an active member of the covenant community must abide by the same law that regulated the lives of the sons of Israel and would be subject to all the curses if the covenant conditions were violated (Deut 29:9-15). The idea of one law for the sons of Israel and the proselyte applied not only to eating the Passover meal (Exod 12:43-49; Num 9:13-14), but also for making sacrifices (Num 15:13-16) and for atoning for unintentional sins (Num 15:27-29). And, most importantly, there was one law that applied to the sons of Israel and to the proselyte in the case of intentional sins: an
intentional and unrepentant sinner must be ostracized from the community (Deut 29:19-21; Num 15:30-31).

Additionally, the regulations in Leviticus regarding judgment for grave offenses also emphasize the equality of the proselyte and the native-born Israelite; both groups were to be viewed as equal members of the community in legal matters. Leviticus 24:22 states:

\[22 \text{ δικαιώσις} \text{ μία ἐσται τῷ προσηλύτῳ καὶ τῷ ἐγχωρίῳ ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.}\]

\[22 \text{ There will be one punishment for the proselyte and for the native-born because I am the Lord your God.}\]

This verse could not be clearer regarding the equality of proselyte and Israelite in terms of judgment for offenses. Considering the reoccurring stipulation that there must be one law applied equally to “the sons of Israel” and to proselytes and, moreover, that the native-born Israelite and the proselyte were viewed as equal in terms of judgment for grave offenses and equal in terms of the penalty for an unrepentant transgressor, we can now return to the issue of circumcision that is addressed in Galatians.

Although Paul never explicitly cites Gen 17 in Galatians, most commentators assume that the Missionaries used this passage in their efforts to convince the Galatians

---

192 See LSJ, “δικαιώσις,” 429. Although δικαιώσις can mean “setting right” or “doing justice to” someone along with “making or accounting righteous” and/or “justification” (see meaning II, ibid.), in Lev 24:22 δικαιώσις should be translated as “condemnation” or “punishment” since vv.10-23 deal with egregious offenses for which this passage prescribes the death penalty. As mentioned in n.20 above, Horbury presents evidence that the penalty for some of these offenses became curse and excommunication during the Second Temple period. See also, Schrenk, TDNT 2:223-24. Citations of Lev are from John William Wevers, ed., Leviticus (VTG 2/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 265, 282-94.

that God defined the covenant with Abraham as “the commandment of circumcision.”

Genesis 17:10-27 includes the specific requirement for the circumcision of all males, which specifically included eight-day old sons, purchased slaves and their sons, and any male ὁ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματὸς σου (“who is not from your seed” in v. 12). But, to the best of my knowledge, commentators do not mention that Gen 17:14 describes the punishment for any male ὁ οὐ περιτμηθήσεται (“who will not be circumcised”):

εξολοθρευθήσεται η ψυχή ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς ὅτι τὴν διαθήκην μου διεσκέδασεν (“that person will be completely cut off/ostracized from his people because he has rejected my covenant”).

At this point, G. F. Hasel’s discussion of the manner in which the penalty of ἐξολοθρεύω was carried out is extremely important:

The “cutting off” formula therefore does not appear to refer solely to human execution of the death penalty. In the majority of offenses, “cutting off” means a “cutting out” which leads to banishment or excommunication from the cultic community and the covenant people (compare Lev 20:7 with CH 154, which also speaks of banishment), except for offenses that can hardly come to public notice (cf. Ex 30:38; Lev 7:20f.; Nu15:30f.), which cannot be punished by human agency. In the case of offenses that lead to exclusion from one’s own clan (cf. Gen 17:14) and from the covenant community, as in the case of secret sins that cannot be punished institutionally, the ultimate end of the punishment, the premature death of the offender, is in God’s hands (cf. krt hiphil in Lev. 17:10; 20:3,5,6; Ezek. 14:8-14).

... the cultic community or the clan can “cut off” the offender (to the extent that his offense is known) from life in God’s presence through exclusion. The one

---

194 E.g., Martyn, Galatians, 303 and 120-26; Hays, Galatians, 186; Betz, Galatians, 156; and Dunn, Galatians, 245.
195 Citations of Gen are from John William Wevers, ed., Genesis (VTG 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 178-82.
so cut off is then left to God as the ultimate agent of final punishment.\(^{196}\)

Since \(\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu\epsilon\theta\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omega\) is the most common Greek verb employed in the LXX when \(זָרַע\) appears in the MT,\(^{197}\) Hasel’s investigation of the meaning of \(זָרַע\) provides further evidence, in addition to the studies by Morland and Horbury mentioned above, that ostracism/excommunication was the standard punishment for several offenses, including refusing to be circumcised. Therefore, if Gen 17:10-27 were taken literally, entrance into the covenant required any male, regardless of age, to be circumcised. And if that male refused to be circumcised, he was to be “ostracized from his people” (17:14). Even though it is generally accepted that there were numerous God-fearers who lived and worshipped in the Jewish synagogues during the Second Temple period, we are proposing that Gen 17:10-27 came into play in Galatia because these Christian communities were founded on the basis of Paul’s preaching that made no distinction between “God-fearing” Gentile Christians and a type of “full proselyte” Gentile Christian. And the very fact that Paul’s gospel did not include circumcision as a requirement for Gentile believers who sought to be considered as faithful members of the covenant people of God was the reason for the Missionaries’ determination to instruct the


\(^{197}\) Johannes Schneider (“דָּלָתִּים, דָּלָת, דָּלָתָּהּ, דָּלָתָּהוֹ,” TDNT 5:167-71, esp. 170) notes that \(דָּלָתִּים\) “is used for 20 different Heb. terms, \(זָרַע\) being the most common.” And he adds: “The word is often used in statements which intimate God’s will to root out men for their sins.”
Gentile believers in the Scriptures, as the Missionaries read them, in order to ensure that Paul’s Gentile converts became full proselytes within the Christian-Jewish community.198

3.1.2.3 The Incident at Antioch in light of Scriptures regarding proselytes

In light of the Scriptures requiring one law for proselytes and “the sons of Israel” and the prescribed penalty of ostracism for rejecting the conditions of the covenant, we can now return to a discussion of The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11-21). Philip Esler claims that the cultural environment of the Mediterranean region in the first century C.E. fostered an atmosphere in which honor was acquired in situations in which one could outdo one’s opponent.199 Therefore, he sees 2:11-21 as a back and forth contest in which Paul is on one team and James, Peter, and John are on the other. Esler proposes that, in this process of saving face, gaining honor, and making deals, part of the agreement that Paul made with the Jerusalem apostles was to allow the Gentile Christians and the Jewish Christians to eat the Eucharist together in fellowship.200 However, there is no indication in Gal 2:11-12 that Peter’s refusal to eat with the Gentiles occurred at a Eucharist meal.

In addition, E. P. Sanders has cogently argued that Jews associated with Gentiles in the normal course of daily life and frequently ate with them provided that the meat and

198 Since most commentators assume that the Missionaries cited Gen 17 to support their teaching (see n.195 above), there is no reason to assume that they would have excluded the required ostracism of any male who refused to be circumcised (v.14) from their teaching.
200 Ibid., 273.
wine to be consumed met Jewish dietary requirements. So what exactly was the problem with eating with the Gentiles at Antioch, and why did Peter withdraw and separate himself from the Gentiles (Gal 2:12) φοβοῦμενος τούς ἐκ περιτομῆς (“fearing the ones from the circumcision [party]”)?

While numerous answers to this question have been proffered, I propose that Peter withdrew from the Gentiles because “certain ones from James” convinced him and the rest of the Jews that the Torah-free Gentiles were intentional and unrepentant sinners. Considering the Scriptures discussed above that stressed the equality of Jews and proselytes in terms of the law and the penalties for rejecting it, the Torah-observant Jewish believers were in favor of excluding the uncircumcised Gentiles in accordance with the scriptural penalty for an intentional and unrepentant sinner. It is our opinion, therefore, that the main reason for Peter’s withdrawal from the Gentiles was his fear of those who were demanding that the uncircumcised Gentiles be ostracized from the faithful community of believers. Paul refers to the group demanding the exclusion of the uncircumcised Gentiles as “the circumcision party.” In the following discussion, we will delineate supporting evidence for our interpretation of the Incident at Antioch. Although some parts of the following discussion are not examples of rhetorical parody, they contribute to our understanding of Paul’s rhetorical parody in Galatians.

---

3.1.2.3.1 Paul’s vocabulary and scriptural demands for exclusion

The first place that we should start in attempting to determine exactly why Peter stopped his former practice of eating with the Gentiles is to look at Paul’s wording in Gal 2:12:

πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἠλθεῖν τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθεν· ὧτε δὲ ἤλθοι, ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἄφωρης έέαυτόν φοβοῖμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς.

For before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing the circumcision [party].

In all of his letters, both undisputed and disputed, Paul employs the verb συνεσθίω only twice. Besides Gal 2:12, the other time that it appears in the Pauline corpus is in 1 Cor 5:11. In 1 Cor 5:9-13, Paul is demanding that the Corinthians not eat with a member of their congregation because that person is immoral. Since Paul is trying to clarify a previous miscommunication with the Corinthians, he is quite specific in explaining the reason for this requirement. First Corinthians 5:9-13 states:

9"I wrote to you in my letter not to associate with immoral people, 10Not at all the immoral of this world or the covetous and greedy or idol worshippers since then you would be obligated to go out from this world. 11Now I wrote to you not to associate with anyone being called a brother if he is immoral or covetous or an idol worshipper or slanderer or drunkard or greedy, with such a person not even to eat.

9I wrote to you in my letter not to associate with immoral people, 10Not at all the immoral of this world or the covetous and greedy or idol worshippers since then you would be obligated to go out from this world. 11Now I wrote to you not to associate with anyone being called a brother if he is immoral or covetous or an idol worshipper or slanderer or drunkard or greedy, with such a person not even to eat.
For what have I to do with judging outsiders? Is it not the ones inside that you are to judge?

Now God judges those outside. Drive the evil person out from you.

Although much of the Corinthian discussion is a list of people that were considered immoral, the important points are: (1) Paul prohibits the congregations from eating with a person who is supposed to be a follower of Christ, but who does not live according to the moral rules by which Christ-followers should abide, and (2) Paul demands that this immoral person, who calls himself a brother, be driven out from the congregation, or in other words he was to be ostracized.

Brian S. Rosner proposes “a link between 1 Cor 5 and Pentateuchal teaching on community exclusion.”

Additionally, Göran Forkman and G.W.H. Lampe understand 1 Cor 5:5 as not only describing exclusion from the community, but also as a powerful or solemn curse since Paul states that he is handing the offender over to Satan εἰς ὀλεθρον (for destruction).

---

202 1 Cor 5:1-13 is wrought with a plethora of exegetical problems. For a full discussion, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 382-418. However, on the two points that are vital for our discussion modern scholarship is in agreement. In noting the consensus view, Thiselton states (here 390): “Paul attacks two distinct problems: (a) the immoral act of the individual person; and (b) the corporate sin of the community in condoning, accepting, and tolerating the situation, with no overt sign even of concern.”

203 *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 61-93. Rosner notes Paul’s καθαρεῖ τὸν ποιημαν εἰς ἵμων αὐτῶν (“remove the evil person from among you”) in 1 Cor 5:13 follows the LXX command ἐκκαθαρίζετε τὸν ποιημαν εἰς ἵμων αὐτῶν (e.g., Deut 17:7; 19:19; 21:21, etc) closely enough to be considered a citation of an exclusion formula and, as I have discussed above in relation to Gen 17:14 and Num 15:30, etc., he does note that ἐκκαθαρίζετε is one of the verbs employed in the LXX when the MT employs ἄδικον to indicate exclusion for an offense (64). Rosner identifies three major reasons for exclusion, which included “covenant, guilt by association, and the maintenance of holiness” (68) and, as I have discussed above, notes the substitution of excommunication for the death penalty (82).
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It is reasonable, therefore, from reading 1 Cor 5:1-13, that Paul continued to view an intentional sinner in a manner very similar to what we saw above in Num 15:30-31. The obvious difference between the two approaches is that Paul qualifies the stipulation for destruction so that it applies only to the sinner’s flesh while his spirit could still be saved. Although the distinction between flesh and spirit is not included in Num 15:30-31, Sanders notes that even though the “biblical view . . . that God’s justice is meted out within this life” continued to be “influential” in Rabbinic Judaism, we also see the development of the Rabbinic idea that rewards and punishments would “be carried out in the world to come” based on the belief that God is just. However, Sanders does point out that in the Tannaitic literature it is obvious that a person who denied God excluded himself or herself “from the covenant and consequently from the world to come. Since accepting the covenant meant accepting the commandments, refusal of the commandments is refusal of the covenant.”

Apparently, in comparison to his Jewish heritage, Paul has replaced the totality of destruction and the consequences of intentionally denying God and the covenant with the opposition of flesh and spirit. While the sinner is to be removed from the community of faith and that person’s flesh would be destroyed, according to Paul, a person whose flesh was condemned to destruction could

---

τοιούτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὀλέθρον τῆς σαρκός, ίνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ("to hand such a person over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord"), see Thiselton, First Corinthians, 395-400.
205 Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 125-26.
206 Ibid., 134.
have hope that his spirit would be saved. Although this view is not specifically stated in
the passages discussed above, Paul’s hope that the sinner’s spirit could be saved is
consistent with Hasel’s investigation of excommunication/ostracism in that the
community has the responsibility of excluding the unrepentant sinner; however, “the one
so cut off is then left to God.”

In Gal 2:12, Peter’s separation and refusal to eat with the Gentiles is very similar
to Paul’s directive in 1 Cor 5:11 that the Corinthians must not associate with or eat with
anyone who was a “brother” in Christ, but remained unrepentant. Such a “brother,”
according to Paul, was to be cast out of the community of the faithful. In Antioch, Peter
withdrew (uprostele) and separated (aphorize) himself from the Gentiles, obviously
implying that he also stopped his former practice of eating with them.

### 3.1.3 Understanding the Controversy at Antioch As the Exclusion of
Gentiles From the Community Rather Than As a Withdrawal of Table
Fellowship

Considering the above discussion of the Scriptures that required one law for the
Jewish people and the same law for the proselyte, it stands to reason that the same
requirement may explain the controversy in the Incident at Antioch. The consistent
problem within the Galatian conflict appears to be that the Torah-observant Jewish
Christians were ostracizing the Gentile members of the community of believers because

---

207 *TDOT* 7:348. Whether one agrees that παραδόων τῶν τωμοῦτον τῷ σατάνῃ εἰς ὀλθρον τῆς σαρκός
should be interpreted in terms of “curse/death” or adopts one of the other interpretations delineated by
Thiselton (*First Corinthians*, 395-400), Paul clearly calls for the exclusion of the unrepentant person from
the community of the faithful.
If this proposal is correct, the reason for Peter’s withdrawal from the Gentiles had nothing to do with any social regulation that Jews could not eat with Gentiles. And, apparently, it had nothing to do with the condition of the food or the wine since Paul makes no reference to either food or wine. As noted above, many Scriptures required the same law and the same judgment for the Israelite and the proselyte. And most importantly if an individual were an intentional, unrepentant sinner, that individual was supposed to be ostracized. So although Paul states that Peter, James, and John agreed in Jerusalem that the two missions would have different audiences since Paul was preaching a law-free gospel to the Gentiles and Peter was preaching to the Jews, some people from James felt that Paul’s Gentile Christ-followers were intentional sinners because they were not circumcised and did not follow the other requirements of the law.

If this were the case, it does explain why Paul presents his theological explanation for Peter’s condemnation in the manner he does. As mentioned above, Paul portrays Peter’s behavior as the parodic reverse of Eleazar’s (2 Macc 6:18-31). However, in explaining the basis for his condemnation of Peter’s actions, Paul again refers to the “truth of the gospel” (2:14), which resonates with his insistence that he preserved “the truth of the gospel” by not submitting to those in Jerusalem who objected to his law-free

---

208 Paul again discusses the exclusion of the Galatians by those who insisted that Gentiles should be “under the law” (4:21) when he says in 4:17: ἐκκλείσαι ἵματις θέλων (they desire to exclude you”). See BDAG, “ἐκκλείσαι,” 303. Cf. Paul’s use of ἐκκλείσαι in Rom 16:7 when he warns believers to shun/turn away from those who cause divisions, etc.
gospel to the Gentiles (2:5).\(^{209}\) If we are correct that the problem at Antioch resulted from “certain ones from James” influencing Peter to view the uncircumcised Gentiles as unrepentant sinners, the reason for Paul’s condemnation of Peter and the basis for the charge of hypocrisy was that Peter was reneging on the earlier agreement stated in 2:7-8: (1) Paul was “entrusted with the gospel for the uncircumcised” (\(\tau \varepsilon \iota \alpha \varsigma \gamma \gamma \ell \iota \omicron \nu \tau \omicron \gamma \zeta \)) while Peter was “entrusted with the gospel for the circumcised” (\(\tau \eta \varsigma \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \)) while Peter was “entrusted with the gospel for the circumcised” (\(\tau \eta \varsigma \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \)); and (2) most importantly, Peter had agreed in Jerusalem that \(\omega \nu \epsilon \tau \rho \gamma \xi \sigma \alpha \varsigma \) (“the one working”) through him was also \(\omega \nu \epsilon \tau \rho \gamma \xi \sigma \alpha \varsigma \) through Paul. As Hays states, “It is the same God who has worked in both Peter and Paul, the same God who has ‘entrusted’ the gospel to each.”\(^{210}\) And since Paul’s law-free mission to the Gentiles had already been accepted in Jerusalem as being empowered by the one true God, Peter was being a hypocrite at Antioch since he now viewed the Gentiles as unrepentant sinners because they were not Torah-observant to the point of submitting to circumcision.

With this interpretation, therefore, Paul’s “the truth of the gospel” is not “one of the vexing puzzles of his account of the incident in Antioch” as Martyn assumes.\(^{211}\) Although Martyn is correct that Paul viewed Peter’s withdrawal from the Gentiles as “the effective preaching of an anti-gospel,”\(^{212}\) Martyn’s insistence that food laws precipitated Peter’s withdrawal diminishes the importance of Paul’s allusions in 2:11-14 to his earlier

---

\(^{210}\) *Galatians*, 226.  
\(^{211}\) *Galatians*, 235.  
\(^{212}\) Ibid.
discussion in 2:1-10, which placed Paul’s law-free gospel to the uncircumcised on an equal footing with Peter’s mission to the circumcised on the basis that both missions were the work of God. Therefore, the controversy at Antioch was over the exact same issue discussed earlier in Jerusalem: whether or not Gentile believers must obey the Mosaic law, including the rite of circumcision, in order to become and/or remain faithful members of God’s covenant people. Apparently, those from James convinced Peter that any uncircumcised male was not a faithful follower of the God who worked through him in his ἀποστολή τῆς περιτομῆς (“apostleship to the circumcised” in 2:8) and, therefore, any male who refused to be circumcised should be excluded from the faithful community as dictated in Gen 17:14.

Although this interpretation of the Incident at Antioch is not that proposed by other commentators,\(^\text{213}\) it seems the most natural reading of the passage, especially

\(^{213}\) As mentioned above, Esler proposes a Eucharist setting. Sanders (“Jewish Association,” 186) thinks the most likely explanation was “reluctance to associate too much with Gentiles, since close association might lead to contact with idolatry or transgression of one of the biblical food laws,” which in turn might cause “Peter’s mission to be discredited.” Robert Jewett (“The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation,” \textit{NTS} 17 [1971]: 198-212, here 205-206) proposes that the Missionaries were Jewish Christians from Judea who insisted on the circumcision of Gentile Christians in order to avoid persecution from the Zealots, who sought to bring an end to Roman occupation by “absolute separation from the heathen world and any uncircumcised element,” therefore, appeasing “God’s wrath . . . by cleansing Israel through extermination of all impure persons.” Hays (\textit{Galatians}, 232-33, 235) acknowledges the validity of Sanders’s argument along with that of Jewett; however, he maintains that the problem at Antioch concerned “Jewish dietary restrictions” and not the issue of circumcision since “that issue had already been clearly settled—with the approval of James—by the meeting in Jerusalem (vv.1-10).” And, as mentioned above, Martyn (\textit{Galatians}, 233-45, esp. 234) focuses on food laws in the common meal; however, he notes that Paul accused Peter of fearing “the circumcision party” rather than “the food-laws party.” Betz (\textit{Galatians}, 107-112) understands that Peter withdrew from the Gentiles because of Jewish dietary and purity laws; however, he understands 2:14 to imply that Peter wanted to compel the Gentiles to obey the entire law, including circumcision. Dunn (\textit{Galatians}, 121-24, esp. 122-23), in discussing the relationship of 2:6-10 to 2:11-14, notes that after Peter left Jerusalem James “would have been a good deal more amenable to the ‘false brothers’ of 2:4-5.” Additionally, Dunn acknowledges that Peter might have feared the circumcision party because the group
considering that in 2:14 Paul not only repeats “the truth of the gospel” from 2:5, but also repeats the verb ἀναγκάζω from 2:3 in which Paul states that not even Titus, being a Greek, ἦν αναγκάσθη περιτεμήναι (“was compelled to be circumcised”). As Martyn notes, “the verb ‘to compel’ is a term of great significance in the Galatian setting.”

Although Paul uses ἀναγκάζω in 2:3 and in 6:12 in conjunction with περιτέμω in order to refer explicitly to an attempt to compel Gentiles to be circumcised, the combination of ἀναγκάζεις and ιουδαίζειν in 2:14 is usually interpreted as referring to Peter’s attempt to compel Gentiles to adopt Jewish dietary restrictions. But is this limited interpretation of ιουδαίζειν the best interpretation of the verb in the context of Paul’s argument? Or is it actually did represent the authority of James by the time of the Antioch Incident. Dunn also provides a full discussion of the ways in which this acknowledgement and Jewett’s proposal fit the accounts of the Jerusalem agreement presented in Gal 2 and Acts 15. While we are in agreement with the majority of commentators that Gal 2 and Acts 15 describe the same meeting in Jerusalem (cf., e.g., Hays, Galatians, 221-22; Martyn, Galatians, 200, 216-17; Betz, Galatians, 84-85; Dunn, Galatians, 88-89; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 131-32; and Hansen, Galatians, 20-21; contra Bruce, Galatians, 44, 52-56; Longenecker, Galatians, lxiii-lxxiii; and Witherington, Grace, 13-20), the intricacies of the relationship between Gal and Acts are beyond the scope of our discussion, which focuses on what Paul says in Gal and the relationship of his words to scriptural demands for Torah observance.

Actually did represent the authority of James by the time of the Antioch Incident. Dunn also provides a full discussion of the ways in which this acknowledgement and Jewett’s proposal fit the accounts of the Jerusalem agreement presented in Gal 2 and Acts 15. While we are in agreement with the majority of commentators that Gal 2 and Acts 15 describe the same meeting in Jerusalem (cf., e.g., Hays, Galatians, 221-22; Martyn, Galatians, 200, 216-17; Betz, Galatians, 84-85; Dunn, Galatians, 88-89; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 131-32; and Hansen, Galatians, 20-21; contra Bruce, Galatians, 44, 52-56; Longenecker, Galatians, lxiii-lxxiii; and Witherington, Grace, 13-20), the intricacies of the relationship between Gal and Acts are beyond the scope of our discussion, which focuses on what Paul says in Gal and the relationship of his words to scriptural demands for Torah observance.

Notable exceptions are: Betz (see n. 213 above); Longenecker (Galatians, 78) who proposes that Peter was trying to compel the Gentiles “to become Jews for full acceptance in the church;” and Francis Watson (Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective [rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 104-107) who maintains that the issue of Gentile circumcision was not discussed in Jerusalem but became a matter of concern first at Antioch. However, even though Watson proposes that Peter withdrew from the Gentiles because they were uncircumcised, he agrees with the majority of commentators that Peter withdrew from “table fellowship” (127). Watson’s scenario, therefore, still does not address why eating with uncircumcised Gentiles was considered to be a problem (see the discussion of Sanders’s findings regarding table fellowship above and in n. 201). While we agree with Watson that the problem at Antioch was generated because the Gentiles were uncircumcised, we disagree with his proposal that the Jerusalem meeting did not deal with this issue. Additionally, in our interpretation, Peter’s withdrawal was equivalent to the exclusion of unrepentant sinners prescribed in the above-mentioned Scriptures and, therefore, was a withdrawal from much more than just “table fellowship.”
likely that most interpreters understand Ἰούδαιος to relate merely to food laws because they place more emphasis on Paul’s use of σωματικός (2:12) than on his reference to φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιστομῆς (“fearing those from the circumcision [party]”) in the same verse?

If we are correct that Peter’s withdrawal from the Gentiles had nothing to do with the condition of the food or the wine but resulted from viewing the Gentiles as unrepentant sinners who refused to be faithful members of the covenant by being circumcised, it is extremely likely that Paul’s accusation against Peter expressed with Ἰούδαιος, should be interpreted as an attempt to compel the Galatians to adopt Jewish customs in general, not Jewish dietary restrictions alone. Most commentators understand 2:14 to mean that Peter had stopped strictly observing Jewish food laws as evidenced by his previous custom of eating with Gentiles, and, therefore, it made no sense for him to compel the Gentiles to live by Jewish dietary restrictions. In this interpretation, Peter is requiring that the Gentiles strictly obey a Jewish custom that he himself has not always obeyed. However, in our interpretation, Paul is saying:

εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἑθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαῖος ἐθνικός, πώς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεται Ἰουδαῖος;

If you being a Jew are living as a Gentile and not as a Jew [because you previously understood that some Jewish customs, such as food laws, could now be relaxed as a result of the death and resurrection of Christ], how can you [possibly] try to force the Gentiles [who have also believed in Christ] to accept Jewish

216 E.g., Hays, Galatians, 235; Burton, Galatians, 112; Martyn, Galatians, 235-36; and Dunn, Galatians, 130. Contra Betz (Galatians, 112) who proposes that Peter’s earlier position was characterized by a “total emancipation from Judaism.”
requirements [such as circumcision or face exclusion from the community]?

In this reading, Paul is not accusing Peter of compelling Gentiles to follow a requirement that he himself has not always followed. Rather Paul is accusing Peter, a Jew whose previous actions implied that he understood the radical change brought about by Christ in terms of the manner in which a human being is made righteous (cf. 2:16), of now inconsistently requiring Gentiles who have accepted the gospel of Christ to adopt Jewish customs in order to be accepted as a righteous, faithful part of the covenant community.\textsuperscript{217}

Regardless of whether one attributes the problem at Antioch to food laws or to the issue of circumcision, the meaning of ιουδαιοζειν is understood as a key in interpreting 2:14. Martyn maintains that the verb carried a sense of superficiality and insincerity since it is used in Esth 8:17 and Josephus (\textit{B. J.} 2.454, 463) to describe Gentiles who converted to Judaism out of mortal fear.\textsuperscript{218} While Martyn’s point fits the situations described in Esth 8:17 and \textit{B. J.} 2.454, any hint of insincerity is precluded in \textit{B. J.} 2.463 since Josephus is describing the massacre of Jews (τοὺς Ἰουδαίους) by the Syrians and notes that those who had converted to Judaism (τοὺς Ἰουδαίους οντας) were also considered suspect by the Syrians. Therefore, in \textit{B. J.} 2.463 it is unlikely that Gentiles would have continued to

\textsuperscript{217} This interpretation is equivalent to Longenecker’s (\textit{Galatians}, 78) with the exception that Longenecker explains Peter’s withdrawal of fellowship (not limited to table fellowship) along the lines of Jewett’s proposal, which emphasizes the importance of the Zealot’s demand for separation of Jews from Gentiles, rather than as the result of a literal reading of the aforementioned Scriptures that required the exclusion of an unrepentant sinner from the community.

\textsuperscript{218} \textit{Galatians}, 236. Cf. Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 112. For a discussion of Esth 8:17 and \textit{B. J.} 2.454, see n.170 above.
profess a superficial conversion to Judaism when such an admission would have put their lives in danger.

While Dunn does not think that Paul is accusing Peter of attempting to compel the Galatians to be circumcised, he does note that Ἰουδαϊκεῖν “could embrace a range of degrees of assimilation to Jewish life-style, with circumcision as the climax, but without necessarily including circumcision.” Although Dunn’s understanding is in line with Josephus’ description of events in B. J. 2.454, it does not fit the Gentiles’ actions described in Esth 8:17 in which the Gentiles initially “had themselves circumcised” and then subsequently followed Jewish customs over a period of time. Therefore, Esth 8:17 depicts circumcision as preceding an ongoing Jewish lifestyle rather than as the climax of a process of assimilating to Judaism, and, therefore, Ἰουδαϊκεῖν in Esth 8:17 should be understood as synonymous with “living as a Jew.”

Although Betz does not view Ἰουδαϊκεῖν in Gal 2:14 as completely synonymous with Ἰουδαϊκός, his assessment of Paul’s understanding of Ἰουδαϊκεῖν is quite important for our discussion:

In Paul’s view, Ἰουδαϊκεῖν includes more than submitting to Jewish dietary laws; it describes forcing one to become a Jewish convert obliged to keep the whole Torah (cf. 5:3). Ironically, therefore, by attempting to preserve the integrity of the Jewish Christians as Jews, Cephas destroys the integrity of the Gentile Christians

---

219 Galatians, 129. Although Betz’s references to “Christianity” and “Judaism” can, of course, be considered anachronistic, his point that Paul interpreted Ἰουδαϊκεῖν to mean forcing Gentile converts to keep the whole Torah is valid.

220 Περιπέτευμοντο is an Aorist Indicative, but Ἰουδαϊκός is an Imperfect Indicative. Therefore, in Esth 8:17 περιπέτευμοντο describes the entrance into a state of being (Smyth, §1924) while Ἰουδαϊκός describes the customary action of “living as a Jew” (ibid., §1893).
as believers in Christ. Instead of welcoming them as converts to Christianity, he wants to make them into converts of Judaism.\textsuperscript{221}

Therefore, Betz’s understanding of Gal 2:14 not only explains Paul’s repetition of \( \text{ἀναγκάζω} \) and \( \text{τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εἰσαγγελίου} \), but it also explains the rationale behind the strategic placement of 2:15-17 immediately following 2:14 since 2:15-17 describes the manner in which any human being, whether Gentile or Jew, is made righteous.

Furthermore, some commentators note the use of \( \text{iουδαίζειν} \) by Ignatius (\textit{Magn.} 10.3), in which the verb refers to practicing Judaism rather than to converting to Judaism, in order to support their contention that Paul’s \( \text{iουδαίζειν} \) in Gal 2:14 refers to adopting Jewish practices, specifically dietary restrictions.\textsuperscript{222} Even though Ignatius is certainly contrasting “living according to Judaism” and “grace” (8.1) in his juxtaposition of practicing Judaism and Christianity (\textit{Magn.} 8.1-10.3), the only specific Jewish custom mentioned is “keeping the Sabbath” (9.1). However, it is clear from the context of Ignatius’ discussion that \( \text{εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαίσμον ζώμεν, ὀμολογούμεν χάριν} \) \( \text{μὴ εἰληφέναι} \) (“For if we live until now according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace” in 8.1) and \( \text{ἀτοπὸν ἐστὶν, Ἡσυχίαν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ ἰουδαίζειν} \) (“It is absurd to proclaim Jesus Christ and practice Judaism” in 10.3) refer to Jewish practices as a whole rather than to keeping the Sabbath alone.

In summary, therefore, we should read Gal 2:14 not only in the context of Paul’s

\textsuperscript{221} \textit{Galatians}, 112.  
\textsuperscript{222} E.g., Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 236 n.99; and Hays. \textit{Galatians}, 235.  
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repetition of ἀναγκάζω and τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου and his recognition that Peter’s actions were due to “fear of the circumcision [party],” but also in the context of his subsequent juxtaposition of “works of the law” and “grace” (2:15-21). And we should consider that the ancient sources cited in order to substantiate the interpretation that Paul is referring to dietary restrictions alone do not support either the idea that ἴωδαίζειν was consistently used with a connotation of superficiality or that circumcision was always the final culmination of a process of assimilation to a Jewish lifestyle. And, most importantly, we know from 1 Cor 5:11 that Paul advised the Corinthians “not to associate with” (μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι) and “not even to eat with” (μηδὲ συνεσθίειν) an immoral “brother” who claimed membership in the faith community, but unrepentantly refused to live in a manner consistent with Christian behavior. Additionally, we know from the Scriptures mentioned above, especially Gen 17:14 in reference to circumcision, that ostracism was considered the appropriate punishment for an unrepentant sinner within the Jewish community. Therefore, it seems more appropriate to view ἴωδαίζειν in Gal 2:14 as referring to living according to the whole law, which included the ostracism of those who rejected the conditions of the covenant, rather than to limit its meaning to “conversion to Judaism,” whether superficial or genuine, or “to adopting Jewish dietary restrictions” alone. By seeking to interpret ἴωδαίζειν in the context of Paul’s entire description of the Incident at Antioch, we are placing equal weight on his repetition of phrases from the Jerusalem meeting, his use of συνῆσθεν to describe Peter’s previous habit of eating with the Gentiles (2:12), his explanation that Peter’s fear of “the
“circumcision party” was the motivating factor in the hypocrisy (2:12), and his subsequent theological argument against Peter’s actions. This method of interpretation seems preferable to assuming, based solely on the use of συνήθως in 2:12, that Paul is employing ἰουδαϊζέων to refer to Jewish dietary requirements alone.

3.1.3.1 A proposed explanation for a Pauline neologism

If we understand Paul’s ἰουδαϊζέων to connote living in accordance with the Mosaic law as a whole, it is possible that Paul coined the verb ὀρθοποδέω for his accusation against Peter and the “rest of the Jews” when he stated: οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (“they were not walking correctly in accordance with the truth of the gospel”). If this interpretation is correct, it is likely that Paul devised a new word in order to allude to a scriptural description of a public confrontation between prophets who each claimed to speak God’s truth to the covenant people. Although Dunn proposes that Paul “may have coined” ὀρθοποδέω because he reasoned that Peter and the rest of the Jews “were departing from the obvious truth of the gospel which he thought had been agreed at Jerusalem,” it is also possible that Paul is alluding to portions of Micah’s prophecy against the leaders of the people and the false prophets in Jerusalem, who were violating the Mosaic law and leading the people astray while, at the same time,

---

223 The verb is a hypax legomenon in the NT. Additionally, the only text cited for ὀρθοποδέω in LSJ (1249) is Gal 2:14. For its use in texts that postdate Paul, see “ὁρθοποδέω,” PGL, 972. The verb is unattested in any extant literature that predates Paul.
224 We are in agreement with Martyn (Galatians, 234, n. 95) that πρὸς in 2:14 means “in accordance with” rather than “towards,” as Mussner (Galaterbrief, 144) maintains. See BDAG, “πρὸς, 3d,” 874.
225 Galatians, 127. Dunn correctly maintains that ὀρθοποδέω does not connote “orthodoxy” until later in Christian literature. Contra Betz (Galatians, 111) who equates ὀρθοποδέω in Gal 2:14 with “orthodoxy.”
claiming that nothing bad would happen to them since the Lord was among them.\footnote{226} We have argued above that the Missionaries were portraying Paul as a false prophet similar to the false prophet described in Deut 13.\footnote{227} Although we cannot determine whether or not portions of Micah’s prophecy were included in the Missionaries’ teachings, Paul’s primary audience in this portion of his letter may well have been the Missionaries and not the Galatians. Therefore, the similarities between Micah’s indictment of the leaders and false prophets who deceived the people and Paul’s words in several portions of Galatians\footnote{228} warrant further investigation into the possibility that Paul may have coined

---

\footnote{226} Mic 3:11 depicts the leaders of the people, the priests, and the prophets as saying: οὐχὶ κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστιν; οὐ μὴ ἔπελθῃ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς κακὰ (“Is not the Lord among us? Evil things will never come upon us”). The Greek text of Mic is from Joseph Ziegler, ed., Duodecim Prophetae (VTG 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943), 205-227.

\footnote{227} See 3.1.2 above.

\footnote{228} Jon D. Levenson (Sinai and Zion [New York: HarperCollins, 1985], 195-200) argues “the traditions of Sinai, specifically the Mosaic covenant,” rather than an emphasis on Davidic theology, underlie the prophecy of Micah. So also A. S. van der Woude, “Micha 2:7a und der Bund Jahwes mit Israel,” VT 18 (1968): 388-91; and idem, “Micah in Dispute with the Pseudo-Prophets,” VT 19 (1969): 244-60. Levenson (197) cites Mic 3:12 as attributing the downfall of Zion/Jerusalem to violations of the Mosaic law. Mic 3:1-3 addresses αἱ ἀρχαὶ ὑκου λακωβ (“the authorities of the house of Jacob”) as αἱ μισοῦντες τὰ καλὰ καὶ ζητοῦντες τὰ πονηρά (“the ones who hate good things and seek evil things”). It is possible that in Gal 4:17-18 Paul is parodying Micah’s description of those violating God’s laws by using similar phrases to describe the law-observant Jewish Christians who were troubling the law-free Galatian Christians and seeking to exclude them as unrepentant sinners. In this case, Paul’s ζηλοῦσιν ἡμᾶς ὧν καλὸς (“They are seeking you for no good purpose”) and καλὸν δὲ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε (“But it is always good to be sought in a good way”) is parodically reversing Mic 3:2-3 by applying the prophet’s words to the ones who were attempting to compel others to be law observant. Additionally, Mic 3:3 states that the leaders κατέφεγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου (“devour the flesh of my people”), and Mic 3:5 describes the false prophets who deceive (πλανᾶω) the people as τοὺς δάκνοντας ἐν τοῖς ὀδόις αὐτῶν (“those who bite with their teeth”). Paul warns the Galatians in 5:15: ἐὰν ἔλληλοι δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπ’ ἐλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε (Now if you bite and devour one another, take care that you are not destroyed by one another”), which is possibly a parodic reversal of Micah’s indictment of those who violated the law since Paul is using strikingly similar vocabulary against those who insist that the Galatians be Torah observant. Also, according to Micah: the sin of Judah is Jerusalem (1:5); the threat of foreign invasion is God’s punishment for sin (1:12); and, as a result of sin, the people have gone into captivity (1:16). Additionally, τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου (“the mountain of the Lord”), which is synonymous with Zion/Jerusalem, is a reoccurring theme in
Although forms of ὀρθός with the connotation of “right” or “correct” frequently appear in our literature,229 Micah is the only prophetic book in the LXX that employs ὀρθός to describe living correctly in accordance with the commands of God (2:7; 3:9).230

Mic (2:9; 4:1-2, 7) to which ἐθνή πολλά (“many nations/Gentiles”) will go so that the covenant people can show them “the way” ὅτι ἐκ Σιων ἔξελεσται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ (“because the law will go out from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem” in 4:2). Although these themes are certainly found in other canonical prophetic books, it is interesting that Micah’s promise of restoration is depicted as the Lord’s deliverance of the people from captivity after they have experienced the pains of childbirth, which results in their willingness to live under the obligations of the law (Mic 4:9-10). If Paul were parodically applying Micah’s criticisms of the leaders and false prophets to the Galatian situation in Gal 4:17-18, it is interesting that he immediately follows the parody with τέκνα μου, οὓς πάλιν ὧδ’ ἔσεσθαι μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστός ἐν ἡμῖν (“My children with whom I am in the pains of childbirth until Christ is formed in you” in 4:19), therefore, parodically replacing the deliverance brought about by obeying the Mosaic law with a deliverance brought about when Christ is formed in the Galatians. Additionally, Paul follows Gal 4:19 with his explanation “to the ones who desire to be under the Law” (4:21) that the covenant from Mount Sinai, the equivalent of the present-day Jerusalem, is still “enslaved with her children” (4:24-25). Therefore, Paul reverses Micah’s promise of a release from captivity and a return to Jerusalem when the people once again, after suffering labor pains, adhere closely to the Mosaic law since Paul claims that the law actually enslaves. The possible parodic reversal of Micah’s prophecy immediately preceding Paul’s direct quotation of Isa 54:1 in Gal 4:27 does not detract from Paul’s reference to Isaiah’s prophecy, but, rather, it enhances the relevancy of Isa 54:1 to Paul’s argument. Isa 54:1 depicts an eschatological Jerusalem/Zion in which ἡ οὕτως ὧδ’ ἔσεσθαι (“she who does not suffer labor pains”) has many children, and Isa 54:3 promises τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐθνῆ ἡμῶν ἐρχόμενοι (“your seed will inherit Gentiles”). A parodic reversal of Micah’s prophecy, which claimed that suffering labor pains would result in adherence to the Mosaic law and freedom from captivity, would compliment Paul’s quotation of Isa 54:1-3. Paul has already argued that Christ is the singular “seed” of Abraham (Gal 3:16) and that Christ buys back the covenant people from the curse of the law (Gal 3: 13), which is equivalent to a release from captivity because the Sinai covenant enslaves (Gal 4:24). Since Isa 54:1-3 tells the “one who does not suffer labor pains” to rejoice and promises “your seed will inherit Gentiles,” Isaiah’s prophetic message is enhanced by Paul’s reversal of Micah’s prophecy that “labor pains” produce deliverance since Paul attributes deliverance to Christ, the singular seed who makes all, Gentile and Jew alike, “heirs according to the promise,” “sons of God,” and “seed of Abraham” (Gal 3:26-29). For other interpretations of Gal 2, see e.g., Gaventa, “The Maternity of Paul: An Exegetical Study of Galatians 4:19,” in The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn (eds. Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa; Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 189-201; and Martyn, Galatians, 423-31.

229 E.g., Prov 8:6, 9; Let. Aris. 244; 4 Macc 1:15.
230 Herbert Preisker (“ὀρθός, διόρθωσις, κτλ.” TDNT 5:449-51) notes that ὀρθός with the connotation of “what is right, correct, or true” can be synonymous with ἀγνός and δίκαιος and can be the opposite of
And Micah employs the adjective in the context of his public indictment of the false prophets and leaders in Jerusalem for their *failure* to live according to the Mosaic law and uphold social justice. In 3:9, Micah condemns ὁγούμενοι οἴκου Ιακωβ (“the leaders of the house of Jacob”) for πάντα τὰ ὀρθὰ διαστρέφοντες (“perverting all things straight/correct”). And, most importantly, Micah records a confrontation with the false prophets who are leading the people astray in 2:6-11. This confrontation immediately follows an oracle (2:1-5) in which the people are threatened with the loss of their “share” ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρίου (“in the assembly of the Lord”) because of their lawless actions and acceptance of the false prophets’ message. The heart of Micah’s controversy with the false prophets is “which faction is speaking the true word” of the Lord. And the text presents to its audience the forceful message “that the future fate of the community, and its behavior in the present, depends strongly on their acceptance of the correct prophets or

---


preachers.”

Since Paul views the Incident at Antioch as one of vital theological importance for the well-being of the Christian community, it is not surprising that he would confront Peter ἐμπροσθεν πάντων (“in front of all”). And if Paul views the situation as similar to Micah’s public controversy with the false prophets, it is not surprising that he would coin ὀρθοποδέω from Micah’s words, especially 2:7 that states:

ὸ λέγων οἶκος Ἰακώβ παρώργισεν πνεῦμα κυρίου· εἰ ταῦτα τὰ ἐπτησίματα αὐτοῦ ἔστιν; οὐχ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ εἰσίν καλοὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὀρθοὶ πεπόρευνται;

He who says the house of Jacob has provoked the spirit of the Lord; are these his ways of living? Are not his words right with him and have they not proceeded rightly/correctly?

If Paul were alluding to Mic 2:7, he is reversing Micah’s original meaning, which condemned those who did not live in accordance with God’s words and were threatened with the loss of their place in the “assembly of the Lord” as stated in 2:5, by accusing...

233 Ben Zvi, Micah, 64.
234 Cf. Martyn (Galatians, 235): “Paul has no alternative but to address the issue in a plenary meeting of the church with the messengers from James also being present.”
235 We agree with Andersen and Freedman’s (Micah, 308) interpretation that the rhetorical questions in 7b-d are asked by Micah. However, since I am following the Greek text of Ziegler’s critical edition, I do not interpret v.7a as a question from the opposing prophets as Andersen and Freedman suppose based on their reading of the problematic Hebrew text (“Is it said O House of Jacob? Has the Spirit of YHWH been shortened?”). In their translation, v.7a deals theoretically with God’s character and asks if God has become impatient with the covenant people. A fact that the false prophets deny based the belief “that Yahweh is slow to get angry” (ibid.). However, in the LXX, Micah’s questions emphasize that the sinfulness of the people has angered God. The main point is not whether God is patient or impatient, but whether the people’s actions are in line with God’s commandments, which are “right with him” and have proceeded correctly (i.e., the law expresses the behavior that God expects from the covenant people). To indicate the level of corruption in the MT, Mays (Micah, 66) contends that v.7a reads: “Is the house of Jacob accursed?” Although Mays’s translation would support my contention that Paul is referring to the curses and blessings of Deut in the earlier portions of his letter, the LXX text of v.7 is not corrupt and differs from the MT. As stated above, rhetorical parody is a play on the words of the hypotext. Therefore, by necessity, we must deal with the LXX text. For texts that use ὀρθός adverbially as “rightly” or “correctly,” see examples cited in LSJ, “ὀρθός 3.2,” 1249.
Peter, Barnabas, and the rest of the Jews of “not walking straight with reference to the truth of the gospel” because they, due to the influence of “certain ones from James,” were withdrawing from the Galatians on the basis that the uncircumcised Gentiles were unrepentant sinners who should be excluded from the faithful community.

Therefore, if we are correct that the confrontation in Antioch concerned whether or not Gentile believers must be Torah-observant in order to be considered faithful members of the community, rather than dealing with the issue of Jewish dietary restrictions alone, and if we are correct that Paul understands the Incident at Antioch to be a confrontation between “prophets” or “preachers,” each of whom claims to be speaking the true word of the Lord regarding observance of the law, Paul’s subsequent theological argument would naturally turn to the manner in which a person is deemed righteous by God. And, after explaining that righteousness is not obtained through “works of the law” but through the “faithfulness of Christ” (2:16-21), Paul immediately discusses the manner in which the Galatians received the Spirit (3:2-5) in order to emphasize that the Spirit was not granted to them on the basis of faithful obedience to the requirements of the Mosaic law.

Although beginning with 3:1 Paul is addressing the specific situation that his

---

236 “Works of the law” should be understood here in light of covenantal nomism. As Sanders (Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 420) states: “obedience maintains one’s position in the covenant, but it does not earn God’s grace as such.” Therefore, in 2:15-16 Paul, speaking from a Jewish perspective, emphasizes that before the revelation of Christ those who are “Jews by nature and not sinners from the Gentiles” maintained their covenantal position by “works of the law.” However, in light of the revelation of Christ, Paul can declare: “no flesh will be justified from works of the law.”
Gentile converts are facing, rather than continuing to describe his confrontation with Peter, his argument regarding the Spirit may also be alluding to Micah’s confrontations with the false prophets of Jerusalem (Mic 2:6-11, 3:5-12). While Micah’s emphasis on the role of the “Spirit of Lord” in prophecy is certainly not unique in Scripture, his confrontation with the false prophets begins by stating: “The house of Jacob has provoked the Spirit of the Lord” because of the people’s failure to live in accordance with Torah (2:7).

Additionally, after declaring that the leaders of the people would be expelled because of their evil manner of living (2:9) and that the people, who have previously opposed God “as an enemy” (2:8), have now been utterly corrupted (2:10), Micah, in reference to the words of the false prophets, states in 2:11: πνεῦμα ἐστήσεν ψεῦδος (“a spirit has established a lie”). And in 3:8, Micah asserts that he enjoys strength “in the Spirit of the Lord,” which empowers him to declare the sins and transgressions of the covenant people. Therefore, in his public confrontations, Micah has

237 Gal 2:15-21 is normally viewed as Paul’s restatement of his speech to Peter at Antioch with the Galatian situation in mind. See, e.g., Dunn, Galatians, 132; Hays, Galatians, 236; Martyn, Galatians, 246.
239 Although παροργίζω is frequently employed to describe the Lord’s anger over the people’s transgressions of the Mosaic law, Mic 2:7 is the only verse in the LXX that employs παροργίζω in reference to the “Spirit of the Lord.” This may be due to the normal occurrence of παροργίζω in the LXX in verses in which the MT employs בזז in the Hiphil (“provoke to anger”). However, MT Mic 2:7 has רָצִּף (“shorten”) rather than בזז. Cf. Deut 4:25; 31:29; 32:21; Ezra 5:12; Ps 77:40, 58; 106:32; Job 12:6; Zech 8:14; Isa 1:4; Jer 7:18-19; 8:19; 11:17; 25:6; Ezek 16:26, 54; 20:27; Jdt 8:14; 11:11; Bar 4:6.
240 That Micah is referring to the false prophets/preachers in 2:11 is beyond doubt. See the discussions of van der Woude ("Micah in Dispute," 258-59) and Andersen and Freedman (Micah, 300-301). The text of the MT differs from the LXX; however, the implication that the false prophets/preachers are speaking lies is the same in both texts. Andersen and Freedman’s (ibid., 295) translation of the difficult MT for Mic 2:11 is: “Let a man walking (in) spirit and deceptively he lied: “I will preach for thee for wine and for the liquor” and he became (will be?) the preacher of this people.”
juxtaposed a spirit, which establishes a lie and rejects the requirements of the law, with the “Spirit of the Lord” that not only is provoked to anger when the covenant people do not live according to Torah, but also empowers a true prophet of God to proclaim the ways in which the covenant people have transgressed the Mosaic law.

As mentioned above, we do not know whether or not the Missionaries referred to Micah’s prophecy in their efforts to convince the Galatians to become Torah-observant; however, they would have been familiar with the passage themselves and would have most likely recognized Paul’s allusion. Additionally, when we trace the development of the concept of Wisdom in Jewish thought, the connection between obedience to Torah and the reception of the Spirit of the Lord becomes evident. From Proverbs through Ben Sira and Baruch, we see the progressive identification of Wisdom first with the fear of the Lord and second with Torah. The Wisdom of Solomon then combines the understanding of Wisdom from Prov 8 and Sir 24 with the Stoic understanding of pneuma as a cosmic spirit that holds all things together. Although Stoic thought identifies pneuma with God, Wis 1, in an effort to maintain the Jewish understanding

---

242 See the discussions of John J. Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 196-97; and Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature, 205. Although Wis’s Egyptian provenance is unquestioned, its date is less certain. For an overview of various proposals ranging between 220 B.C.E. and 50 C.E., with an argument in favor of the period of Jewish persecution during Caligula’s reign (37-41 C.E.), see David Winston, Wisdom of Solomon (AB 43; Garden City: Doubleday, 1979), 20-25. Collins (Jewish Wisdom, 179) proposes a date no earlier than 30 B.C.E. and possibly as late as 70 C.E.
243 See the Stoic explanation of humanity’s conception of deity as πνεῦμα in SVF 2.1009, 1027.
of God’s transcendence,\textsuperscript{244} claims:

Wisdom is God’s Spirit. This cosmic force, which fills the world and holds all things together (v.7), is also a divine gift that dwells within individuals (vv 2-5; cf. 7:27).\textsuperscript{245}

The above quotation from Nickelsburg correctly expresses Pseudo-Solomon’s understanding that Wisdom is God’s Spirit; however, Wis 7:27 emphasizes that Wisdom indwells the “holy souls in every generation”\textsuperscript{246} and “makes them friends of God and prophets.” Although Wisdom of Solomon does not specifically identify Wisdom with Torah, it stresses that only those faithful to God’s commandments are indwelled by the Spirit since Wisdom/God’s Spirit does not dwell in those who are separated from God by sin (1:3-4; 6:4-5; 10:8). And, importantly, Wis 9:17-18 maintains that God has sent the Holy Spirit/Wisdom so that “the paths of those on earth were set right (διορκόω) and humans were taught the things that please (τὰ ἀρεστά)” God. I am not proposing that either the Missionaries or Paul drew directly from the Wisdom of Solomon.\textsuperscript{247} However, the work is an example of a Jewish text, which most likely was composed very close to the time of Galatians, that not only employs a compound of ὀρθόω to express the Holy Spirit’s direction in a righteous person’s life, but also contends that the Holy Spirit

\textsuperscript{244} God’s transcendence is evinced in references to God as Creator in, e.g., Sir 24:3; 2 Macc 7:28; Wis 7:25-26.
\textsuperscript{246} Wis maintains that the Holy Spirit/Wisdom indwells those who are pious/righteous (1:5; 6:9-10, 16-18; 10:4-6, 9, 12-17).
\textsuperscript{247} For a study of the distinct similarities between Wis and the NT, see C. Larcher, \textit{Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse} (Paris: Gabalda, 1969), 11-30. The similarities between Wis and Paul are particularly apparent in Romans: Rom 1:18-23 and Wis 13:1-9; Rom 5:12 and Wis 2:24; and Rom 9 and Wis 11-12. For the proposal that Rom 1:18-32 is Paul’s presentation of a Jewish “teacher’s” argument based on Wis, see Campbell, \textit{Deliverance}, 542-45.
indwells those who follow the things that are pleasing to God (i.e., live according to the commandments).

Additionally, we see a further development in the connection between following Torah, knowing God, and the role of the Spirit in Philo, who, in order to continue to maintain the Jewish conception of God’s transcendence as Creator, combines the Stoic conception of *pneuma* with Plato’s ideas (*Spec.* 1.36-50).²⁴⁸ For Philo, therefore, the law of Moses is a guide to a *φιλόθεος* ("lover of God") who seeks to know "the essence” of God but who, as a part of creation, can receive only a partial apprehension of the divine through a desire for wisdom. And importantly for our discussion, Philo (*Spec.* 1.51) immediately follows his explanation that the Mosaic law is the necessary guide to knowing what humanity can apprehend of God with three further discussions regarding the law. The first (*Spec.* 1.51-53) is the importance of welcoming proselytes into the *φιλόθεος πολιτεία* (“pious commonwealth” = covenant community) when they recognize the benefits of seeking the one true God by becoming Torah-observant. The second (1.54-59) is the insistence that any apostate from the law should be banished (*αποκίζω*) by those who are zealous for the law as was Phinehas. The third (1.60-65) is that all who are *τῇ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους πολιτείᾳ* (“in the commonwealth according to the laws”) must be *τέλειος* ("perfect," in 1.63). And in their desire to live piously according to the Mosaic

law, God will not only provide the indwelling Spirit, but also God will provide prophets who are fully “inspired” by God and speak as the “interpreters of God” in order to assist the members of the commonwealth in being faithful to the commandments (1.64-65).

That the Spirit indwells those who study Torah and are obedient to God’s laws continued to be expressed in the Tannaitic period. As *m. Abot* 3:2 states, “[when] two sit together and do exchange words of Torah, then the הַנַּיְקִיב ("Divine Presence") dwells with them.” However, as Sanders notes, the Rabbis studied and obeyed Torah, not as an attempt to earn their salvation, but because “the study of Torah itself causes one to feel that he is in the presence of God.” Therefore, while the covenant community obeyed Torah as the proper response to God’s grace in electing Israel and giving the law, a consistent thought throughout the literature cited above is that the Spirit indwells those who are deemed “righteous” as a result of their continuing obedience to Torah. And according to Sanders, there are passages in Rabbinic literature that define *tsaddiq* (“righteous”) with a level of precision. One of these states that the righteous ones are those who “are opposite ‘those who provoked Him.’”

Returning to the claim in Mic 2:7 that the “House of Jacob has provoked the Spirit of the Lord” by its disregard for the “words of the Lord,” which “have proceeded

---

249 Tannaitic literature was produced between 70 C.E. and the compilation of the Mishnah by R. Judah ha-Nasi (ca. 200 C.E.). See Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 59.
250 Ibid., 221.
251 See the discussion in 3.1.2.2 above, esp. nn.177-79.
252 Mek. Vayassa’ 3 (165; II, 110 [ch.4]; to 16:13): ‘If God thus provided for those who provoked Him, how much more will He in the future pay a good reward to the righteous’ quoted in Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 202 and n. 114.
correctly,” it is quite logical, based on the sources mentioned above, that Jewish thought contemporaneous with Paul would view those who unrepentantly disregarded the commandments as not only unrighteous, but also as incapable of having the Holy Spirit indwell them. Therefore, if Paul were parodically reversing Micah’s public denunciation of the false prophets who led the people into lawlessness by publicly denouncing Peter, and by implication Barnabas and the rest of the Jews, for “not walking straight with reference to the truth of the gospel” (Gal 2:14) because they viewed the law-free Galatians as unrepentant sinners, he would need to support his statement initially by reiterating the means by which a person is viewed as righteous in light of the crucifixion of Christ (2:15-21). And, secondly, to give the Galatian believers a more prominent place in his argument, Paul would need to appeal to the Galatians’ previous and continuing experience of the Holy Spirit as confirmation of their rectification in Christ apart from the law (3:1-5). Therefore, the movement in Paul’s argument from rectification through Christ to the experience of the Spirit as confirmation of that rectification is not

253 Cf. Wis 1:4: Wisdom/Spirit “will not indwell a body involved in sins.”
254 Following Martyn (Galatians, 249-50) and Hays (Galatians, 237-38), among others, we consider the most appropriate translations of δικαιοσύνη and δικαίος to be “rectification” and “to rectify,” respectively. As Martyn (here, 250) correctly states: “The subject Paul addresses is that of God’s making right what has gone wrong” (italics in original).
255 Cf. Hays (Galatians, 251): “Paul does not seek to convince the Galatians that they really have received the Spirit; the argument works the other way around. He argues from the indisputable empirical fact that they have received the Spirit in order to convince them that no further validating action is required to ensure their status as God’s children.”
surprising at all. While Gal 3 will be discussed in more detail below, suffice it to say that Paul’s short discussion of the Galatians’ experience of the Spirit immediately following his theological explanation that rectification is not “from works of the law” lends support to our contention that the problem at Antioch was that Peter, Barnabas, and the rest of the Jews were convinced that the law-free Gentile believers were unrepentant sinners. And as unrepentant sinners, the Gentiles should not only be ostracized from the faithful community, but were also considered incapable of having the Spirit indwell them. In summary, therefore, Betz’s assessment that, as far as Paul was concerned, Peter was attempting to force the Gentiles at Antioch to “become converts of Judaism” seems to be correct.

3.1.4 Galatians 2:15-21 as a Continuation of Paul’s Parodic Reinterpretation of the Maccabean Model of Faithfulness

As mentioned above, many commentators view 2:15-21 as Paul’s restatement of his speech to Peter in view of the Galatian crisis, thus making these verses not only a continuation of Paul’s description of the Incident at Antioch, but also a decisive

---

256 Contra Martyn (Galatians, 283) on Gal 3:2: “Less immediately clear than the rhetorical structure of Paul’s question is his reason for selecting the subject on which he will compel the Galatians to speak: the Spirit.”

257 Galatians, 112.

258 See n.237 above. Contra Betz (Galatians, 114) who understands this passage as the propositio, which is a summary of the content of the narratio (1:12-2:14). In Betz’s opinion, therefore, 2:15-21 should not be considered as a continuation of Paul’s address to Peter because the propositio is not a part of the narratio, but the beginning of the confirmatio, or proof. Betz, following Quintilian’s definition of a propositio (Inst. 3.9.2; 4.4.2) within the judicial form of rhetoric, claims that he has solved the long-debated controversy regarding the relationship of vv. 15-21 to the preceding narrative; however, declaring 2:15-21 the propositio does not solve the issue. Even Quintilian (Inst. 4.4.1) acknowledges that some rhetors prefer to view the propositio as attached (subiungo) to the narratio and, therefore, as forming a transition to the
statement to the Galatians regarding the basis on which a person is initially deemed righteous by God (v.16) and the manner in which that person then lives (vv.17-21). However, if we interpret these six verses in light of our previous discussion of Paul’s rhetorical parody of scriptural demands for obedience to the Mosaic law, several of his statements are clarified.

We previously argued that Paul parodically reverses the paradigm of faithfulness that is presented in 2 Maccabees by employing the same vocabulary that the Maccabean narrative uses to praise those who upheld the law at all costs, such as Judas Maccabees, Eleazar and the seven brothers. However, Paul’s parody of 2 Maccabees does not end with his description of the Incident at Antioch. Another striking example occurs in Gal 2:18 in which Paul employs καταλύω in reference to the law. Paul states: εἰ γὰρ ἄ ἄ

confirmatio. Quintilian (Inst. 3.9.5) attributes the alternate understanding of the propositio to Aristotle. Aristotle (Rhet. 3.13) stresses the distinctions necessary in the arrangements of judicial, deliberative, and epideictic oratory and reduces the parts of a speech to the two essentials: πρόθεσις (statement of the case = propositio) and πίστις (proof) with all other parts of the speech subordinated under these two headings. Therefore, Aristotle subsumes the διήγησις (narratio) under the πρόθεσις. Although later rhetors did not subsume διήγησις/narratio under πρόθεσις/propositio, the transitional nature of the πρόθεσις/propositio and its connection with the διήγησις/narratio remained. See Lausberg, §§289-349. Since Betz’s proposal that Gal is an example of forensic rhetoric is now widely rejected (see n. 14 above), the discussions of Quintilian (Inst. 3.8.10-11) and Aristotle (Rhet. 3.16.11) concerning the role of the διήγησις/narratio in deliberative oratory are more important in determining the relationship between the narrative in Gal and 2:15-21 than discussions of the relationship of the propositio to the narratio in judicial oratory. Although Witherington (Galatians, 169-71) views Gal as deliberative rhetoric, he does maintain that 2:15-21 is the propositio; however, he stresses the transitional role of the passage and its relationship to the preceding and following sections of the letter.

259 As Witherington (Grace, 172) states: “The Mosaic law and obedience to it is not, in Paul’s view, how one got into Christ, how one stays in Christ, or how one goes on in Christ. It is no longer what defines and delimits who the people of God are and how they ought to live and behave.”

260 See 3.1.2.1.
κατέλυσα ταύτα πάλιν οἰκοδομώ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτῶν συνιστάνω (“For if which things I tore down these things again I restore, I prove myself a transgressor”). As mentioned above,261 2 Macc 2:21 praises Judas and his brothers for “diligently performing brave deeds on behalf of Ἰουδαίσμου,” and v.22 specifically mentions that the Maccabees restored τοὺς μέλλοντας καταλύεσθαι νόμους (“the laws that were about to be torn down”).262 If Paul is employing vocabulary from 2 Maccabees in order to dissociate the necessity of upholding the Mosaic law from the typical conception of faithfulness to God, Paul again presents his own experience as the parodic opposite of the actions of the Maccabean heroes. While Judas and his brothers restored the laws that were about to be torn down, Paul refuses to restore again the things that he has torn down. Although Paul retains καταλύω from 2 Macc 2:22, at first glance it seems that Paul replaces ἐπανορθῶ with οἰκοδομῶ in order to describe the action that he refuses to do as “building up.” However, on closer inspection, Paul’s οἰκοδομῶ may be part of a stronger parodic reversal of the Maccabean verse than it first appears.

The verb ἐπανορθῶ occurs in the LXX only in 2 Maccabees (2:22, 5:20), and it can mean “to set up again/restore” or “to correct/amend/revise.”263 If Paul is parodically reversing the Maccabean understanding that a faithful follower of God is one who

261 See the discussion of 2 Macc 2:21-22 and n.140 above.
262 Cf. 4 Macc 5:33 in which Eleazar refuses τὸν πατρίν καταλύσαι νόμον (“to tear down the ancestral law”) and, as discussed above in 3.1.2.1, Philo (Spec 2.253) who states: “For there are thousands of observers, zealots (ζηλωταί) for the laws, most accurate guardians of the ancestral customs, being merciless to those doing anything to tear [them] down” (καταλύσαι). See also n.157 above.
263 LSJ, “ἐπανορθῶ,” 609.
restores the law, it is extremely likely that Paul does not substitute οἰκοδομέω in order to connote the idea of “building up,” but that he chooses a commonly used verb that is synonymous with ἐπανορθῶ when ἐπανορθῶ means “restore.” This seems especially likely not only since οἰκοδομέω can mean “restore” as well as “build/build up,” but also because οἰκοδομέω, in contrast to ἐπανορθῶ, is never used to connote “revising/amending.” If Paul were parodically reversing the Maccabean understanding that a faithful follower of God should uphold the law, or should restore it if it were being torn down, he certainly would not have wanted to use a verb that could give the impression that he was attempting to “revise” or “amend” the covenant requirements while leaving some of the demands of the law in place for Gentiles. 

The above interpretation of 2:18 is quite different from the consensus that Paul is referring to Torah as a wall of separation between Israel and the Gentiles as it is described in Let. Aris. 139; however, there is no verbal correspondence between Gal

264 BDAG, “οἰκοδομέω 1c,” 696.
265 As discussed above in 3.1.1, Paul’s denial that he is still pleasing humans (1:10b-c) is most likely a response to the charge that his law-free gospel was an attempt to please humans. See Dunn, Galatians, 50. Therefore, implying that he was revising or softening some of the requirements of the law would have reinforced the criticism that he was merely pleasing humans by preaching a law-free gospel to the Gentiles. It is also possible that Paul may have avoided ἐπανορθῶ because the verb was used with the connotation of “to set up against” before the patristic period, a connotation that is not included in the possible meanings of οἰκοδομέω. See “ἐπανορθῶ,” PGL, 509.
266 Cf. Martyn, Galatians, 256; Dunn, Galatians, 142; Hays, Galatians, 242.
267 The relevant phrase in Let. Aris. 139 is: περιέφραξεν ἡμᾶς ἀδιακόπτοις χάραξι καὶ σιδηροῖς τείχοις (“he fenced us all around with unbreakable palisades and iron walls”). Dunn (Galatians, 142) also suggests Isa 5:5; however ἀφέλω τὸν φρεγμὸν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ καθέλω τὸν τοίχον αὐτοῦ (“I will take away its fence . . . and I will pull down its walls”) does not display any verbal correspondence with Gal 2:18, considering that καθέλω is the future active indicative of καθαρίζω, not καταλύω. See LSJ, “καθαρίζω,” 849. Additionally, Martyn (Galatians, 256) compares Gal 2:18 to Eph 2:14, which states: Λύτος γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἁμφότερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φρεγμοῦ λύσας (“For he (i.e., Christ) is our peace, the one
2:18 and Let. Aris. 139. Considering the distinct verbal correspondence between 2 Macc 2:22 and Gal 2:18, it seems much more likely that Paul is alluding to the Maccabean verse rather than to the Letter to Aristeas. But if this interpretation is correct, how does it affect our understanding of παραβάτην ἐμαυτόν συνιστάνω (“I prove myself a transgressor”)? Martyn interprets the phrase in relation to the following verse and paraphrases it as: “The way in which I would show myself to be a transgressor would be to reassert what I have denied: the connection between rectification and observance of the Law.” Martyn goes on to claim that Paul assigns a new role to the Mosaic law “leading not to the defining and vanquishing of transgression, but rather to transgression itself!” However, as Hays notes, Alan F. Segal’s explanation of Gal 2:17-18 is most likely the way that the Galatians would have understood Paul’s statement:

Paul’s rhetorical point is that if he should return to the law, he would be admitting making the two one and having broken the dividing wall of the fence”). While Eph 2:14 does display verbal correspondence with Isa 5:5 and Let. Aris. 139, Gal 2:18 does not specifically refer to a “wall” or a “fence.” Therefore, we should not arbitrarily force the idea of a wall of separation onto Paul’s discussion of the law in Gal 2:18, especially when a different focus may be indicated if we take Paul’s possible reversal of 2 Macc 2:22 into account. In proposing that Paul is parodically reversing 2 Macc 2:22, we are not denying that the pre-Christian Paul viewed the Torah as a fence of separation between Israel and the Gentiles since this imagery is clearly depicted as being in place in Let. Aris. 139 and Isa 5:5 describes the destruction of the protection around Jerusalem and Judah. Additionally, we are not denying that Paul preached that Christ had “broken down the dividing wall” as Hays (Galatians, 242) explains based on the way that Eph, “probably the work of one of Paul’s immediate followers,” presents the imagery in 2:14-16. However, we are proposing that a parodic reversal of 2 Macc 2:22 fits the context of Paul’s argument in Gal better than the other passages. Additionally, considering that Philo (Spec 2.253) employed καταλύω to describe those who stood in direct contrast to zealots for the law (see n. 260 above), it seems likely that Gal 2:18 is strictly referring to a rejection of the law as the basis for human rectification before God without implying anything regarding a social wall of separation between human ethnic groups.

268 Galatians, 256.
269 Galatians, 242.
that he was a transgressor of it. Paul does not call himself an apostate; yet in admitting that, without understanding the primacy of his new faith in the crucified messiah, he can be called a transgressor from the opposing position. He testifies that others see him as an apostate. The definition of apostasy is a matter of perspective. On the basis of his experience of the risen Lord, he can abandon circumcision for the gentiles. If he were to abandon his faith and return to the position that the gentiles needed circumcision, he would become a Jewish sinner in retrospect, not a faithful Christian. This is what the opponents think of him. This is also what he thinks of his Jewish Christian opponents who do not stress the primacy of faith.  

Therefore, adopting Segal’s proposal that Paul’s rhetorical point is that he would have proven himself to be a transgressor/apostate in retrospect if he had restored the law, we see again the parodic reversal of the Maccabean heroes who were praised for restoring the law (2 Macc 2:22) and for refusing to commit apostasy by transgressing the law in order to avoid persecution/death (2 Macc 6:18-7:42).  

If we are correct that Gal 2:18 is the parodic reversal of the Maccabean praise for restoring the law, Paul’s statement in 2:19a-b may also be a parodic reversal of the reoccurring theme that the Maccabean martyrs were willing to die for the Mosaic law (2 Macc 7:2, 9, 23, 29, 37). When Paul, in 2:19a-b, states εγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ

---

270 Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 202-3. Although we agree with Segal’s understanding of 2:17-18, we disagree with his understanding that Paul’s opponents in Galatia were “Christians who accepted circumcision when they converted to Christianity and proselytes of a conservative Christianity in which conversion to Judaism was a necessary prerequisite” (here, 208). It seems much more likely that Paul’s opponents were ethnic Jews who had accepted Christ as the messiah, but who demanded that Gentile converts also become Torah observant. See n.3 above.

271 Cf. also 2 Macc 7:2: ἐτευμαμεν γὰρ ἀποβαίνειν ἵσμεν ἵ παραβαίνειν τούς πατρίους νόμους (“For we are prepared to die rather than to transgress the laws derived from our fathers”). This verse, therefore, juxtaposes dying for the law with transgressing the law.

272 For 2 Macc 7:2, see the previous note. 2 Macc 7:9 states: σὺ μὲν ἀλάστωρ ἐκ τοῦ παρόντος ἡμᾶς ζην ἀπολύεις ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἀποθανόντας ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ νόμων εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν
ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζῆσω ("For I through the law died to the law, in order that I might live to God"), he may be parodically reversing the Maccabean paradigm of the faithful follower of God as one who would die for the law rather than commit apostasy. While the martyrs died for the sake of the law, Paul declares that he died through the law. The rhetorical parody in this case is specifically represented by two substitutions that Paul makes in the wording of 2 Macc 7:23. First, Paul substitutes διὰ νόμου in 2:19a for διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους in 2 Macc 7:23. Second, Paul arranges his sentence so that several phrases that promise eternal life to the Maccabean martyrs are now realized in the believer’s earthly life. Specifically, in 2 Macc 7:23, the πνεῦμα and the ζωή that God returns to the martyrs constitute a promise of eternal life that is voiced by the mother assuring her sons that although “in the present time” (νῦν) they die “on account of his laws” (διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους), God surely gives back (ἀποδίδωμι) to them spirit/breath.

ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει ("On the one hand, you, accursed wretch, separate us from the present life, but, on the other hand, the king of the universe will raise us to eternal renewal of life since we died for the sake of his laws"). In 7:23, the mother states: τοιούτῳ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης ὁ πλάσας ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν καὶ πάντων ἐξειρότε γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἵς ἔλεεν πάλιν ἀποδίδωσιν μετ’ ἐλέοις ὡς νῦν ὑπερορᾶτε ἑαυτοῖς διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους ("Therefore, the creator of the world, the one who formed the origin of humanity and invented the origin of all things also with mercy he will give back to you again spirit/breath and life as long as now you disregard yourselves on account of his laws"). In 7:29, the mother tells the youngest brother: ἐπίδεξαι τὸν θάνατον ἵνα ἐν τῷ ἐλέει σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς σου κοινοσώματι σε ("Welcome death in order that in mercy I may receive you back with your brothers") And 7:37 states: ἔγὼ δέ καθάπερ οἱ ἀδελφοί καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδωμι περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων ("Now, I like [my] brothers also give up body and life for the ancestral laws"). Cf. numerous phrases in the description of Eleazar’s martyrdom in 2 Macc 6:18-31. Additionally, in reinterpreting Eleazar’s martyrdom, the author of 4 Macc has Eleazar declare in 6:27: ἀποθνῄσκω διὰ τῶν νόμων ("I die for the sake of the law").
(πνεύμα) and life (ζωή). 273 Paul, on the other hand, announces: ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζῇσον even during his present lifetime since, as he makes clear in 2:20-21, he is now (νῦν) living in faithfulness, not in a state of apostasy. 274 And Paul goes on to state that the faithfulness in which he now lives is not his own faithfulness to the Mosaic law, but it is the faithfulness of Christ, who handed himself over (παραδίδωμι) on Paul’s behalf. 275 When we recognize Paul’s rhetorical parody of 2 Macc 2:22 in Gal 2:18 and of 2 Macc 7:23 in Gal 2:19-20, it is very likely that Paul’s παραβάτης in Gal 2:18, rather than ἀμαρτωλός as in 2:15-17, is also the parodic reversal of 2 Macc 7:2 in which one of the brothers declares that he would rather die than transgress (παραβαίνω) the law. 276 Since, as has long been recognized, 277 Paul normally employs παραβάτης in connection with the Mosaic law, its presence in 2:18 further accentuates Paul’s parody of

273 So Goldstein, II Maccabees, 314.
274 Gal 2:20-21 states: ᾧ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἔμοι Χριστὸς· δὲ νῦν ζῷον σαιρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῷ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἔμοι. Οὐκ οὖν τὸν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἀρὰ Χριστὸς δορκὶ ἀπέθανεν. (“Now I no longer live, but Christ lives in me; and what I now live in the flesh, I live in faithfulness, that is in the faithfulness of the son of God who loved me and handed himself over for me. I do not reject the grace of God; for if rectification is through the law, then Christ died for nothing.”). 275 Paul makes his meaning clear in the final portion of Gal 2:20: τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἔμοι. Although Werner R. Kramer (Christ, Lord, Son of God [SBT 50; London: S.C.M., 1966], 30-34) and Klaus Wengst (Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums [SNT 7; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972], 55-58) argue that Paul employs a pre-existing Christological formula in 2:20, Gabriella Berényi (“Gal 2:20: Pre-Pauline or Pauline Text?” Bib 65 [1984]: 490-537), in presenting an extensive study of texts employing παραδίδωμι with a personal object, notes that most ancient texts employ παραδίδωμι in a military context and the use of the verb with a reflexive pronoun referring to Christ’s crucifixion is limited to Gal 2:20 and Eph 5:2, 25. Therefore, she concludes that παραδόντος ἑαυτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἔμοι in Gal 2:20 is an original expression created by Paul. Prior to Berényi’s study, Betz (Galatians, 126 n. 109) refers to Kramer’s proposal as “largely speculative.”
276 See n.271 above for the Greek text of 2 Macc 7:2.
277 See, e.g., Jan Lambrecht (“The Line of Thought in Gal 2.14b-21,” NTS 24 [1978]: 484-95, here 487) who notes in comparing the Pauline use of ἀμαρτωλός and παραβάτης: “For Paul the term παραβάτης has a more specific content; it refers not just to a sinner in general, but to one who transgresses an explicit command.”
the Maccabean model of faithfulness to the law and leads directly into 2:19 in which Paul declares boldly that he has already died to the law in stark contrast to the Maccabean martyrs who died for the law.

Therefore, in stating that he “died through the law,” Paul is agreeing that the Deuteronomist curse/death stipulation applies to all who do not continue to recognize their transgressions and to make use of the provisions within the law for atonement (cf. 3:10). Because Paul no longer zealously upholds obedience to the law, along with its provisions for atonement, as the sole means by which all people, including Gentile proselytes, can enter and/or maintain a right standing before God, he has become a victim of the curse of the law and, therefore, died “through the law.” As discussed above,

278 As Sanders (Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 422) so importantly notes in describing the last three elements in covenantal nomism: “(6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God’s mercy belong to the group which will be saved.” See n.57 above for specific references to apostates in the literature that Sanders reviewed. It must also be stressed here that Sanders (ibid.) states: “Election and ultimately salvation are considered to be by God’s mercy rather than human achievement.” Therefore, when we translate Gal 3:10 later in this chapter with the phrase “[conducting their lives] on the basis of works of the law,” we are not describing acts that represent a human attempt to earn righteousness. On the contrary, we are describing human obedience to God’s commandments, which, prior to the coming of Christ, was the appropriate response to God’s mercy in giving the law (cf. Gal 3:23-25). Also see n.236 above. The meaning of Gal 3:10 will be discussed below. 279 Cf. Deut 29: 19-21 and Num 15:30-31 in light of our discussion of the unrepentant sinner in 3.1.2.2 above. A full discussion of Gal 3:10-14, which we believe supports our interpretation of 2:19, will be presented below. However at this point in our discussion, it is important to note that understanding Paul’s death through the law in 2:19 as occurring through the curse of the law solves Andrew H. Wakefield’s (Where to Live: The Hermeneutical Significance of Paul’s Citations from Scripture in Galatians 3:1-14 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003], 142) concern over what he expresses as “the absence of an expected term.” Wakefield appeals to metalepsis to explain the absence of “the term death – and in particular the idea of a threat of death, along with the threat of curse vs. the promise of blessing and life” in 3:1-14. However, our reading of 2:19 explains the absence of the “threat of death” in 3:1-14 without having to appeal to metalepsis. Because Paul has died to the law through the curse of the law (2:19) yet lives because Christ lives in him (2:20), the threat of death does not need to be discussed in 3:1-14. Rather,
Deut 28 prescribes a return to slavery as the divine punishment for rejecting the law. However, Deuteronomy also constantly reiterates that the people must obey the law in order that they might live (e.g., 4:1; 6:24; 8:1; 11:8; esp. 30:15-20). The most important of these Deuteronomic passages for our interpretation that Paul, in 2:19a, is acknowledging that he has suffered the curse of death for his rejection of the Mosaic law is 30:15-20. Not only does v.15 describe Moses as presenting the people with a choice between obeying the law, which is equated with life/good, or disobeying the law, which is equated with death/evil, but also v.19 describes Moses as demanding that the people make a conscious choice between blessing/life and curse/death. And the verse includes, by referencing the seed of those who were present to hear Moses’ words, the implication that future generations must make the same choice between obedience to the law/blessing/life and rejection of the law/curse/death. As a future member of the Jewish community, Paul is then saying, “I chose death as the penalty for rejecting the law so that I can now live to God through the faithfulness of Christ.”

Our interpretation of ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον is consistent not only

Paul’s concern, esp. in 3:13, is to assure all who have suffered the curse of the law/death that Christ’s death has “bought them back from the curse of the law.”

280 See 3.1.1.3 above.

281 Note the imperative of ἐκλέγω in 30:19: διαιματήρωμαι ἵματιν σήμερον τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. Τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον δέδωκα πρὸς προσώποι ἵματιν τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν. καὶ ἐκλέγει τὴν ζωὴν, ἵνα ζήσῃ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου (“I bear witness to you today by heaven and earth – I place before you the aforementioned life and death the blessing and the curse; and so choose life in order that you and your seed may live”). The “life” and “death” mentioned in v.19 refers back to 30:15, which begins the charge from Moses by stating: ἔδωκα δέδωκα πρὸς προσώποι σου σήμερον τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον, τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ κακόν (“Behold I place before you today life and death, good and evil”).
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with Paul’s previous statements regarding apostasy and curse in 1:6-10, but also with his parodic reinterpretation of the Maccabean model of faithfulness. Additionally, our proposal that Paul is acknowledging that his death through the law is consistent with the Deuteronomic curse of death for those who choose to reject the law takes into consideration the addition and emphatic placement of εγώ in 2:19a. Although some commentators posit that Paul’s death through the law should be interpreted in light of “the role that the law played in Christ’s death,” such an interpretation not only ignores the emphatic εγώ, but also forces us to read 2:19 as if Paul had reversed the order of his statements. Paul does not claim in 2:19 that he has been crucified with Christ and that the co-crucifixion resulted in his death to the law through the law. In 2:19, Paul first

282 See 3.1.1 above for a discussion of the connotations that μετατίθημι in the middle voice conveyed in ancient texts.
283 Smyth, §1190; BDF, §472. The addition and emphatic placement of εγώ in 2:19 stands in stark contrast to the lack of the personal pronoun in 2:18 and the emphatic position of ζω, rather than εγώ, in 2:20. This is so regardless of whether one views εγώ as primarily paradigmatic or, as Dunn (Galatians, 145) and Joseph Ziesler (The Epistle to the Galatians [London: Epworth, 1992], 22-23, 28) propose, a personal reference to Paul’s previous zeal for the law in persecuting the church, which led to his encounter with Christ.
284 According to Martyn (Galatians, 257), Paul, in 2:19, claims: “what separated him from the Law in its paired existence [with Not Law] was precisely the role that the Law played in the death of Christ.” Hays (Galatians, 243) more tentatively acknowledges: “the law played an active role in the death of Jesus and pronounced a curse upon him (Gal 3:13). Thus, since Paul’s death to the Law came about through his being ‘crucified with Christ’ (v. 19; cf. 6:14), the Law played an instrumental role in this process.” But as Hays (Galatians, 243) points out, Paul does not offer a specific explanation of how he died through the law. Additionally, Paul does not explicitly refer to the curse of the law in Gal 2:15-21; however, our interpretation does accord with and explain the emphatic placement of εγώ in 2:19. If we reject Dunn and Ziesler’s interpretation (see previous note), which Hays (ibid.) correctly notes does not explain Paul’s death “to the law,” and we adopt the proposal that Paul’s death “through the law” should be interpreted as referring to the Law’s role in the death and cursing of Christ, one is left to wonder why Paul emphatically employs εγώ in 2:19.
285 Obviously, Paul changed his opinion regarding the need to observe the law because of Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection; however, we understand Paul’s reference to his crucifixion with Christ as stating that his participation in Christ’s crucifixion is the source of his present existence in which Christ lives in him, not the proximate cause of his death through the law. Although Paul’s acknowledgment of the
stresses his own death to the law. Only after noting that he died through the law does he emphasize his crucifixion with Christ as the preceding cause by which Christ now lives in him (2:20). Therefore, it is logical that when Paul announces that he “died through the law to the law,” he is referring to his own state of spiritual death, which he suffered under the curse of the law when he no longer believed that a faithful follower of God lives and is granted rectification as a result of continuing in the works of the law (cf. 3:10-12). By interpreting Paul’s ἐγὼ γάρ διὰ νόμου νόμων ἀπέθανον as referring to a state of spiritual death, which was brought about by his own rejection of the belief that law observance demonstrated one’s faithfulness to God, we give proper consideration to Paul’s change from the aorist ἀπέθανον to the perfect συνεσταύρωμα. Paul, in 2:19a-b, speaks of his death through the law as a past event that, having already occurred, is a precursor to living to God. In 2:19c-20, Paul explains that, although he no longer lives, his salvific effect of Christ’s death and resurrection resulted in his (Paul’s) rejection of Torah obedience as the ultimate demonstration of faithfulness to God, and therefore the means of rectification before God, the rejection of Torah regulations, including means for atonement, as the basis upon which all people, Jew and Gentile, were rectified before God, was the proximate cause of Paul’s death through the law. Although our discussion of the aorist indicative and the perfect indicative in Gal 2:19 focuses on the time element involved in the tenses, Paul’s change from the aorist ἀπέθανον to the perfect συνεσταύρωμα is just as important if we adopt Stanley E. Porter’s (Idioms of the Greek New Testament [2d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1994], esp. 21-22) emphasis on the verbal aspect of the tenses. For Porter, the aorist tense represents the “perfective aspect” and describes an action that is “conceived of by the language user as a complete and undifferentiated process” while the perfect tense represents the “stative aspect” and describes an action that is “conceived of by the language user as reflecting a given (often complex) state of affairs.” Even if we discuss Gal 2:19 in terms of verbal aspect, Paul views his death to the law as an occurrence that is already complete while his crucifixion with Christ is a continuing state that allows him to live to God. Therefore, we should not assume that Paul’s death to the law occurred via Christ’s crucifixion since Paul views his death to the law as a “complete and undifferentiated process” while the crucifixion with Christ
crucifixion with Christ is the basis through which Christ now lives in him, thus allowing him to claim that he now lives to God.

In support of our interpretation, it is important here to recognize not only the order of Paul’s statements within 2:19, but also the progression of Paul’s argument from v.18 to v.20. First, via the rhetorical parody of the Maccabean verses noted above, Paul states that restoring the law would make him a transgressor (v.18), who would need to acknowledge his sin and make use of the means of atonement provided for in the law in order not to become/remain apostate and suffer the curse/death of the law. Next, he parodically reverses the Maccabean model of faithfulness to the law, which praised those who died for the law, by boldly announcing: “For I through the law died to the law in order that I might live to God” (v.19a-b). And, importantly it is only after declaring himself dead through the law in order that he might live to God that Paul announces: “I have been crucified together with Christ” (v.19c) and “now I no longer live, but Christ lives in me” (v. 20a).

Therefore, if we read v.19c as explaining v.19b and also as introducing v.20, we understand that Paul is dissociating the condition of being cursed by the law from the belief that a person so cursed remains in a state of death unless that person first turns

____________________________________

reflects a stative condition. See also Stanley E. Porter, Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood (New York: Peter Lang, 1989).

287 Note the difference between the RSV, which assumes that Χριστός συνεσταθήσεται is part of v.20, and the NRSV, which translates the phrase with v.19.
back from lawlessness, thus establishing him/herself as a transgressor (cf. 2:18b), and second makes use of the atonement procedures in the law in order to be rectified again with God. Even though Paul, the previously Torah-observant Jew, is cursed by the law and no longer lives, Paul, the believer in Christ, now lives to God (2:19b) solely on the basis of the faithfulness of Christ, who “handed himself over on behalf of” Paul and now lives in the apostle (2:20). If we are correct that Paul is admitting that he has suffered the curse of the law and has, therefore, died through the law, a logical interpretation of ἐν πίστει ζῷ τῷ θεῷ τῷ θεοῦ τῷ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντων ἑαυτῶν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (“in faithfulness I live, the faithfulness of the son of God who loved me and handed himself over on behalf of me”) would be to understand πίστις with the genitive as a subjective genitive. Since Paul has suffered the curse of the law by rejecting the

288 While Deut 30:1-10 gives assurance of restoration and blessing to those who turn back to God after suffering the curse of the law, Deut 29:20-21 warns the unrepentant sinner of exclusion from “the sons of Israel” and that the “Lord will remove his name from the covenant under heaven.”

289 See n.278 above.

290 Note the emphatic position of ἐν πίστει and the anaphoric use of the article τῇ to refer back to πίστει. See Smyth, §1120b and especially §1145; BDF, §252.

291 See Smyth, §1330; Wallace, Greek Grammar, 113-16. Also in 2:16, we understand Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in the phrase διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as well as Χριστοῦ in the phrase ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ to be subjective genitives in agreement with Hays (Galatians, 239-40) and Martyn (Galatians, 253). Contra Dunn, Galatians, 138-39. While we are expressing the subjective genitive as the faithfulness of Christ, we view Christ’s faithfulness as expressed by Hays (“ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and Pauline Christology: What Is At Stake?” in Pauline Theology, Volume IV [ed. E. Elizabeth Johnson and David M. Hay; Atlanta: Scholars, 1997], 35-60, here 37): “His death in obedience to the will of God, is simultaneously a loving act of faithfulness (πίστεως) to God and the decisive manifestation of God’s faithfulness to his covenant promise to Abraham.” Although the literature on the πίστεως Χριστοῦ debate is too immense to include an exhaustive bibliography here, any list of works that support the subjective genitive interpretation of Paul’s πίστεως Χριστοῦ phrases must include Richard B. Hays’s seminal work, The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11 (Chico: Scholars, Press, 1983; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), esp. 119-162 (page references are to the 2nd edition). Other important works that promote the subjective interpretation, besides Hays’s article (“ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and Pauline Christology,” n.3), which lists numerous proponents of the subjective interpretation up until 1995, include: Douglas A. Campbell, The Quest for
validity of the law as the means for Jew and Gentile to be rectified before God (2:16, 21;

Paul’s Gospel: A Suggested Strategy (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), esp. 178-232; idem, Deliverance, 610-76, 833-895; and Bruce W. Longenecker, “Πίστις in Romans 3:25: Neglected Evidence for the ‘Faithfulness of Christ?’” NTS 39 (1993): 478-80. In addition to Hays (Galatians, 239-40, 244, 269) and Martyn (Galatians, 251, 259-63, 360, 375), several commentators regularly referenced above prefer the subjective interpretation including: Witherington (Grace, 179-82, 192, 260); and Matera (Galatians, 98-103). For the objective genitive interpretation, see, among others, Betz, Galatians, 117, 175; Dunn, “Once More, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,” in Pauline Theology, Volume IV: Looking Back, Pressing On (ed. E.E. Johnson and D. M. Hay; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 61-81; idem, Galatians, 138-40, 146, 195-96, 200-202; idem, “EK ΠΙΣΤΕŌS: A Key to the Meaning of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,” in The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays (ed. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 351-66 ; Francis Watson, Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 47-53, 73-6; idem, Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective (rev. and exp. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 237-45; R. Barry Matlock, “Dethelogizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective,” NovT 42 (2000) : 1-23; idem, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 3:26: Neglected Evidence for ‘Faith in Christ?’” NTS 49 (2003): 433-39); and idem, “The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2:16, 3:22, Romans 3:22, and Philippians 3:9,” JSNT 30 (2007): 173-203. Williams (Galatians, 65-70, here 70) argues that the phrase represents “a double-sided expression, referring first to the faith of Christ himself but including as well the answering faith of those who are in him.” Many of the works listed above interpret the slightly varying πίστις Χριστοῦ phrases in Gal (2:16, 20; 3:22, and some include 3:26) in light of such phrases in Rom (3:22, 26 and some include 3:25) and Phil (3:9). Although this approach is preferable in any study of Pauline theology (see esp. Hays, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ,” 38-40), we do not consider this approach helpful in attempting to discover the most likely way in which the Galatians would have understood the phrases in Paul’s correspondence with them, especially considering that these Gentile believers had no way of knowing what Paul would write at a later time to the churches in Rome. Therefore, we will interpret the πίστις Χριστοῦ phrases in Gal in terms of the argument that Paul presents solely in this letter; however, we are discussing these phrases in light of the proposal that Paul is employing rhetorical parody in order to counter scriptural demands for faithful obedience to the Mosaic law. The theological value of such an approach can only be determined by comparing the implications of our reading of the πίστις Χριστοῦ phrases in Gal with the meaning of the phrases in Rom and Phil in a future study. Suffice here is to note that our interpretation of the “faithfulness of Christ,” as it is used in the context of Gal 2:15-21, comes very close to Campbell’s (Deliverance, 610-38) downward martyrrological reading of the phrase in the context of Rom 3:21-31 with two major differences: 1) We understand Paul’s argument in Galatians in terms of rhetorical parody, and 2) We interpret Paul’s reference to the faithfulness of Christ as providing the solution for those, including Paul, who suffer the curse of the law and spiritual death due to their rejection of the law as a means of rectification with God. Importantly, however, Campbell (ibid., 611) supports his interpretation of Rom 3:21-31 with reference to the martyr narratives in 2 Macc 7:40 and 4 Macc. We discussed the martyr narratives in 2 Macc above as the basis for much of Paul’s rhetorical parody in Gal 1-2, and we will discuss the reinterpretation of these narratives in 4 Macc as they relate to Gal 2:15-21 in the following pages. Additionally, Hays (Faith, xxx-xxxii) stresses that Paul’s πίστις Χριστοῦ phrases refer to Christ’s obedient and “self-sacrificial death on the cross.” For recent articles on the current state of the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate from both sides of the issue, see The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical and Theological Studies (ed. Michael F Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009).
3:11), the way in which he can now claim that he lives to God in his earthly life is via the faithfulness of Christ to the law. Therefore, Paul is insisting that he is not an apostate even though he now rejects the law as the means of rectification with God. Additionally, Paul insists that he is living in faithfulness; however, the basis of his current faithfulness is not his own faithfulness to the law, but the faithfulness of Christ. By pointing to himself as an example, Paul is seeking to transform the Missionaries’ understanding of faithfulness to God and is assuring the Galatians that refusing to be Torah-observant does not make them unrepentant sinners who will remain forever cursed. On the contrary, by demonstrating that even he, a Jew so previously zealous for the law that he persecuted the

292 Paul clarifies the connotation that πίστις (“faithfulness”) carries in 2:20 more fully in 3:13 when he specifically notes that the reason that Christ was cursed was that he was hung on a tree, not that he failed to remain faithful to the law. Therefore, since Christ demonstrated faithfulness to the law and was cursed by the law solely because he was hung on a tree, he was able to become a “curse for us.” When we consider that Paul begins his sentence in 3:13 with “Christ bought us back (ἐξαγόρασώ) from the curse of the law,” it is more logical that Paul died through the curse of the law and that Christ’s faithfulness to the law and obedience “to the point of death, that is death on a cross” (to borrow a phrase from Phil 2:8 without implying that Gal 3:13 should be interpreted via Phil) is the source of Paul’s life rather than the cause of his death “through the law.” See BDAG, “ἐξαγόρασώ,” 343. Gal 3:10-14 will be discussed in detail below.

293 While our reading is not dependent in any way on Paul’s other letters, it adheres quite well with Phil 3:9, which states: καὶ εὑρέθω ἐν αὐτῷ, μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει (“and I may be found in him, not having my own rectification, the rectification on the basis of the law, but the rectification through the faithfulness of Christ, the rectification from God on the basis of [Christ’s (note the anaphoric use of the article)] faithfulness.” See, BDAG (“ἐπὶ 6,” 364) for the connotation “on the basis of” with the dative. We disagree strongly with Peter T. O’Brien (Commentary on Philippians [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 400) who juxtaposes interpreting the anaphoric article as referring to Christ’s faithfulness and understanding ἐπὶ as “indicative ‘of that upon which a state of being, an action, or a result is based’” as if the two interpretations were mutually exclusive. With this juxtaposition, O’Brien determines that even though διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ refers to Christ’s faithfulness, the final prepositional clause of 3:9 must refer to “man’s answering response.” However, it is precisely Christ’s faithfulness that forms the basis of the rectification, which originated with God. And it is Christ’s faithfulness that Paul starkly contrasts with his own rectification based on the law, albeit, of course, a human response to Christ’s faithfulness would be expected. If our reading of Gal 2:15-21 is correct, Paul’s own righteousness in Phil 3:9 has nothing to do with his performance of works of the law. Rather, his “own righteousness on the basis of the law” refers to his previous understanding that the law was the only means of rectification with God and, within this previous understanding of the law, he was blameless (3:6).
church, could suffer the curse of the law and yet live to God on the basis of the faithfulness of Christ, Paul is dispelling any possibility that the Missionaries could ever claim that a Gentile’s failure to observe Torah would result in a perpetual state of anathema as an unrepentant sinner. As argued above, the Missionaries were attempting to convince the Galatians not only that they were Gentile proselytes to Judaism and as such must become Torah obedient, but also that a refusal to become Torah-observant would make them unrepentant sinners who should be excluded from the community of the faithful. Therefore, Paul is assuring the Galatians that Christ’s own faithfulness to the law, which included Christ’s willingness to hand himself over for those who died through the law as the result of their rejection of the law, releases them from the curse of the law. This is the grace of God that Paul does not reject (2:21a).

Consequently, an important advantage of reading 2:15-21 as Paul’s parodic reversal of the Maccabean model of faithfulness is that it answers one of Dunn’s most recent objections to the subjective interpretation of ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ. Dunn rightly states:

Everything depends on the context in which ἐκ πίστεως appears: how does the context indicate Paul understood the ἐκ πίστεως phrase or wanted it to be read? What was the defining characteristic of the Christian and of the righteousness to

294 By “rejection of the law,” we are referring to the denial that faithfulness to the Mosaic law is a necessity in order for a person to be rectified before God. We are not implying that Paul either personally violated the ethical precepts of the law or that he would have approved of Gentile believers violating them. As Martyn (Galatians, 256-57) states: “It is crucial to note that Paul speaks about separation from the Law, not about commencing a life that is characterized by violation of the Law.” Note also our previous discussion of 1 Cor 5: 9-13 in 3.1.2.3.1 above, esp. nn.203-204.
which the Christian could lay claim through Christ?\textsuperscript{295}

If Paul is rhetorically parodying several portions of the Maccabean narratives in order to dispel the belief that a faithful follower of God would die on account of the law rather than commit apostasy and if Paul is seeking to dissociate the belief that a perpetual rejection of the law as the method of rectification with God would result in eternal curse/death,\textsuperscript{296} “the defining characteristic . . . of the righteousness to which the Christian could lay claim through Christ” in the context of Paul’s letter to the Galatians would be the *faithfulness of Christ* to the law, which atones for what the Missionaries may have interpreted as the *faithlessness* of those who reject the necessity of Torah obedience in light of the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. The faithfulness of Christ would, therefore, buy back the apostate from the curse of the law (cf. 3:13).

An obvious question at this point is how we should understand Paul’s “I have been crucified together with Christ” in 2:19c if we are correct that, in 2:19a, Paul claims to have died to the law through the curse of the law rather than through his participation in Christ’s crucifixion. Here again we must emphasize Paul’s change from the aorist \( \acute{a} \pi \acute{e} \theta \alpha \nu \nu \) to the perfect \( \sigma \nu \kappa \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \acute{\varphi} \omicron \omicron \mu \alpha \). Even though Paul’s spiritual death was a completed action brought about through the curse of the law, he could still refer to a metaphorical crucifixion with Christ since the law played a role in both his spiritual death

---

\textsuperscript{295} “EK PISTE\( \breve{\Omega} \)S,” 360.
\textsuperscript{296} Note again Deut 29:20-21 stipulates that an unrepentant sinner will suffer three named punishments: 1) “all the curses of this covenant will be attached to him,” 2) the “Lord will remove his name from the covenant under heaven,” and 3) “the Lord will be separate him for evil from all the sons of Israel according to all the curses of the covenant, the ones written in the book of this law.”

---

227
and Christ’s physical death. Additionally, since συνεσταύρωμαι is stative, Paul could also have employed the verb to describe the on-going process by which he participates in the life-giving aspect of Christ’s self-sacrificial death. In this case, “now I no longer live, but Christ lives in me” emphasizes not only Paul’s personal revivification from spiritual death, but also his on-going participation in the new creation produced by Christ’s crucifixion, which Martyn correctly understands as God’s apocalyptic invasion into the cosmos. Therefore, in describing the new creation (6:15) produced by this apocalyptic invasion, Paul employs the perfect of σταυρώ in 6:14:

ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δὲ οὐ ἔμοι κόσμος ἔσταύρωται κάγῳ κόσμῳ.

But may it never be for me to boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified to me and I to the world.

Since Paul discusses his crucifixion with Christ and the radical change brought about by the Christ event with stative forms of συσταύρω (2:19) and σταυρώ (6:14), he is emphasizing his on-going participation in the new manner in which life/creation has been brought about by God through the self-sacrificial death of Christ.

297 Although Martyn discusses “God’s apocalyptic act in Christ versus religion” throughout his commentary (here, Galatians, 37), his emphasis on God’s apocalyptic invasion is extremely clear in his discussion of the “The Dawn of the New Creation” (ibid., 572-73). First, “God’s new-creative act,” which Martyn describes as “God’s sending his Son and the Spirit of his Son into the present evil age,” brought about the birth of the “Spirit and its opposite, the Flesh.” And second, “The advent of the Son and of his Spirit is thus the cosmic, apocalyptic event.”

298 Importantly, however, when Paul discusses the fruit of the Spirit in 5:24, he states: οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις (“And the ones who are Christ’s crucified the flesh with its passions and desires”). As Martyn (Galatians, 501) notes: “It was at some point in the past that, as Christ’s own, the Galatians vanquished the Flesh.” Therefore, Martyn (ibid.) understands that Paul, by employing the aorist active indicative of σταυρώ, is referring to the victory already accomplished when a person willingly chose to be baptized. Similarly, Schlier (Galater, 193) understands
Therefore, an extremely loose paraphrase of 2:15-21, which includes some items mentioned earlier and later in the letter, would be as follows:

We are by nature Jews and not sinners from the Gentiles; but knowing that a person is not rectified on the basis of works of the law, except through the

Paul’s ἐσταφισμαι as describing a “past occurrence” in which the Galatians crucified the flesh. Witherington (Galatians, 412), following John Bligh (Galatians in Greek [Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966], 205), views ἐσταφισμαι as an inceptive aorist and notes: “Those in Christ must continue to crucify the flesh when ever it comes to life again.” However, Martyn’s (Galatians, 501) emphasis “that the victory was decisive, but it is paradoxically incomplete” accurately interprets Paul’s use of ἐσταφισμαι in the sense that the Galatian believers actively crucified the flesh in the past and they now live in the Spirit (5:25a) even though they must “be in line also with the Spirit” (5:25b). Martyn’s interpretation accords well with Barclay’s (Obeying, 143) understanding that Paul tells the Galatians how “the moral threat as ‘flesh’ (not sin) . . . has been dealt with through ‘crucifixion’ (5:24) and can be continually repulsed by the power of the Spirit (5:16-17).” Cf. Hays, Galatians, 328 and Dunn, Galatians, 315. Importantly, the perfective aspect of crucifixion in 5:24 and the stative aspect of co-crucifixion/crucifixion in 2:19c and 6:14 lend support to our understanding that Paul employs the perfect tense in 2:19c and 6:14 to describe on-going life in the new creation, which was brought about by Christ’s faithfulness to the point of death by crucifixion, while he employs the aorist ἐπέκαθαν in 2:19a to indicate his spiritual death, as a completed action, to the law through the curse of the law.

299 BDAG, “ὡς” 3.i., 297.

300 See BDAG, “ἐὰν” 1.c.b, 267-68; Thayer, “ἐὰν” 1.3.c, 162; and BDF, §376. We do not agree with translating ἐὰν μὴ as the simple adverative “but,” which is employed by the RSV, NRSV, NASV, and NIV. Nor do we agree with Martyn (Galatians, 251) that ἐὰν μὴ “in the present context signifies absolute opposition to that which precedes,” thus resulting in the translation “but rather.” As Andrew Das (“Another Look at ἐὰν μὴ in Galatians 2:16,” JBL 119 [2000]: 529-39, here 530) demonstrates: “Paul always uses ἐὰν μὴ to express exception.” Therefore, Das proposes that in 2:16a Paul is making an ambiguous statement since he is addressing all the different factions of Jewish Christianity referenced earlier in Gal 2. For Das, viewing 2:16a as ambiguous fits nicely with his understanding, along with Witherington (Grace, 169-71), that 2:15-21 is the proposito. (See nn. 235 and 256 above.) Additionally, for Das, an ambiguous reading is superior to the two previous options for exceptive translations: 1) the antithetical interpretation of Burton (Galatians, 121) and William O. Walker, Jr. (“Translation and Interpretation of ἐὰν μὴ in Galatians 2:16,” JBL 116 [1997]: 515-20) in which the exception applies to ὁ δικαιούσαι ἄνθρωπος alone, rather than to the entire phrase ὁ δικαιούσαι ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἔργαν νόμον; and 2) the complementary interpretation of Dunn, which implies that a person could be rectified by works of the law in conjunction with, in Dunn’s translation, “faith in Jesus Christ.” Campbell (Deliverance, 843-44; 1147-48 n. 32) provides an overview of the different interpretations of ἐὰν μὴ and proposes a third option for an exceptive translation: “The ‘except’ that Paul supplies here is an entirely understandable qualification in relation to Jewish Christians, the subject of the sentence (see v. 15), who are all of course law observant already, and presumably did not cease being so on conversion.” While we agree with Das, Dunn (Galatians, 137), and Campbell (Deliverance, 843-44) that ἐὰν μὴ is exceptive and not antithetical, we do not agree with any of their proposed interpretations. Although Das (“Another Look,” 538) is most likely correct that Paul, in 2:16, is
faithfulness of Christ to the law, even we ourselves believed in Christ Jesus, in order that we may be rectified on the basis of the faithfulness of Christ Jesus and not on the basis of works of the law, because on the basis of the works of the law no flesh is rectified. Now when I say except through the faithfulness of Christ, I certainly do not mean that anyone, either Jew or Gentile, needs to continue or to begin to live in accordance with works of the law in addition to his or her trust in Christ’s faithfulness as the means of our rectification with God! What I am saying is that the law, of course, played a role in the process by which Christ freed us from the curse of the law, a curse that brings death to those who reject the law, along with its provisions for atonement for our transgressions, as the means of rectification before God. But if seeking to be rectified in Christ we were found even ourselves sinners, is Christ a servant of sin? Is Christ a servant of sin in the sense that he is leading us into a permanent condition of cursed death now that we have rejected the belief that faithfulness to the law is the means of our rectification with God in light of the crucifixion and resurrection? May it never be! For if what things I tore down, these things again I restore, I establish myself as a transgressor in need of repentance. Now, from what I understand, the Missionaries may be telling you that I am a transgressor of the law because I no longer believe that faithfulness to the law is necessary in order for a person to be rectified before God. These Missionaries say that they believe in Christ, but they insist that faithful followers of God must also be faithful in works of the law. And, apparently, they have given you numerous examples of faithful followers of God, like those described during the persecutions of Antiochus who refused to responding to affirmations made by those troubling the Galatians, we do not have to understand the verse as ambiguous. Also, we do not agree with Dunn’s position (Galatians, 138) that Paul is ambiguous in order to reflect “precisely the ambiguity of Peter’s position.” Nor do we agree with Campbell that none of the Jewish Christians whom Paul is addressing had ever ceased to be law observant. Campbell’s interpretation forces us to understand 2:16 as specifically excluding Peter, who had at some point begun “living as a Gentile” (2:14), and, therefore, forces us to view 2:15-21 as unrelated to the Incident at Antioch reminiscent of Betz’s proposal that 2:15-21 is the propositio, which in Betz’s opinion cannot be a continuation of the preceding narrative. Campbell’s interpretation is inconsistent with his own statement in the paragraph directly following the quoted text (Deliverance, 844) in which he describes “the Jewish constituency of v. 15” as “presumably including Peter.” Therefore, we propose another option for an exceptive translation of ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: Paul is qualifying his statement that no person is rectified on the basis of the law by simply noting the role that the law played in Christ’s crucifixion and acknowledging Christ’s faithfulness to the law and obedience unto death. We understand ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as expressing Paul’s one exception to the entire preceding phrase εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ δικαιούται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. Therefore, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a clarifying aside that introduces the role that the law played in God’s plan of salvation, which is a subject that Paul takes up again in 3:13 and 4:4-5.
reject the law even if being faithful to the law resulted in great suffering and physical death. As I just told you, arguments like the ones presented by the Missionaries caused Peter, Barnabas, and the rest of the Jews in Antioch to view Torah obedience as a necessity even though they also believe in Christ. So they gave in, declared themselves to be transgressors of the law, and repented so they would not be considered apostates who had rejected the law. However, as I said earlier, they did this because they feared that the circumcision party would exclude them from the faithful community. They even withdrew from the Gentile believers, thus declaring that the Gentiles in Christ were unrepentant sinners because they were not Torah-observant. But, as I said, this is hypocrisy and is not consistent with the truth of the gospel! Also, I imagine that you may have been told that I am like the unrepentant sinner mentioned in the description of the covenant at Moab (Deut 29:19-21) upon whom “all the curses of this covenant, the ones written in the book of this law will be attached.” Since the Missionaries claim that I am leading you astray by failing to insist that you become Torah-observant, they must think that I do not take the curse of the law seriously. But I would never deny the validity of our Scriptures! So let me explain how this works. Moses was correct. Anyone who thinks that the requirements of the law do not need to be followed will suffer the curse of the law because “cursed is every person that does not continue in all the words of the law to do them” (Deut 27:26). And Moses was also correct when he said at Moab: “I have set before you life and death, curse and blessing; choose life in order that you and your seed may live” (Deut 30:19). But God knew all along that there was a solution to the curse of the law, a solution that would be such a model of faithfulness that we could be bought back from the curse of the law. In fact, an earlier model of faithfulness was already given before Moses gave the law. He was named Abraham, and, yes, this is the same Abraham about whom the Missionaries have told you. I will write in detail about Abraham, but, for now, what is most important about Abraham is not that he was circumcised. The most important thing is that God gave us Abraham as an example of faithfulness so that we would recognize the faithfulness of Christ, the supreme model of faithfulness, when the fullness of time came long after Moses lived. Because of Christ’s faithfulness, I can reply to the charges of the Missionaries. Yes, I did come under the curse of the law about which Moses warned us. For, in fact, I died to the law through the curse of the law, in order that I might live to God. And, unlike the Maccabean martyrs, I do not have to wait for God to return life to me in the future. I can now live to God because I have been crucified together with Christ. You see, I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. And what I now live in the flesh, I live in

301 We reference Deut 27:26 here; however, we will discuss other verses that Paul may have conflated with Deut 27:26 in Gal 3:10 below.
faithfulness, not in my own faithfulness to the law, but in the faithfulness of the Son of God, the one who loved me and handed himself over for me. I will explain more in a minute about how Christ bought all of us back from the curse of the law, but for now let me say that although I now reject the law as the way to be rectified with God, I do not reject the grace of God. For if rectification is through the law, then Christ died in vain.

3.1.4.1 Galatians 2:15-21 in relationship to Fourth Maccabees

In support of the view that Paul, in Gal 2:15-21, is parodically reinterpreting the Maccabean understanding that faithfulness to God requires Torah-observance, it is important that many commentators,\(^{302}\) in discussing 2:15-21, note that 4 Macc 7:19 and 16:24-25 claim that those martyred for the law “live to God.” But considering the uncertain date for the composition of 4 Maccabees, we do not know whether these statements were written prior to or after Galatians.\(^{303}\) However, as mentioned above,\(^{304}\) we do know that 4 Maccabees is the product of a Jewish author roughly contemporaneous with Paul who reinterpreted the narratives of the martyrs in 2 Maccabees. Although the author of 4 Maccabees considers the Maccabean martyrs to be alive “to God” even

\(^{302}\) Dunn, *Galatians*, 142; Hays, *Galatians*, 243; and Witherington, *Grace*, 189. 4 Macc 7:19 states: πιστεύοντες ὅτι θεῷ οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκουσιν ὡσπερ οὐδὲ οἱ πατριάρχαι ἡμῶν άβρααμ καὶ ίσακ καὶ ίακωβ ἀλλὰ ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ (believing that they do not die to God just as neither our patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob [die to God], but they live to God”). 4 Macc 16:24-25 states: διὰ τούτων τῶν λόγων ἢ ἐπαμήνευτον ήν έκαστον τῶν υἱῶν παρακαλοῦσα ἀποθανεῖν ἐπεισεν μᾶλλον ἢ παραβήναι τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔτι δὲ καὶ ταύτα εἰδότες ὅτι οἱ διὰ τὸν θεὸν ἀποθνῄσκουσιν ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ ὡσπερ άβρααμ καὶ ίσακ καὶ ίακωβ καὶ πάντες οἱ πατριάρχαι (“Through these words the mother of the seven encouraging each one of [her] sons persuaded [them] to die rather than to transgress the commandment of God, and, furthermore, knowing also these things that the ones dying on account of God live to God just as Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the patriarchs.”)

\(^{303}\) See n.143 above.

\(^{304}\) See 3.1.2.1. And note that the statement of one of the sons in 2 Macc 7:2 (see n.271) is reworked not only in the words of the seven brothers (4 Macc 9:1), but also in the persuasion of the mother in 4 Macc 16:24 (see n.273).
though they died for the law, we cannot posit a direct relationship between Paul’s words in Gal 2:19 and 4 Maccabees. However, as noted above, in 4 Macc 5:29 Eleazar declares that he will not neglect the “sacred oaths of the forefathers concerning the keeping of the law.” Since the account of Eleazar’s martyrdom in 2 Macc 6:18-31 makes no reference to the “sacred oaths of the forefathers concerning the keeping of the law,” the author of 4 Maccabees may have had Eleazar mention the sacred oaths in order to connect the Deuteronomic blessings and curses with the martyr narrative.

Further evidence that the author of 4 Maccabees connects dying for the law and living to God with the last chapters of Deuteronomy appears in the conclusion of the work. In 4 Macc 18:3, the martyrs are praised for being “counted worthy of a divine portion” (θείας μερίδος κατημόρησαν), which may be an allusion to Deut 32:9 in which the Israelites are declared to be μερίς κυρίου (“a portion of the Lord) and the σχοινίσμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ (“allotment/line of his inheritance”). Also, in 4 Macc 18 the mother of the seven brothers notes that their father taught them about the “law and the prophets”

305 See n.144.
306 See the discussion above in 3.1.2.1.
307 While de Silva (4 Macc, 138) is correct in understanding the preservation of oaths philosophically as “the just course of action” or the “noble” thing to do, he unnecessarily limits the scriptural basis for 4 Macc 5:29 to Exod 24 and Josh 24, thus ignoring the renewal of the covenant at Moab in the context of the final chapters of Deut, esp. 26:15-18; 28:69-29:15; 30:16-20. Considering the references to Deut 30-32 that de Silva notes in his discussion of 4 Macc 18:18-19 (ibid, 264-65) and the lack of verbal correspondence between 4 Macc 5:29 and either Exod 24 or Josh 24, such a limitation seems erroneous.
308 The author of 4 Macc begins an appeal to the audience to follow the martyrs’ strict adherence to the law in 18:1, which states: ὁ τῶν Ἀβρααμαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι πατέρας Ἰσραήλιται πείθεσθε τῷ νόμῳ τούτῳ (“O Israelite children, descendants of the seeds of Abraham, obey this law”). The plural σπερμάτων, which is the only occurrence of the plural of σπέρμα when it is used to refer to the descendants of Abraham in the LXX, is an interesting contrast to Paul’s argument stressing the singular “seed of Abraham,” which is Christ (Gal 3:16).
(v.10), “the zeal of Phinehas” and Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael, and Daniel, who were endangered for their faith (vv.12-13), and the Song of Moses (v.18). However, 4 Macc 18:19 records the Song of Moses as stating: ἐγὼ ἀποκτενω καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν (“I will kill and I will make alive, this is your life and the length of days”). Therefore, 4 Macc 18:19 conflates ἐγὼ ἀποκτενω καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω from Deut 32:39 with αὕτη ἡ ζωή ὑμῶν from Deut 32:47 along with καὶ ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν from Deut 30:20.

When we note that Deut 30:19 states τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον δέδωκα πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν ἐκλεξαὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἵνα ζήσῃ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου (“I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse; choose life in order that you and your seed may live”) and Deut 30:20 follows τοῦτο ἡ ζωὴ σου καὶ ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν σου (“this is your life and the length of your days”) with κατοικεῖν σε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἢς ἤμοσεν κύριος τοῖς πατράσιν σου Ἁβρααμ καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰακώβ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς (“so that you may dwell on the land which the Lord swore to your forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to give to them”), we see that 4 Macc 18:19 connects dying for the law and living to God with the Deuteronomic curses and blessings by including a reference to Deut 30:19-20 as part of the reference to

Deut 32:47 states: ὅτι αὐχέλ λόγος κενὰς αὕτος ὑμῖν ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ζωή ὑμῶν καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ λόγου τούτου μακροπομερέετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς Ἦν ὑμείς διαβαίνετε τὸν Ἰορδάνην ἐκεῖ κηρυγμόν ἅρμα αὕτην (“For this is no vain word for you because it is your life and because of this word you will live long upon the land into which you cross over the Jordan there to inherit it”). Deut 30:20 is quoted in the following discussion. De Silva (4 Macc, 264-65) notes that in the conflation of Deut 32:29, 32:47, and 30:20 the author of 4 Macc emphasizes not only a “temporal sequence” intended to assure the audience that faithful martyrs are subsequently made alive again by God, but also, by including αὕτη ἡ ζωή ὑμῶν from 32:47, “connects this life more explicitly with the performance of the words of the law in the lives of the Hebrews.” Further, the inclusion of a portion of 30:20 “identifies the source of this life to be loving God, obeying God, and holding fast to God” (ibid., 265).
Deut 32. Also, 4 Maccabees seems to replace the Deuteronomic blessing of living on the land (Deut 30:20; 32:46-47) with the promise of living to God in the sense of eternal life. Thus, 4 Macc 16:25 notes that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are living to God without mentioning the land that God swore to them, and 4 Macc 18:3 explains that those who die for the law are worthy of the “divine portion,” which is now considered eternal life.

Although Paul may well have penned Galatians prior to the writing of 4 Maccabees, he, just as the author of 4 Maccabees, may have reinterpreted the martyr narratives of 2 Maccabees in terms of the Deuteronomic stipulation that the people must choose between life/blessing and death/curse. However, Paul and the author of 4 Maccabees have vastly different reinterpretations of the martyr narratives. In maintaining the validity of the Deuteronomic understanding that those who keep the law have chosen life rather than death, 4 Maccabees seeks to reassure readers that those who die for the law still live to God in the sense that they have eternal life. As mentioned above, Paul does not refute the validity of the Deuteronomic understanding that failure to keep the law is equal to choosing death/curse; however, he reinterprets the Deuteronomic concept of death/curse versus life/blessing in light of the crucifixion of Christ. Paul declares that he suffered the curse of the law because, in light of the Christ event, he now rejects the

310 It is important here to note that 2 Macc 6:18-28 declares numerous times that the choices confronting Eleazar were life and death in the sense that continuing his present life would be the result of apostasy while death would be the result of being faithful to the Mosaic law.

311 Cf. 4 Macc 7:3; 13:17; 14:5; 15:3; 16:13; 17:12. Additionally, de Silva (4 Macc, 238) argues that the author of 4 Macc held the view that dying for the law expressed “having faithfulness toward God” based on πίστιν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἔχοντες in 16:22.
law as the means of rectification with God. Therefore, he “died to the law through the law;” however, because he “has been crucified with Christ,” he now lives to God in the present since Christ lives in him.

3.1.5 Supporting Evidence for Our Reading of Gal 2:15-21 from Gal 3:6-14

If Paul, in Gal 2:15-21, is reinterpreting the Maccabean understanding of faithfulness to God so that the conception of faithfulness is dissociated from the Deuteronomic stipulation that a person must choose between adherence to the law/life/blessing and rejection of the law/death/curse, we would expect to find other sections of the letter that support our interpretation of these verses. As argued above, Paul insists that the spiritual death, which he personally suffered through the curse of the law subsequent to his rejection of the law as the means of rectification with God, is not an irreparable condition since the faithfulness of Christ, rather than adherence to the law and/or repentance and atonement, is the source of rectification/life/new creation.

Therefore, when Paul argues that God rectifies the Gentiles on the basis of faithfulness (3:8) and presents the faithful Abraham in 3:9 as a reinterpretation of the paradigm of

\[312\] In addition to Deut 30:19 quoted above, cf. Deut 11:8a: καὶ φυλάξεσθε πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς κύτῳ Ἰσραήλ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον ἵνα ζήτε (And you will keep all his commandments, as many as I command you today, in order that you may live”).

\[313\] We are not proposing that Paul presents Abraham as a paradigm for Christian faith in the sense that Paul argues that faithfulness in accordance with the example of Abraham imparts life to the Christian. See Hays (Faith of Jesus Christ, 170-77) for the rationale behind rejecting this opinion. Although Abraham is presented as a human example of the proper response to God’s grace, it is clearly the faithfulness of Christ, as we will demonstrate below, that imparts life to the Christian since Christ “bought us back from the curse of the law” (3:13), which produces spiritual death for those who reject the law or, as Paul states in 3:10, are cursed because they “do not remain in all that is written in the book of the law to do them.”
faithfulness that was expressed in 2 Maccabees, he is continuing his reinterpretation of
the Deuteronomic understanding of blessings/life and curses/death. By noting that Gen
12:3 and 18:18 describe all the nations as those “who will be blessed” in Abraham (3:8)
and equating those who are rectified by God on the basis of faithfulness with the ones
who are blessed (3:9), Paul continues to dissociate God’s blessing from the
commandment to keep all the words of the law.

The Maccabean martyrs expressed the hope that their supreme obedience to the
law might bring an end to God’s wrath produced by the sins of the people (2 Macc 7:32-
38). Therefore, as discussed above, the author of 2 Maccabees depicts the suffering of
the people as consistent with the Deuteronomic curses predicted for those who do not
obey all the words of the law. In the Maccabean understanding, the martyrs’ willingness
to die for the Mosaic law is praised as being an appeal for God to show mercy to an
apostate nation, thus implying that the proper response for an apostate people is to repent
and once again observe the law.

In contrast, Paul depicts Abraham, not as appealing to God for mercy, but as
properly receiving God’s freely given grace. Martyn correctly stresses that in Paul’s
quotation of Gen 15:6 “it is entirely clear that rectification is – both at its inception and at
its end – an act of God;” While it is generally agreed that the quotation of Gen 15:6

---

314 See 3.1.2.1 and n.123 above.
315 Galatians, 298-99. Although Martyn (ibid., 300) interprets Paul’s quotation of Scripture in Gal 3:8 as a
response to the “Teachers’” interpretation of Gen 12:3, he considers Paul’s quotation of Gen 15:6 to be “his
own selection” (ibid., 297). Cf. Dunn (Galatians, 187) who notes that Paul concludes his discussion of
introduces several scriptural proofs that Paul presents after noting that the Galatians’ reception of the Spirit provides evidence of their rectification with God,\textsuperscript{316} the translation of καθώς at the beginning of 3:6 and the grammatical relationship between 3:6 and the immediately preceding and following verses are variously interpreted.\textsuperscript{317} Betz proposes that καθώς is shorthand for καθώς γέγραπται (“just as it stands written”), and he understands 3:6 as beginning a new section of the letter (3:6-14), which is the second part of the \textit{probatio}.\textsuperscript{318} However, several commentators translate καθώς as “just as” or “things were the same with,”\textsuperscript{319} therefore, understanding 3:6 as forming a transition from 3:5 and as introducing a comparison of Abraham’s faith with the faith of the Galatians. Williams\textsuperscript{320} and Witherington,\textsuperscript{321} in addition to arguing for the transitional nature of 3:6 and interpreting καθώς as “just as” or “so too,” consider 3:6 and 3:7 as Abraham by once again stressing God’s grace in 3:18, which states: εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία, οὐκέτι εξ ἑπαγγελίας· τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι’ ἑπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεὸς (“For if the inheritance is on the basis of the law, [it is] no longer on the basis of promise; but God has freely bestowed [the inheritance] to Abraham by means of promise”).\textsuperscript{316} Since 3:6-14 offers direct support for our interpretation of 2:15-21, we are discussing it prior to 3:1-5. \textsuperscript{317} NA\textsuperscript{27} presents Gal 3:6-7 as: Καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην· γινώσκετε ἀρεί ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσιν Ἀβραὰμ. The NRSV translates Gal 3:6-7 as: “Just as Abraham ‘believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness,’ so, you see, those who believe are the descendants of Abraham.” However, the RSV renders the verses as two separate sentences: “Thus Abraham ‘believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness.’ So you see that it is men of faith who are the sons of Abraham.\textsuperscript{318} Galatians, 137-40. Although Dunn (\textit{Galatians}, 160) translates καθὼς as “just as,” he considers the conjunction “more or less an abbreviation for the fuller formula, ‘as it is written.’”\textsuperscript{319} Cf. Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 296; Hays, \textit{Galatians}, 255; Witherington, \textit{Grace}, 217-18; and Sam K. Williams, “Justification of the Spirit in Galatians,” \textit{JSNT} 29 (1987): 91-100, esp. 92-94. Longenecker (\textit{Galatians}, 112), however, opts for “the absolute use” of καθὼς, which in his opinion renders καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ as “take Abraham as the example.”\textsuperscript{320} “Justification,” 93.\textsuperscript{321} \textit{Grace}, 217-18.
separate sentences in agreement with the RSV. In their very similar arguments, Williams and Witherington note that Paul does not employ καθῶς as an abbreviation for καθός γέγραπται elsewhere in his letters; therefore, they rightly reject Betz’s interpretation.

Citing Gal 2:21, 3:29, and 5:11, Williams argues against reading 3:7 as the apodosis of 3:6 since he states that Paul normally employs ἀρα as the first word in the apodosis when the protasis begins with εἰ. While Gal 2:21 and 3:29 do contain this grammatical construction, 5:11 should not be cited as supporting Williams’ conclusion.

However, most discussions of the proper translation of καθως, the transitional nature of 3:6, and the relationship between 3:6 and 3:7 do not include several factors that would support a slightly different understanding of Paul’s argument in 3:6-9, which would, in turn, substantiate an interpretation of 3:10-14 that not only explains Paul’s substitutions in the wording of some of his scriptural quotations in vV. 10-14, but also supports our interpretation of 2:15-21. First, although καθως frequently connotes comparison and is translated as “just as” or “according as,” it can also be causal and,

322 Betz (Galatians, 140 n.13) acknowledges: “The abbreviated formula occurs only here in Paul.”
323 Gal 5:11 states: Ἐγὼ δὲ, ἀδέλφοι, εἰ περιτομήν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἐτι διώκομαι; ἀρα κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. (“Now if I, brothers, still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted? Then the offense of the cross has been abolished.”) Therefore, in 5:11, ἀρα is not the first word of the apodosis, as Williams (“Justification,” 93) claims, but is the first word of a new sentence. For clear indication that τί ἐτι διώκομαι is the apodosis in 5:11, see Wallace’s (Greek Grammar, 688-89) discussion of the use of questions in implicitly conveyed conditional sentences.
324 See BDAG, “καθως 1,” 493. LSJ (857) notes that καθως is synonymous with καθά (848), which means “according as” or “just as.”
as such, it should be translated as “because,” “since,” or “in so far as.” Therefore, if \( \kappa \alpha \theta \omicron \omega \varsigma \) is viewed as causal, 3:6 should be understood as the protasis with the \( \alpha \rho \alpha \) clause in 3:7 as the apodosis. And if \( \kappa \alpha \theta \omicron \omega \varsigma \) is causal, then Paul is not presenting the faithful Abraham in direct comparison with the Galatians’ faith. Also, with this reading, 3:6 is not a transition from Paul’s discussion of the Galatians’ reception of the Spirit. Rather, it is the beginning of Paul’s second argument in which he seeks to convince the Galatians that they are in a right standing with God without Torah obedience. By quoting Gen 15:6, a Scripture describing Abraham’s faithful response to God’s free election, Paul is following his discussion of the Galatians’ experience of the Spirit with a recognizable “fact” regarding Jewish history with which the Missionaries could not disagree. Paul’s introduction of Abraham not only presents the patriarch as a human being deemed rectified by God’s own initiative prior to the giving of the law, but, importantly, also allows Paul to describe Abraham as “faithful,” another point with which the Missionaries would be in agreement. However, as we hope to demonstrate below, Paul employs the “faithful Abraham” in order to allude parodically to scriptural passages that describe Abraham’s faithfulness in contrast to apostate Jews who are in need of repentance and covenant renewal.

Second, although Williams makes much of the fact that \( \alpha \rho \alpha \) “is the second word

---

325 See BDAG, “\( \kappa \alpha \theta \omicron \omega \varsigma \ 3 \),” 494; Thayer (“\( \kappa \alpha \theta \omicron \omega \varsigma \ 3 \),” 315); BDF, §453(2); and Wallace, Greek Grammar, 674. Cf. Rom 1:28; 1 Cor 1:6; and Phil 1:7.
326 Many commentators have, of course, discussed these points. The nuances of their arguments will be presented in the following discussion.
327 The specific scriptural passages will be discussed below.
of v. 7” in order to argue that the ἀρα phrase should not be considered the apodosis of v. 6,328 the second placement of ἀρα is not unusual at all since ἀρα is a postpositive in classical usage and is employed as a postpositive at times by Paul.329 Additionally, an extremely important point that has not, to the best of our knowledge, been previously addressed in interpreting 3:7 is that ἀρα can also be used as the equivalent of ὡστε in conjunction with a finite verb.330 Therefore, since ἀρα can connote result in the same manner as ὡστε, 1 Cor 1:6-7 are extremely relevant verses in understanding the relationship between Gal 3:6 and 3:7, especially since several commentators view καθώς as casual in 1 Cor 1:6.331 First Corinthians 1:6-7 states:

6καθώς το Μαρτυριον του Χριστου έβεβαιωθη έν ιμιν, 7οστε ιμας μη ιστερεισαι έν μηδενi χαρισματi άπεκδεχομενου την άποκάλυψιν του κυριου ήμων Ιησου Χριστου.

6Since the witness of Christ was confirmed in you, 7so that you are not lacking in any freely given gift eagerly awaiting the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ;

328 Since Williams (“Justification,” 93) italicizes the word “second,” he is stressing the placement of ἀρα as important. However, considering that Gal 5:11 should not be included in his comparison (see n. 319 above), Williams is basing his interpretation on the two times in Gal that Paul employs ἀρα in the first position of the apodosis when the protasis begins with ει, not καθώς. While we have argued above that we should seek to understand Gal on its own terms exegetically, a discussion of Pauline syntax and grammatical usage necessitates not only considering verses in Gal in which Paul employs καθώς, but also including relevant examples from the undisputed letters.
329 See BDF §451(2), which notes that Paul employs ἀρα in the classical, postpositive position at times (cf. εὐρίσκω ἀρα in Rom 7:21); however, at other times and in conjunction with οὐν, he places ἀρα in the first position. Cf. Smyth, §2800.
331 For the causal interpretation of καθώς in 1 Cor 1:6, see Christophe Senft, La Première Épitre de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens (2d ed.; CNT 7; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990), 30; and Peter T. O’Brien, Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 120. Additionally, although Thielson (First Corinthians, 94 n. 46) translates καθώς with “as,” he states his agreement with Senft in regarding καθώς as causal.
If Christophe Senft and Peter T. O’Brien are correct in their understanding that καθώς is causal in 1 Cor 1:6, ὅστε clearly denotes a result that follows from the fact that “the witness of Christ was confirmed” in the Corinthians. Since ὅστε means “so that” when it is followed by the accusative and an infinitive in a dependent clause, the conjunction cannot be translated as “therefore” as it would have been if it had been followed by an independent clause with the indicative or imperative. However, since ἀρα can be the equivalent of ὅστε and ἀρα is employed in the apodosis, which, of course, is the independent clause in Gal 3:6-7, ἀρα should be translated as “therefore.” A paraphrase of Gal 3:6-7 would then read: “Since Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as rectification; recognize, therefore, that the ones [living their lives] on the basis of

332 BDAG, “ὁστε 2,” 1107. The independent clause in Paul’s long sentence in 1 Cor 1:4-8 is, of course, the initial clause in v. 4.
333 BDAG, “ὁστε 1,” 1107. Ernest DeWitt Burton (Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek [3d ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900; repr., Eugene, Or: Wipf & Stock, 2003], §237) cites 1 Thess 4:18 as a Pauline example of ὅστε in an independent clause that follows the causal fact. 1 Thess 4:18 states: "Ὅτα παρακαλεῖτε ἄλληλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις ("Therefore, comfort one another with these words").
334 Given that ἀρα can be the equivalent of ὅστε, the importance of 1 Cor 1:6-7 for our argument is not Paul’s syntax following ὅστε, but his causal employment of καθώς followed by a result clause containing ὅστε.
335 Martyn (Galatians, 299), Longenecker (Galatians, 114), and Witherington (Grace, 226) claim that γινώσκετε is an indicative based on their understanding that γινώσκετε ἀρα ὅτι was typically employed as a “ disclosure formula” in Hellenistic letters. However, a thorough study of disclosure formulas in Hellenistic letters conducted by White (Greek Letter, 11, 52) reveals that the present indicative of γινώσκω was not employed in any of the four disclosure formulas typically used. But, according to White, the imperative γίνωσκε was common in such formulas. Therefore, Betz (Galatians, 141), Dunn (Galatians, 162), and Terrence L. Donaldson (Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle’s Convictional World [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997], 118 n.29) are correct in interpreting γινώσκετε as an imperative. Cf. Paul’s syntax in 1 Thess 4:18 (see n. 328 above) in which Paul employs an imperative after ὅστε following a causal statement. In Gal 3:7, however, the imperative γινώσκετε precedes the postpositive ἀρα.
faithfulness these \(^3^{36}\) are the sons \(^3^{37}\) of Abraham.”

In this interpretation, Paul’s point in quoting Gen 15:6 is exactly as Martyn expresses: Paul is emphasizing that rectification is a free gift of grace, which is, from beginning to end, an “act of God.”\(^3^{38}\) However, since we understand γνωσκετε as an imperative, Paul’s quotation of Gen 15:6, a Scripture with which the Missionaries would be in agreement, is not followed by a reminder of something that the Galatians “already know.”\(^3^{39}\) Rather, Paul quotes Gen 15:6 in good parodic fashion in order to draw an entirely different conclusion than the one that the Missionaries would have understood as the natural consequence of Abraham’s trust in God’s word. It is generally agreed that the Missionaries would have interpreted Gen 15:4-6, which included God’s promise to Abraham that he would have a natural heir through whom his descendents would be numerous, and Gen 15:18, which included the covenant to inherit the land, in light of Gen 17,\(^3^{40}\) which included circumcision as a sign of the covenant between God and Abraham (17:11), and Gen 22, which reiterated the blessing of the nations through Abraham’s seed

\(^{36}\) Hays (Galatians, 255) correctly notes that Paul emphasizes οὗτοι (“these”) in order to stress that it is not the circumcised that are the descendants of Abraham, but οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (“the ones [living their lives] on the basis of faithfulness”). See the following discussion of Gen 15:2-5.

\(^{37}\) Note also the emphatic placement of οὗιον in οὗιον οὗιοι εἶσαν Ἄβραάμ, which is the preferred reading based on, among others, P\(^6\), R, and B over the textual variant οὗτοι εἰσιν. Paul repeats the emphatic placement of οὗιον in ὁ δὲ πνευμάτι Θεοῦ ἐγενόμενον οὗτοι Θεοῦ εἰσιν (“For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God”) in Rom 8:14.

\(^{38}\) Galatians, 298-99.

\(^{39}\) Contra Witherington, Grace, 226-27.

\(^{40}\) See, e.g., Hays, Galatians, 255; Dunn, Galatians, 16; de Boer, Galatians, 187.
since Abraham was faithful when the Lord tested him. However, rather than interpreting Abraham’s trust in God in light of the covenant to inherit the land (Gen 15:18), circumcision as a sign of God’s covenant with Abraham (Gen 17), or Abraham’s obedience when tested (Gen 22), Paul focuses solely on Abraham’s trust in God’s promise of an heir and numerous descendants from his own seed (Gen 15:4-5) in order to parodically equate the “sons of Abraham” with \( \text{o}i` \text{\epsilon\iota\kappa\iota\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\omega} \).

Although Martyn is technically correct that the text of Gen 15:6 does not use the phrase “sons of Abraham,” the context of Gen 15:6 definitely indicates that Abraham believed God’s promise regarding his biological heir (15:4) and the numerous descendants from his seed (15:5). In response to Abraham’s proposal that Eliezer of Damascus should be considered his heir (Gen 15:2-3), Gen 15:4-5 contains God’s reply, which is important in interpreting Paul’s quotation of Gen 15:6. These verses state:

\[
\begin{align*}
4&\text{And immediately the voice of the Lord came to him saying this one will not succeed you as heir, but the one coming out from you this one will succeed you as heir.} \\
5&\text{And he led him outside and said to him: “Indeed, look up into heaven and count}
\end{align*}
\]

---

341 Note especially de Boer’s (Galatians, 196) discussion of Paul’s reference to “the faithful Abraham” (3:9) as a polemical “allusion to the story of the near sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:1-19) and its interpretation in contemporary Jewish tradition.” Our discussion below will propose that Paul is parodically reversing a different scriptural passage in his reference to “the faithful Abraham.”

342 Galatians, 299-300.

343 Cf. Hays, Galatians, 255.
the stars if you are able to count them.” And he said, “So will your seed be.”

Therefore, Paul is not, as Martyn claims, exegetically presenting an answer to “a question not posed in the text” of Gen 15. On the contrary, Gen 15:4 employs the demonstrative pronoun (οὗτος) to describe Abraham’s single, biological descendant through whom the future descendants (expressed by the singular σπέρμα in 15:5) would be numerous. So, in 3:7, Paul is parodically redefining the identity of Abraham’s heir(s) as οἱ ἐκ πίστεως by specifically employing the plural οὗτοι, the same demonstrative pronoun used in the singular in Gen 15:4 to indicate that Abraham’s single heir would result in innumerable descendants.344

In order to support his parodic reinterpretation of Gen 15, Paul naturally turns in Gal 3:8 to a narrative that is recorded as occurring earlier than either Gen 15, which identifies Abraham’s heirs as his biological descendants, or Gen 17, which requires the circumcision of “every male of you” (17:10) and every male ὁ οὐκ ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός σου (“who is not of your seed”) as part of the covenant that must be kept faithfully (17:12).345 In quoting Gen 12:3, Paul substitutes πάντα τὰ ἔθνη for πᾶσαι αἱ

344 In Gal 3:16, Paul will return to the subject of the single heir, expressed in Gen 15:4 by ὁ θεὸς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ οὗτος κληρονομῆσαι σε, and Abraham’s descendants, represented in Gen 15:5 by σπέρμα, in order to redefine the meaning of the singular σπέρμα as Christ.
345 Gal 3:8 states: προιδούσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (“Now the Scripture, foreseeing that God rectifies the Gentiles on the basis of faithfulness, proclaimed good news in advance to Abraham: ‘All the Gentiles will be blessed in you’”).
346 Barnabas Lindars (New Testament Apologetic [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961], 225) notes: “The passage referred to must be 12:3 because the argument turns on the fact that the promise has already been made before 15:6.”
Christopher D. Stanley argues against an “accidental conflation” of Gen 12:3 with Gen 18:18 since “in its present wording, the quotation in v.8b is fundamental to Paul’s argument.”

Stanley is certainly correct that Paul included πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in the quotation of Gen 12:3 in order to substantiate God’s rectification of τὰ ἔθνη (v.8a) by demonstrating “that God had already declared long ago” that Gentiles would share in the blessing of Abraham. However, his assumption that the Gentiles are blessed “as they imitate the ‘faith’ of Abraham (v.9)” does not adequately explain the relationship between 3:9 and Paul’s emphasis on the identity of the “sons of Abraham”

347 Gen 12:3 states: καὶ εὐλογήσω τοὺς εὐλογοῦντάς σε, καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσωμαι: καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσιν αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς (“And I will bless the ones blessing you, and I will curse the ones cursing you; and all the tribes of the earth will be blessed in you”).

348 Christopher D. Stanley (Paul and the Language of Scripture [SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992], 236 n.184) observes that Gen 28:14 contains “identical language” to 12:3 and notes: “similar expressions appear in Gen 18:18 and 22:18. But the context of Gal 3 makes it clear that the Gen 12 episode is the one Paul has in mind here.” See also de Boer, Galatians, 195. In our opinion, Paul’s substitution of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη most likely results from a conflation of Gen 18:18 with Gen 12:3, rather than a conflation of Gen 22:18 with Gen 12:3. Not only does the context of Gen 18:18 (vv. 10, 14) include the promise of a son for Abraham, which is relevant to Paul’s reference to the υἱὸι of Abraham in Gal 3:7, but Gen 18:18 additionally promises that Abraham will become a ἐθνὸς μέγα (“great nation”), which is also stated in Gen 12:2. Contra Scott W. Hahn, “Covenant, Oath, and the Aqedah: Διαθήκη in Galatians 3:15-18,” CBQ 67 (2005): 79-100. In discussing Gen 22:15-18, Hahn (here, 90) claims: “Indeed it can be shown that this Abrahamic covenant episode fits the context of Paul’s remarks in Gal 3:6-18 better than the other two covenant-making episodes, Gen 15:17-21 and 17:1-27.” Although Hahn’s primary focus is on Gal 3:15-18 and the meaning of διαθήκη, he asserts that Gen 22:18 is the source of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in Gal 3:8 on the basis that Gen 18:18 “is not spoken to Abraham” (here, 92 n. 64). While Hahn is correct that Gen 18:17-19 is typically understood as God’s soliloquy and, therefore, is not technically spoken directly to Abraham, Walter Brueggemann (Genesis [IBC; Atlanta: John Knox, 1982], 169) notes that Gen 18:18 reiterates “the promise of 12:1-3.” Since 12:3 and 18:18 are so closely connected thematically, we cannot dismiss 18:18 as the source of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in Gal 3:8 on the basis that the words are part of a divine soliloquy that describes God’s covenant with Abraham, rather than part of a covenant-making episode per se.

349 Stanley, Language, 237 (italics added).

350 Gal 3:9 states: ὅσοι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ (“Therefore the ones [living their lives] on the basis of faithfulness are blessed with the faithful Abraham”). Additionally, see n. 309 above.
in 3:7. An alternate way of understanding Paul’s reference to “the faithful Abraham” is Martyn’s proposal that Paul is borrowing the expression from “the Teachers.”

Although the Missionaries could have employed the expression as Martyn suggests, it is also likely that Paul could be borrowing the expression from a different passage of Scripture: a passage that not only refers to the faithful Abraham in stark contrast to the faithlessness of an apostate people, but also appeals to the Abrahamic covenant presented in Gen 12:1-3 and 15:6 in an effort to settle a dispute over the identity of the seed/sons of Abraham.

3.1.6 Galatians 3:6-14 as a Parodic Reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19:1-20:29

In the following discussion, we will seek to demonstrate that Paul employs the reference to the faithful Abraham (2 Esd 19:8), whom God elected (2 Esd 19:7), as a springboard to reverse parodically many features contained in the penitential prayer and covenant renewal liturgy portrayed in 2 Esd 19-20. One notable feature of the passage is that there is one covenant between God and the community, the covenant with Abraham.

---

351 Galatians, 302. De Boer (Galatians, 196), as mentioned above (n.341), directly relates 3:9 to the new preachers’ interpretation of Gen 22.

352 Following the nomenclature of Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva (Invitation to the Septuagint [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000], 78), we use the designation “2 Esdras” to refer to the Greek text of the combined books of Ezra-Neh. Throughout our discussion, the text and versification is that of Robert Hanhart, ed., Esdrae Liber II (VTG 8/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 202-18. For a discussion of the problematic dating of the Greek version of Chron, Ezra, and Neh, see Sidney Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 290-94. For a discussion of the relationship between 2 Esd and Theodotion, in addition to Jellicoe (esp., 83-94, 293-94), see Jobes and Silva, Invitation, 41-42. In agreement with Jellicoe and Jobes and Silva, the following discussion presumes the existence of Proto-
However, the depiction of the covenant renewal ceremony indicates that the Mosaic law forms a vital component of God’s covenant with Abraham. If we are correct that Paul is parodically reversing much of 2 Esd 19-20, the vital issue in this part of Galatians is not the ability or inability of the law to produce rectification and/or life. Rather, the vital issue with which Paul is dealing is whether or not the Mosaic law is an

Theodotion, thus providing for a Greek text of the canonical books of Ezra and Neh in the pre-Christian era. Recently two scholars have proposed that the Greek text of 2 Esdras was produced as late as the second century C.E.: Richard C. Steiner, “On the Dating of Hebrew Sound Changes and Greek Translations (2 Esdras and Judith),” *JBL* 124 (2005): 229-67; R. Glenn Wooden, “2 Esdras,” in A New English Translation of the Septuagint (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 405-23; idem, “Interlinearity in 2 Esdras: A Test Case,” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (eds. W Kraus and R. G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 119-44; and idem, “The φορολόγος of 2 Esdras,” in *Die Septuaginta-Texte, Kontexte, Lebenwelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Setuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*, eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 248-57. While Steiner and Wooden are confident of a second-century C.E. date for the Greek translation, Timothy Janz (“The Second Book of Ezra and the ‘Καιγε Group,’” in IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: *Cambridge 1995* [ed. Bernard Taylor; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997], 153-70) is much less certain of the relationship of 2 Esd to the Καιγε Group. Additionally, the presence of φορολόγος, a word that was not current in usage until the time of Strabo and Plutarch, in the Greek text of 2 Esd is considered by Wooden to be strong evidence for a second-century date. However, the four times that the word does occur in the text are confined to 2 Esd 4-5. We also consulted Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des 2. Esrabuches* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003). While Steiner (“Dating,” 246-49) considers the rendering of proper names in 2 Esd to be representative of the second century, Hanhart (*Text*, 8-10) considers the rendering of proper names to be of secondary importance in determining the dependence of 2 Esd on 1 Esd. Additionally, Steiner considers that the use of 1 Esd, but not 2 Esd, by Josephus lends further evidence for a date later than the first century for 2 Esd. However, he does acknowledge that Jellicoe notes that Josephus might have preferred the Greek text of 1 Esd over that of an existing Greek text of 2 Esd. Therefore, the proposals that a Greek text of 2 Esd did not exist prior to the second century do not seem conclusive. Furthermore, although Hanhart (*Text*, 360-62) notes that the translation of forms of γραφή by either forms of στιγμή or σωτήρ may indicate Aquilan influence on the Greek translation of 2 Esd, we see this same equivalence in LXX Deut 33:29 and several times in the Greek text of Chron (1 Chron 16:35; 18:6, 13; 19:12; 2 Chron 32:2). Gillis Gerleman (*Studies in the Septuagint, II Chronicles* [Lund: Gleerup, 1946], 5 n.1) notes that Eupolemus (mid-second century B.C.E.) recorded an account of the history of David and Solomon that was unquestionably dependent on an early Greek translation of Chron. Furthermore, Gerleman (here, 9-13) proposes that Eupolemus’ Vorlage was Paralipomena, which is the Greek translation of canonical Chron. The presence of στιγμή for γραφή in 2 Esd does not necessitate a late date for the Greek translation. Therefore, there could have easily been a pre-Christian Greek translation of Ezra-Neh that could have been quite similar to Hanhart’s critical text of 2 Esd.
inseparable part of God’s covenant with Abraham. If this understanding is correct, the various points in Paul argument are shaped specifically to combat the confluence of the Mosaic law with the Abrahamic covenant as described in 2 Esd 19-20. Although our study will compare Paul’s language in Galatians with the text of 2 Esd 19-20, most scholarly discussions of Neh 9-10, the passage that corresponds to 2 Esd 19-20, deal exclusively with the MT. Therefore, several theological emphases that have been observed by commentators on the Hebrew text will be interspersed throughout our comparison of the Greek text of 2 Esd 19-20 with Galatians.

As has been observed by numerous scholars, Neh 9 is an early theological reinterpretation of Gen 12:1-3 and Gen 15:6 in relation to the law given at Sinai and a Deuteronomistic view of Israel’s salvation history. Rolf Rendtorff notes that the author of the penitential prayer in Neh 9:6-37 not only “employs an independent and sophisticated

---

theological language” in reinterpreting the “pentateuchal traditions in their final shape,”
but also displays a profound interest in referring to God’s election of Abraham prior to
the giving of the law at Sinai, rather than following the Deuteronomic tradition that
describes the election of Israel as the corporate people of God. Additionally, Frederick
C. Holmgren, Mark A Throntveit, and Richard J. Bautch discuss the theological
importance of the covenant with Abraham within the covenant renewal ceremony
described in Neh 9-10 and are, therefore, particularly important for our discussion.

Before discussing the importance of these scholars’ contributions in interpreting
Gal 3, it is necessary to review the salient points of 2 Esd 19-20. Nehemiah’s prayer is a
national confession that greatly stresses the divine action of God in Israel’s salvation
history; however, the author is highly selective in the particular items within Israel’s
history that are enumerated. The national confession, which begins by referring to the
people in 19:1-2 as ‘‘the sons of Israel’’, emphasizes that God created

354 “Neh 9,” 111-12, 15. He notes (112) that Neh 9:7 “is the only time in the Hebrew Bible that the verb כָּלַע
‘to elect’ is used in reference to Abraham.” Rendtorff’s observation regarding כָּלַע is also true for εὐκλεῖσθαι in
the LXX. 2 Esd 19:7, which states that God chose (εὐκλεῖσθαι) Abraham, is the only time in the LXX that
εὐκλεῖσθαι is used in reference to Abraham. In MT Deut, כָּלַע normally refers to the election of Israel as a
corporate people (e.g., 4:37; 7:6-7; 10:15; 14:2) or a place that God chooses as holy. In the corresponding
passages in LXX Deut, εὐκλεῖσθαι appears in place of כָּלַע.
9,6-10,1,” ZAW 104 (1992): 249-254; Mark A. Throntveit, Ezra-Nehemiah (IBC; Louisville: John Knox,
356 Although 2 Esd 19:1 employs וּיִּשְׂרָאֵל to describe those who assembled in a state of fasting, in
sackcloths, and with ashes on their head and 19:2 employs the same phrase to describe those who separated
themselves from foreigners, MT Neh 9:1 has יִשְׂרָאֵל (“sons of Israel”) while 9:2 has כִּבְיָד יִשְׂרָאֵל (“seed of
Israel”).
the world and gives life (ζωοποιέω) to all things (v. 6). Then, the author, speaking to God in 19:7, states: σὺ ἔξελέξα ("you elected") Abraham, which is followed in 19:8 by εἴρες τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ πιστὴν ἐνώπιόν σου ("you found his heart faithful before you") and διέθευς πρὸς αὐτὸν διαθήκην δοῦναί αὐτῷ τὴν γῆν . . . καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ("you made a covenant with him to give to him the land. . .and to his seed"). In the account of the exodus (19:9-21), 19:13-14 states not only that the law was given at Sinai ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ ("by the hand of Moses"), but also that God’s Spirit was given in order to instruct the people in the law. In 19:23, the author specifically references the promises that God spoke to Abraham by noting that, in terms of Abraham’s descendants, God “multiplied their sons as the stars of heaven” and led them into the land, which ἐκληρονόμησαν ("they inherited"). However, 19:26 states that the people ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ σοῦ ("apostatized from you" [i.e. “God”]) and ἔρριψαν τὸν νόμον σου ὅπϊσω σώματος αὐτῶν ("they cast your law behind their body"). The author then attributes the apostasy of the people in failing to keep the commandments as the cause of their return to a condition of slavery (19:28-35).

Following the prayer, the people participate in a covenant renewal ceremony in which they pledge to obey the law (19:38-20:29). Therefore, although the passage emphasizes the election of Abraham, the faithfulness of Abraham, and the covenant that God made with him, the people participate in the renewal of the covenant that, of course, includes the Mosaic law.357

357 Since the covenant with Abraham is the only covenant explicitly mentioned in Neh 9, Holmgren 251
Returning to Gal 3, Paul immediately follows his reference to “the faithful Abraham” in v.9 with a discussion of the curse of the law. Although Dunn assumes that there is “a jump in thought between verses 9 and 10,” a comparison of Paul’s language with that of 2 Esd 19:1-38 and 20:28-29 may indicate that Paul’s discussion of the curse of the law quite logically follows his reference to “the sons of Abraham” (3:7) and “the faithful Abraham” (3:9) if we understand Gal 3:6-14 as a parodic reversal of many of the phrases that are included in 2 Esdras’s theological reinterpretation of the Pentateuch.

First, we contend that Paul parodically replaces the “sons of Israel” who “were separated from every son of a foreigner” and who publicly “confess their sins and the lawlessness of their fathers” (2 Esd 19:2) with “the sons of Abraham” (Gal 3:7) who are like Abraham in that they are rectified by God’s initiative act (Gal 3:7-8). Although Paul quotes Gen 15:6, which indicates that Abraham was considered rectified solely on the basis that he believed God’s word before he was circumcised (Gen 17) or was tested (Gen 22), Paul’s reference to “the faithful Abraham” is most likely an allusion to the

("Faithful Abraham," 252) argues: “The Abraham covenant is the covenant – the covenant whose teaching, at least in this prayer, includes that of Sinai.” Additionally, Boda (Praying the Tradition, 126) notes regarding Neh 9: “There is one covenant, the Abrahamic covenant which suffices for the entire history of Israel.”}

358 Galatians, 169. Gal 3:9 states: ὃς τε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραὰμ ("Therefore the ones [conducting their lives] on the basis of faithfulness are blessed with the faithful Abraham"). Gal 3: 10 states: ὃς τε γάρ ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου εἰσίν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν· γέγραπται γάρ ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς ὁκ ἐμένει πάσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ τοῦτον αὐτὰ. ("For as many as are [conducting their lives] on the basis of works of the law, they are under a curse; for it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who does not abide by all the things written in the book of the law to do them.’")
theological reinterpretation of Gen 12 and Gen 15:6 presented in 2 Esd 19:7-8. As Rendtorff observes, the covenant renewal ceremony is unique in that Moses “is not given as much prominence as Abraham.” Additionally, Holmgren, noting that Neh 9:8 (2 Esd 19:8) states that God made the covenant with Abraham and his seed, concludes that a major part of the controversy addressed in Neh 9:6-10:1 revolves around two issues: “Who are the children of Abraham and to whom belongs the land?”

Therefore, since this unique account of salvation history, which emphasizes that God elected Abraham, “found his heart faithful,” and made a covenant with Abraham and his seed without any explicit mention of circumcision as a sign of the covenant with God, reflects a reinterpretation of the Abraham tradition in order to address postexilic

359 Support for this statement will be presented below.
360 “Neh 9,” 115-16.
361 Ibid., 253. Duggan (Covenant Renewal, 202) notes that the election of Abraham in v. 7 might derive from Isa 41:8-9 in which Jacob, the “offspring of Abraham,” is said to be chosen and the exiles are identified as true Israel, the “offspring of Abraham” (יהושע בן נון, 41:8-9; cf. 51:1-2). Duggan continues: “Such a declaration indicates that the covenant with Abraham was particularly vital to defining the authentic Israel in exilic controversies. Evidence in Ezekiel discloses the roots of the debate. Ezekiel quotes those who remained in Judah during the exile as asserting that they regarded themselves as the genuine descendants of Abraham and therefore the rightful inheritors of the land (Ezek 33:24).” Similarly, H. G. M. Williamson (“Structure and Historiography in Nehemiah 9,” in Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies [1985] Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East [ed. David Assaf and Moshe H. Gosen-Gottstein: Jerusalem: Magnes Press Hebrew University, 1988], 117-31, here 129), in discussing the provenance of Neh 9, states that the community that remained in Palestine and was never exiled to Babylon appealed to Abraham in order to legitimate their claim to the land and “the later generations’ close association with him.” Williamson also notes that this group, in light of their apparent exclusion from participation in the temple cult, is close to the “ideological stance preserved in the polemic of Ezek 11:15 and 33:24, where those left in the land saw the exile as a judgment on those deported and as a vindication of their own situation.” Further, Williamson (here, 130 n. 37) observes: “The fact that the exilic community responded with claims of their own in relation to Abraham (Isa 41:8; 51:2) was only to be expected.” Additionally, Boda (Praying the Tradition, 111-12) observes that the references to the Abrahamic covenant in the prophets are few; however, he states: “Ezek 33 denounces claims made by Jews in Jerusalem that those who remained in Palestine, as opposed to those who went into exile, inherited the Abrahamic promises of descendants and land. Similar claims, though limited to the promise of descendants, are used in Deutero-Isaiah ( Isa 51:2) in connection with the exilic community.” Boda also observes that Mic 7:20 “grasps the promise of Abraham and Jacob as the basis for forgiveness of sins after divine anger.”
controversies concerning the identity of Abraham’s seed, it could well be the source of Paul’s bold reference to “the faithful Abraham.” Although neither Paul nor the Missionaries, in the midst of their interactions with the Galatians, would have been interested in postexilic controversies over rights to the land, a passage of Scripture that had been previously employed in order for certain groups to claim that their members, and only their members to the exclusion of other groups, constituted the seed/sons of Abraham may very well have caught the attention of the Missionaries and/or Paul. While Paul’s references to Abraham do not by themselves suggest a strong connection with the account in 2 Esdras, his subsequent discussion of those “under a curse” (v.10) and his substitutions in the scriptural quotations in 3:10 and 3:12 strengthen the connection between Gal 3:6-14 and the covenant renewal ceremony described in 2 Esd 19-20.362

362 The literature dealing with “works of the law” and “under a curse” in Gal 3:10 and “the curse of the law” in 3:13 is immense. In the following pages, we will discuss Stanley’s proposal that the curse of the law should be interpreted as conditional, and we will disagree with those who propose that Gal 3:10-14 should be read in light of a missing premise. In addition to these two views, which will be covered more fully below, four interpretations have occupied a major place in previous discussions: 1) According to E. P. Sanders (Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983], 21-22), Paul presents a terminological argument in Gal 3: the scriptural passages that Paul cites are chosen because they contain key words. Therefore, Paul uses them as proof-texts, and, rather than attempting to determine what the cited Scriptures mean, we should recognize that Paul understood the passages to mean “what Paul says in his own words.” Therefore, Sanders summarizes his understanding of Gal 3 (ibid., 27), as: “Thus the whole thrust of the argument is that righteousness was never in God’s plan intended to be by the law. This helps us to see that the problem with the law is not that it cannot be fulfilled. Paul has a view that excludes righteousness by the law: his position is dogmatic.” Sanders adds: “God sent Christ; he did so in order to offer righteousness; this would have been pointless if righteousness were already available by the law (2:21); the law was given to bring righteousness (3:21);” 2) James D. G. Dunn proposes (“Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3:10-14),” NTS 31 [1985]: 523-42; and Galatians, 168-80) that Paul’s “works of the law” should be understood socially as “boundary markers,” which separated Jews from Gentiles. Therefore, in Dunn’s view, Paul is criticizing those who derive their identity from works of the law (3:10) for “putting too much weight on the distinctiveness of Jews from Gentiles and on the special laws which formed the boundary markers between them” (here, Galatians, 172). For Dunn (ibid., 173), Israel’s nationalistic over-confidence in possession of the law, which not only is considered as an
“advantage over those outside the law,” but also “blinds ‘the Jew’ to the seriousness of his sin,” actually results (“Works of the Law,” 534) in incurring the “curse of the law” since such an attitude “is less than what the law requires.” Therefore, the curse of the law, in Dunn’s understanding (ibid., 536), “has to do primarily with that attitude which confines the covenant promise to Jews as Jews: it falls on those who live within the law in such a way as to exclude Gentile as Gentile from the promise.” Dunn (ibid.) continues: “The curse which was removed therefore by Christ’s death was the curse which had previously prevented that blessing from reaching the Gentiles, the curse of a wrong understanding of the law.” He (“4QMMT and Galatians,” NTS 43 [1997]: 147-153) supports his interpretations of “works of the law” and “curse of the law” by noting parallels between the theological attitude toward the law represented in 4QMMT and “the attitude and action of Peter and the other Christian Jews in Antioch (Gal 2:11-14).” In the additional notes to the reprint of “The Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law” in Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990), 215-41, Dunn attempts to clarify his understanding of the curse of the law further. Not only does the curse of the law apply to those who have a wrong understanding of the law, but it also includes the covenant-breaker, the one outside the covenant who is thus forsaken by God (ibid., 237). Therefore, in Dunn’s view, Christ became a curse (Gal 3:13) because of the “forsakenness which Jesus experienced on the cross.” For an extended critique of Dunn’s understanding of “works of the law,” see Jacqueline C. R. de Roo, “The Concept of ‘Works of the Law’ in Jewish and Christian Literature,” in Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson; JSNTSup 192; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 116-47.

For agreement with Dunn, at least on his interpretation that “works of the law” refer to “ethnic identity markers,” see Donaldson, Paul and the Gentiles, 120; 3) N. T. Wright (Climax of the Covenant, 137-56) explains that, in Gal 3:10-14, Paul’s “central theme is the family of Abraham.” Paul discusses God’s blessings that were promised to Abraham in light of covenant theology and the Deuteronomic understanding of Israel’s corporate history, which is characterized by a failure of ‘the nation as a whole’ to keep “the Torah as a whole” (here, 146, emphasis original). Because of Israel’s corporate failure, the nation is in an extended state of exile under Roman domination, as predicted in the curses of Deut 28:15-29:29. For Wright (here, 147), the curse is not a threat; “Israel is under the curse” as are all who “embrace Israel’s way of life.” Therefore, Torah is unable to deliver the promised blessing. In Wright’s view (152), Paul’s “argument actually depends on the validity of the law’s curse, and on the propriety of Jesus, as Messiah, bearing it on Israel’s behalf.” And, “the death of Jesus is thus understood in covenant-renewing terms” (153). Because Christ became the curse, the Gentiles can receive the blessing of Abraham in Christ, and the blessing of the renewed covenant is now understood as the Spirit (154). Cf. Hays, Galatians, 258-59; and 4) J. Louis Martyn (Galatians, 307-34 and “The Textual Contradiction Between Habakkuk 2:4 and Leviticus 18:5” in Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997], 183-90) argues that Paul’s understanding of the in-breaking of God into the cosmos, which occurred with the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, has brought about a new age in which exists a “hermeneutical gulf between Paul and the Teachers” (Galatians, 328). Paul’s argument in Gal 3:10-14 should be understood as “the substantive conflict between assertions made by two parties who are in actual disagreement with each other” (ibid., 329). Within this polemical setting, “Paul anticipates the Teachers’ use of the Textual Contradiction” method of reconciling what appears to be conflicting Scriptures so that it can be concluded that the Scriptures do not, in the end, conflict with each other. But, in anticipating that the Teachers will attempt to reconcile the scriptural basis for faith and “works of the law” so that there is no conflict within Scripture, Paul seeks to show the Galatians that, in the new age, a Scripture that insists on faith (Hab 2:4) cannot be reconciled with a Scripture that insists on “works of the law” (Lev 18:5). Therefore, for Martyn, Paul demonstrates in Gal 3:10-14 that while God blesses and the law curses, the cross defeats the curse of
Not only is the ceremony in 2 Esd 19-20 unique in that it gives prominence to Abraham over Moses and it refers to God’s election of Abraham rather than God’s election of corporate Israel, but also 2 Esd 20:28-29 highlights, as part of the covenant renewal ceremony, the fact that the Israelites, as well as the “people of the land” who wanted to follow the law, willingly placed themselves under the curse of the law in order to live within God’s law. These verses state:

28 And the rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the gatekeepers, the singers, the temple servants, and everyone who comes from the people of the land to the law of God, their wives, their sons, their daughters, everyone knowing and understanding,

29 they were prevailing over their brothers, they cursed them, and they entered into the curse and into the oath in order to walk in the law of God, which was given by the hand of Moses the servant of God, to guard and to do all the commandments of the Lord and his judgments.

Therefore, we contend that Paul follows his discussion of the “sons of Abraham” the law (ibid., 333-34). Martyn then explains that Paul’s comments in Gal 4:21-5:1 indicate that the law is a witness to the gospel and, therefore, the law actually has two voices (ibid., 328, 334). Wakefield (Where to Live, 66-96) and R. Barry Matlock (“Helping Paul’s Argument Work? The Curse of Galatians 3.10-14,” in The Torah in the New Testament: Papers Delivered at the Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008 [ed. Michael Tait and Peter Oakes; New York: T&T Clark International, 2009], 154-179) present critiques, from very different perspectives, of recent scholarly discussions regarding Gal 3:10-14.

363 Numerous individuals who “placed their seal” on the covenant during the ceremony are specifically named in 2 Esd 19:38b-20:27. Therefore, οἱ κατάλοιποι τοῦ λαοῦ means “the rest of the people” who, although nameless, participated in the covenant renewal. 364 LSJ, “ἐνισχύω,” 569.
(3:7) and “the faithful Abraham” (3:9) by again parodically alluding to 2 Esdras in order to dispel the view that submission to the curse of the law (2 Esd 20:28-29) is a necessary part of being a faithful follower of God. And, importantly for our discussion, these verses can easily be interpreted to mean that even Gentiles who desire to be faithful followers of God should enter “into the curse and into the oath in order to walk in the law of God.” Interestingly, it is not only the Greek text that has been interpreted in this manner. While some scholars understand MT Neh 10:29 to refer to Israelites who separated themselves from non-Israelites as part of the covenant renewal process, others interpret the Hebrew phrase as describing the assimilation of Gentiles who were willing to adopt Torah into the covenant people of God. Since 2 Esd 20:28 does include the preposition ἀπό, which does connote separation, the phrase could be translated as: “everyone who [i.e., an Israelite] is coming from the peoples of the land to the law of God.” However, since the Greek verb προσπορεύομαι does not connote separation as does the Hebrew בֵּית, we propose that the best translation is: “everyone who [i.e., Gentile God-fearer/proselyte] is coming from the peoples of the land to the law of God.” It seems

365 The relevant phrase in the MT is: יָהּהָ וְיָאֵל וְיָאֵל (And all who separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to Torah”).
logical that if the Greek text were meant to describe the separation of Israelites from non-Israelites, this idea would have been conveyed clearly by employing a verb that exclusively expressed the idea of separation or setting apart, as does the Hebrew לַעֲזָר. Therefore, the presence of προσπορέομαι, in lieu of a Greek verb that clearly connotes separation, supports interpreting 2 Esd 20:28 as referring to proselytes who “come to the law of God” from their native people.

Furthermore, Philo’s discussion of the importance of the Mosaic law as a guide for learning about God (Spec. 1.36-65, esp. 41) includes two points that are extremely relevant for our translation of 2 Esd 20:28. 369 First, in discussing those who follow Moses’ example in seeking to know God (1.41-50), Philo describes two types of human beings that are approved by God (1.51): 1) τοὺς . . . ὅτι τὴν εὐγένειαν οὐ κατέλυσαν (“those that did not tear down the noble birth”); and 2) τοὺς . . . ὅτι πρὸς εὐσέβειαν ἠξίωσαν μεθαρμόσασθαι 370 (“those that thought [it] worthy to adopt piety”). And most importantly, Philo not only specifically states that the second category consisted of προσηλύτους (“proselytes”), but also he leaves no doubt regarding his understanding of the etymology of the word προσηλύτως in Jewish history. He explains in Spec. 1.51:

369 See the discussion of Spec. 1.36-50 in 3.1.2.3.1 above.
370 Although we have previously cited the Greek text as it appears in Spec.1 (Colson, LCL), Colson amends the Greek text of 1.51 by changing μεθαρμόσασθαι to μεθαρμίσασθαι. He states (here 126 n.2): “MSS. μεθαρμόσασθαι, a word less suitable here and often confused in MSS. with μεθαρμίσασθαι.” However, we quote the passage in agreement with MSS. since LSJ (“μεθαρμίζω,” 1089) defines μεθαρμίζω in the middle voice as “to adopt” and presents examples in which μεθαρμίζω is employed in the middle voice to describe adopting new customs and/or lifestyles. In our view, μεθαρμίζω fits the context of Philo’s discussion as well as or better than μεθαρμίζω, which LSJ (“μεθαρμίζω,” 1091) defines in the middle voice as: “seek refuge from” or “sail from one place to another.”
Second, Philo notes that Moses admonishes the Jewish people not only to welcome proselytes who “have come” to the covenant community by “having left” their “country, friends, and relatives,” but also that the community should view proselytes as equal to those who were Jews at birth (Spec. 1.52). Additionally, there is no doubt that Philo understood “tearing down (καταλύω) the noble birth” (1.51) to be synonymous with becoming apostate since he follows the passage with a discussion of the penalty for apostates and a recount of the zeal of Phinehas for the law (1.54-59). Since Philo’s discussion of proselytes coming to the covenant community from their country, friends, and relatives includes a statement indicating that he considers the faithful within the covenant community to be those who did not tear down the Mosaic law, Spec. 1.51-53 expresses ideas comparable to our suggested interpretation of 2 Esd 20:28. If our reading of 2 Esd 20:28 is correct, then Gentile proselytes were included in the group who entered into the curse and the oath in order to follow the law of God (2 Esd 20:29).

Therefore, if Paul is seeking to dissociate living in accordance with the Mosaic law from the Deuteronomic conception of faithfulness and blessing by parodically

---

371 For the causal connotation of ἁπά, see Smyth, §1684c(3).
372 In Spec. 1.36-50, Philo upholds the Mosaic law as the necessary guide to knowing what humanity can of God. Cf. Spec. 2.253 in which Philo refers to those who are “zealots of the laws” (ζηλωται νόμων) as being synonymous with “the most accurate guardians of the ancestral customs” and notes that these people are merciless to those “doing anything” to “tear down” (καταλύω) the laws/customs.
alluding to 2 Esd 20:28-29, ὀσοὶ in Gal 3:10 refers to the number of people, regardless of whether they are Jews or Gentiles, who submit to “the curse of the law” by agreeing to adhere to the Mosaic law as a way of life. Consequently, our interpretation of 3:10 does not support the view that there is a missing premise, which assumes that it is humanly impossible to keep the law perfectly. While Stanley is certainly correct that Paul’s ἐπικατάρατος ("accursed") in 3:10 describes “only those who fail to live up to the requirements of the law," his interpretation that ὀσοὶ... ἔξ ἔργων νόμου can be understood to include Jews “only if the reader supplies such a reference in the ambiguous expression” fails to recognize that 2 Esd 20:28-29 describes Jews and proselytes entering “into the curse... in order to walk in the law of God.”

So, although Stanley is correct that the penalties of the curse are actualized only upon those who become apostate, Paul’s ὘σοὶ γὰρ ἔξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν, ὑπὸ κατάραν

---

373 See n.358 above for the text of Gal 3:10.
376 Ibid., 498.
εἰσίν describes anyone who desires to live under the conditional threat of the curse of the law. When we read Gal 3:10 in light of 2 Esd 20:28-29, we see that Paul is parodically reversing the covenantal understanding that living under the curse of the law is a positive and expected requirement of the faithful. Although Hays is certainly correct that, in 3:10, Paul is “informing the Galatians of a point repeatedly emphasized in Deuteronomy: Those who enter the covenant are subject to its sanctions and curses,” our posited parodical allusion to 2 Esdras is strengthened when we note the verbal connections between 2 Esd 19:29 and Paul’s scriptural quotations in 3:10 and 3:12. And when we recognize that Paul is rhetorically parodying the covenant renewal ceremony in 2 Esdras, we see that his argument in 3:10-14 indicates that the “curse of the law” entails the understanding that a person, whether Jew or Gentile, who has agreed to be under the law acknowledges that a subsequent rejection of the law and its atonement provisions, not the mere act of committing transgressions, will result not only in spiritual death, but also in a condition of slavery. Our interpretation is consistent not only with Paul’s acknowledgment in 2:19 that he “died to the law through the law,” but also we will see below that it accords well with the scriptural proof in 3:10 that describes the grounds upon which the curse is actualized.

Cf. Gal 4:21, which states: Λέγετέ μοι, οί ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἰναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούστε; (“Tell me, the ones who are desiring to be under the law, do you not hear the law?”). At this point our interpretation of Gal 3:10 sounds similar to Wakefield’s (Where to Live, 172-80) proposal that Paul is discussing the sphere in which the Galatian Christians should live rather than the manner in which individuals are saved; however, the following discussion will reveal notable differences between our proposal and Wakefield’s. Galatians, 258.
As has been well researched, Paul conflates Deuteronomic passages in 3:10.\(^{379}\) However, in addition to conflating Deut 27:26 and 28:58 in 3:10, it is possible that Paul’s substitution of αὐτά for αὐτοῦς is drawn from the quotation of Lev 18:5\(^{380}\) as it is presented in 2 Esd 19:29. Since Paul’s scriptural quotation in Gal 3:12 follows 2 Esd

---

\(^{379}\) Deut 27:26 states: Ἐπικατάφθατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, ἥστις σύκ ἐμμενεῖ ἐν πάσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου τοῦ πατρία αὐτοὺς· καὶ ἔρωσιν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς Γένειοτο (“Cursed is every person, whoever does not remain faithful in all the words of this law in order to do them, and all the people will say “Let it be so””). Although Paul cites Deut 27:26a, he substitutes the phrase γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ for λόγοις. For the possibility that Paul is conflating Deut 27:26 with 29:19b, see Dietrich-Alex Koch, Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus (BHT 69; Tübingen, Mohr-Siebeck, 1986) 164. However, according to Stanley (Language, 240-41), Paul’s substitution is most likely due to a conflation with Deut 28:58 since this verse, in agreement with Gal 3:10, references the “requirements of the law” rather than the curses. Deut 30:10 also contains the phrase τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου in the context of God’s blessings for obedience to the law. Additionally, as Stanley (ibid., 238-40) notes, the substitution of ὅς for ἥστις can be explained on the basis of variants in the LXX manuscripts; however, Paul’s retention of πᾶς while omitting ἄνθρωπος has no support in any extant LXX text. Considering Paul’s identical omission of ἄνθρωπος from his scriptural quotation in Gal 3:12 while including the word in Rom 10:5, Stanley (ibid.) concludes that omitting ἄνθρωπος must serve Paul’s editorial purpose in Gal. Therefore, given that Paul appears to have edited his Deuteronomistic quotations in Gal 3:10 to fit his argument in the letter, his retention of the Deuteronomic ἐμμενεῖ, a verb not attested in any other undisputed or disputed Pauline, rather than substituting the more common μένω (1 Cor 13:13, 15:6; 2 Cor 3:11, 14, 9:9; Phil 1:25) or ἐπιμένω (Rom 6:1, 11:22, 23; 1 Cor 16:7,8; Gal 1:18; Phil 1:24; Col 1:23) could be due to the association of ἐμμενεῖ with its use in the context of remaining faithful to oaths. See LSJ, “ἐμμενεῖς 2,” 542 and sources cited there. BDAG (“ἐμμενεῖς 2,” 322) notes the presence of ἐμμενεῖ in legal formulae employing the dative of a participle in order to explain Paul’s substitution of γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ for λόγοις. But, in citing Josephus (A. J. 19.247) as employing ἐμμενεῖν πίστει (“to remain in faithfulness”), BDAG fails to indicate that the “faithfulness” is clearly in reference to an oath of allegiance to Claudius by the Roman army. Obviously, ἐμμενεῖ in Gal 3:10 is taken from Deut 27:26a, rather than from the reinterpretation of the covenant renewal ceremony as it is presented in 2 Esd 19-20. However, it is important here that Paul retains ἐμμενεῖ, along with its connotation of “remaining true to oaths,” even though he replaces the Deuteronomic reference to “words,” as part of the covenant renewal ceremony stressing the people’s assent to “the words of this law,” with a reference to “the things written in the book of the law.” The significance of Paul’s retention of ἐμμενεῖ and its connection with being faithful to oaths will become clear in the following discussion of Paul’s quotation of Scripture in 3:10-12.

\(^{380}\) In discussing the substitution of αὐτά for αὐτοῦς in 3:10, Stanley (Language, 242-43) states: “It is not difficult to see how the close link between the two citations [i.e., the scriptural quotations in 3:10 and 3:12] in the Pauline context could have produced a corresponding shift in the gender of the pronoun in v.10 in anticipation of the quotation in v.12. When all the evidence is taken into account, a Pauline origin for the neuter pronoun remains probable, but the possibility of a textual basis for the change should not be discounted.”
19:29 more closely than it does Lev 18:5, it will be helpful to compare 2 Esd 19:29 and Lev 18:5 with Gal 3:12 before further discussing Gal 3:10-11.

2 Esd 19:29: καὶ ἐπιμαρτύρω αὐτοῖς ἐπιστρέφαι αὐτοῖς εἰς τῶν νόμων σου, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν, ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἐννοιαῖς σου καὶ ἐν τοῖς κρίμασι σου ἠμάρτοσαν, ἀ ποιήσας αὐτά ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔδωκαν νότον ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ τράχηλον αὐτῶν ἐσκληρύναν καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

And you appealed to them to turn them back to your law, and they did not listen, but they sinned in your commandments and in your judgments, which doing them a person will live in them; and disobeying they gave [their] back and they hardened their neck and they did not listen.

Lev 18:5: καὶ φυλάξεσθε πάντα τὰ προστάγματά μου καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματά μου καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτὰ ἄ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.

---

381 Numerous studies have not only compared the citation of Lev 18:5 in Gal 3:12 to the wording of the citation in 2 Esd 19:29 and Philo, Congr. 86, but also have discussed the allusions to Lev 18:5 in Ezek 20 and the DDS. Our references here are limited to the discussions that are the most germane to our comparison of Gal 3:12 and 2 Esd 19:29. Philo, in citing Lev 18:1-5, repeats καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά from Lev 18:5a and presents Lev 18:5b as ὁ ποιήσας αὐτά ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, which is identical to Paul’s wording of Lev 18:5b in Gal 3:12. Andreas Lindemann (“Die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Gesetz Erwägungen zur Auslegung und zur Textgeschichte von Römer 10:5,” ZNW 73 [1982]: 231-50, here 241 n. 37), although mainly discussing the citation of Lev 18:5 in Rom 10:5, notes that Philo’s citation of Lev 18:5b “corresponds to the version in Gal 3:12;” however, he considers Philo’s “almost verbatim” quotation of Lev 18:1-5a in Congr. 86 to warrant the proposal that Philo’s citation of Lev 18:5b was “adapted to the citation of Paul” by “a Christian copyist of Philo’s text.” Alternatively, Preston M. Sprinkle (Law and Life: The Interpretation of Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and in Paul [WUNT 2/241; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 27-51, 101-14, 133-52) explains the verbatim agreement between Philo and Paul on the basis that: 1) Lev 18:5 came down to Philo and Paul as a “free-standing formulation” that employed the participle ποιήσας in an independent clause; and 2) “that the Leviticus formula was a familiar expression that was ‘in the air’” (here, 135). Sprinkle (here, 40-44) notes that Neh 9 and Ezek 20 allude to Lev 18:5 in relation to Israel’s rebellious past. Additionally, he (here, 50) acknowledges that 2 Esd 19:29 adds αὐτά, which is not present in MT Neh 9:29, and notes that the citation in 2 Esd 19:29 retains the phrase in a dependent clause in agreement with Lev 18:5 (here, 135 n.13). So, while mentioning the quotation in 2 Esd 19:29, Sprinkle does not investigate the other similarities between Gal 3 and 2 Esd 19-20. In his study of the citation of and allusions to Lev 18:5 in Ezek 20, Neh 9:29/2Esd 19:29, and CD III, 16, Joel Willitts (“Context Matters: Paul’s Use of Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians 3:12,” TynBul 54 [2003]: 105-22) traces the theological development of Lev 18:5 in Jewish interpretation, and he determines that Ezek and Neh cite the verse to highlight Israel’s covenant failure. However, he does not directly compare the context of 2 Esd 19:29 with the context of Paul’s argument in Gal 3.
And you will keep all my ordinances and all my judgments and you will do them which doing a person will live in them I am the Lord your God.

Gal 3:12: ὃ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλὰ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.

But the law is not on the basis of faithfulness, but the one doing them will live in them.

As Stanley notes in his comparison of Lev 18:5 and Gal 3:12, the substitution of ὃ for ἃ and the omission of ἀνθρωπος most likely originated with Paul and was an effort “to create a near-perfect verbal parallel between this verse and the quotation from Hab 2:4 in v.11.” When discussing the inclusion of αὕτα in the text of 3:12, Stanley emphasizes the divided evidence in the witnesses for Lev 18:5 and for Paul’s citation of the verse in Rom 10:5. However, while the position of αὐτά in Gal 3:12 does not correspond to the

---

382 We are presenting an extremely wooden translation for two reasons: 1) to emphasize the order of the words in the Greek text of Lev 18:5; and 2) to demonstrate that Paul’s quotation in Gal 3:12 is closer to the wording of 2 Esd 19:29 than it is to the wording of Lev 18:5.

383 Language, 244-45. Longenecker (Galatians, 120-21) proposes that Paul omitted the generic word ἀνθρωπος in Gal 3:12 since retaining it would have implied that the conditions of Lev 18:5 were relevant for Gentiles in addition to Jews. Sprinkle (Law and Life, 135) mentions the proposals of Stanley and Longenecker. However, in agreeing that the omission of ἀνθρωπος in Gal 3:12, in contrast to Paul’s retention of the noun in Rom 10:5, was deliberate on Paul’s part, he makes no effort to explain the omission of ἀνθρωπος in Philo. Sprinkle’s argument is therefore inconsistent. If the form of Lev 18:5b were a “free-standing formulation” (containing ὁ ποιήσας in an independent clause and including ἀνθρωπος as quoted by Paul in Rom 10:5), as Sprinkle claims at one point in his argument, why would Philo omit ἀνθρωπος? Therefore, it seems best to agree with Lindemann’s proposal that the text of Congr. 86 was adapted to agree with Paul. Consequently, Philo’s text should not be used to support Sprinkle’s proposal that the phrase employed by Paul was “in the air” as a “free standing formulation.” Without forcing such a preconceived notion on Paul’s scriptural citation in Gal 3:12, we can evaluate, on its own merits, the possibility that Paul parodically shaped his argument from the covenant renewal ceremony in 2 Esd 19-20.

384 According to Stanley (Language, 127): “The most plausible explanation for this diversity of evidence is to suppose that an earlier Greek text [of Lev 18:5] without αὐτά was ‘corrected’ at some point toward the Hebrew by the addition of an equivalent for the Hebrew תר יים, and that Paul then drew his citation from a manuscript that reflected this later tradition.”

264
position of \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \), in the witnesses for Lev 18:5 that do include it, the placement of \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in 2 Esd 19:29 and in Gal 3:12 is exactly the same. While Stanley does acknowledge that, unlike Rom 10:5, there is no witness that omits \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in Gal 3:12, he does not comment on the difference in the placement of \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in Gal 3:12 and the placement of the pronoun in the witnesses for Lev 18:5 that include it as part of the phrase \( \kappa\alpha\iota \ \pi\omega\iota\varsigma\nu\tau\varepsilon \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \).

Importantly, the neuter \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in 2 Esd 19:29 is quite explicable since it refers not only to “commandments,” a feminine noun, but also to “judgments,” a neuter noun. Therefore, considering that Paul’s citation not only agrees with the neuter \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) employed in 2 Esd 19:29 but also follows its word order, it seems likely, especially in light of our proposed allusion to “the faithful Abraham” (2 Esd 19:8) and the substitution of “sons of Abraham” for “sons of Israel” (2 Esd 19:2), that Paul is quoting from the reinterpretation of Lev 18:5 as it appears in 2 Esdras. That Paul is, in turn, reinterpreting 2 Esdras 19-20 seems even more likely when we remember that Paul states, “as many as are

---

385 The variant readings for \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in Lev 18:5 that Stanley discusses all deal with the phrase \( \kappa\alpha\iota \ \pi\omega\iota\varsigma\nu\tau\varepsilon \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) that immediately follows \( \kappa\alpha\iota \ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha \ \tau\acute{\alpha} \ \kappa\rho\iiota\mu\iota\acute{\alpha} \ \mu\omicron \). According to Wevers (Leviticus, 203) only one manuscript, 767, employs \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in the position in which it occurs in Gal 3:12, which can be explained on the basis of assimilation to Paul. Koch (Schrift, 52 n. 20, 120), not having the advantage of Wevers’s critical edition of the Greek text of Lev that was published the same year as Koch’s work, presents this portion of Lev 18:5 as \( \alpha \ \pi\omega\iota\varsigma\nu\tau\alpha \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \ \acute{\alpha} \nu\theta\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\chi\omicron \ \zeta\prime\omicron\etta\iota \ \acute{\epsilon} \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \ \chi\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \iota\omicron \ ). In agreement with the dated text of Alan E. Brooke and Norman McLean, The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906). Sprinkle (Law and Life, 135) misplaces \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in Lev 18:5 in his comparison of Lev, Gal, and Philo. Lev 18:5 is thus incorrectly quoted as \( \alpha \ \pi\omega\iota\varsigma\nu\tau\alpha \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \ \acute{\alpha} \nu\theta\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\chi\omicron \ \zeta\prime\omicron\etta\iota \ \acute{\epsilon} \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \ \chi\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \iota\omicron \ ). Therefore, Sprinkle does not actually address the agreement in the placement of \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in 2 Esd 19:29 and Gal 3:12 in contrast to its position in Lev 18:5.

386 Language, 127 n.134.

387 Of course, Lev 18:2 also refers to “the sons of Israel;” however, our proposal that Paul’s “sons of Abraham” (Gal 3:7) is alluding to 2 Esd 19:2, rather than Lev 18:2, is based on the cumulative evidence that Paul is parodically reinterpreting 2 Esd 19-20.
[conducting their lives] on the basis of works of the law are under a curse” in 3:10, which alludes to the description of the people willingly placing themselves under the curse during the covenant renewal ceremony “in order to walk in the law of God” (2 Esd 20:29).

Furthermore, it is also likely that Paul’s reference to \( \text{οἱ ἐκ πίστεως} \) in connection with “the faithful Abraham” (3:6, 9) and his contrast of \( \text{οἱ ἐκ πίστεως} \) over against those who are \( 
\text{ἐγὼ ὠμοίων} \) are part of a parodic reversal of 2 Esd 19:36-38, a passage that not only attributes the people’s enslavement to foreign rulers as punishment for their sins against God’s commandments and judgments, but also “decrees faithfulness” in the midst of the covenant renewal ceremony in which the people place themselves under the curse and the oath connected with the law (2 Esd 20:28-29). 388 Second Esdras 19:36-38 states:

36 Ίδοὺ ἐσμέν σήμερον δούλοι, καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἣν ἔδωκας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν φαγεῖν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς,
37 τοῖς βασιλεύσιν, οἷς ἔδωκας ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ἔπλησεν τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ἔξουσιάζουσιν καὶ ἐν κτίσεις ἡμῶν ὡς ἄρεστόν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐν θλίψει μεγάλῃ ἐσμέν.
38 καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις ἡμεῖς διατίθεμεν πίστιν καὶ γράφομεν, καὶ ἐπισφραγίζουσιν πάντες ἀρχοντες ἡμῶν, Λευτῖται ἡμῶν ἱερεῖς ἡμῶν.

36 See we are slaves today, and the land which you gave to our fathers to eat the fruit of it,
37 [is controlled] by the kings, whom you appointed over us on account of our sins, and they have authority over our bodies and with our cattle [they do] as pleasing to them, and we are in great distress.

388 As mentioned above, the entirety of 2 Esd 19:38b-20:27 consists of the named officials who place their seal on the renewed covenant. Therefore, 2 Esd 20:28-29 describes the actual renewal of the covenant that is mentioned in 19:38.
And because of all these things we decree faithfulness and we record a written document and all our officials, our Levites, and our priests place [their] seal [on it].

Again, commentators on MT Neh 9:36-10:1 present valuable information for interpreting the passage. Of primary importance are the discussions and various translations of within the phrase (MT Neh 10:1), which corresponds to (2 Esd 19:38). Considering that is used in conjunction with , the noun can be viewed as synonymous with ("covenant"). In this case, the phrase would mean, “we are making an agreement/covenant.” However, Duggan and Holmgren interpret more in the sense of an adjective and, drawing the connotation of covenant from , render the phrase as: “We are making a firm agreement/covenant.” BDB cites and translates the phrase as

---

38 And because of all these things we decree faithfulness and we record a written document and all our officials, our Levites, and our priests place [their] seal [on it].

389 Forms of are employed frequently in the LXX with the connotation of making a covenant, and when the verb carries this connotation, it normally appears in conjunction with . See, e.g., Gen 9:7, 15:18, 21:27, 32, 26:28, 31:44; Exod 24:8; Deut 4:23, 5:2, 7:2, 9:9, 28:69, 31:16, and esp. 2 Esd 19:8. Importantly, in the depiction of the covenant renewal ceremony presented in Deut 29, the verb is also employed to describe the stipulations of the covenant that God decreed (Deut 29:11, 13, 24) and to which the people take an oath to obey. Therefore, in 2 Esd 19:38, is best translated as “we decree faithfulness” or “we covenant faithfulness” since is obviously the direct object of even though the context of the passage indicates that the people are to be faithful to the Abrahamic covenant, which here includes the stipulations of Sinai, and that the oath and curse that the people willingly assume (2 Esd 20:28-29) are those connected with the Mosaic law.

390 BDAG, “γράφω 2b,” 207.

391 For a full discussion of the various interpretations of see Boda, Praying the Tradition, 32-34.

392 See, e.g., Jacob M. Myers, Ezra Nehemiah (AB 14; Garden City: Doubleday, 1964), 173.

393 See, e.g., Duggan, Covenant Renewal, 235-42; Holmgren, Israel Alive, 136-37; and ibid., “Faithful Abraham,” 249-254. Williamson (Ezra, Nehemiah, 332) maintains that the adjectival sense is best represented with “binding” rather than “firm.”
“we are plighting faith.” 394 Although all three translations are possible for the Hebrew phrase, a literal rendering of the Greek, as mentioned above, requires that πίστιν be translated as the direct object of the verb. Therefore, the phrase in 2 Esd 19:38 should be translated as “we decree faith/faithfulness” or “we covenant faith/faithfulness.”

Although our translation of the Greek agrees grammatically with BDB’s translation of the Hebrew, rather than with those who prefer the adjectival rendering of פֶּתַח, Duggan and Holmgren make several valid observations regarding Nehemiah’s penitential prayer and the covenant renewal ceremony. First, both note that Neh 10:1 and Neh 9:8a 395 are theologically connected since the verses employ not only a derivation of the root הָבַי, but also a form of the verb מָאָס. 396 Additionally, as mentioned above, Duggan and Holmgren view the ceremony as renewing the covenant made with Abraham, which included the commandments given by the hand of Moses at Sinai. However, Duggan, in discussing the community’s covenant renewal (Neh 10:1-40) makes three observations that are extremely important for our proposed Pauline reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20 in Galatians. First, Duggan notes:

The preceding psalm (9:6-37) states that God established the “covenant” (ברית, 9:8a; cf. 9:32b) with Abraham while he communicated the “law” (תִּתֵּר, 9:14b; cf. 9:32b; cf.

394 “faith." 53.
395 The relevant portions of Neh 9:8 are: נָבִיאָה אֵאָרֶץ לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה לֵבָנָה (Neh 9:8). As discussed above, the relevant portions of the Greek text of 2 Esd 19:8 state: εἴρει τήν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ πιστὴν εἰνώπιον σου ("you found his heart faithful before you") and διέθεσεν πρὸς αὐτὸν διαθήκην δοῦναι αὐτῷ τὴν γῆν . . . καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ("you made a covenant with him to give to him the land . . .and to his seed").
8:1, 14; 10:30) through Moses. Thus, the community’s agreement emerges as the confluence of these traditions. The “firm agreement” (אמות, 10:1) of the community implies their imitation of Abraham’s “faithfulness” (אמות, 9:8a). Their swearing “to walk in the law of God that was given through the hand of Moses” (10:30) indicates their allegiance to the Sinaitic legislation (9:13-14).  

Second, he states:

The people’s establishing the agreement “in writing” (וֹהוָ, 10:1) parallels . . . with the “written” character of the Torah noted elsewhere in the covenant renewal: previously concerning the Festival of Booths, and subsequently in connection with the precepts (לְהוָה, 8:14, 15, 10:35, 37). The appropriate response to the written text of the Torah is the written agreement by the people.

And third, under a section that he labels “historical reorientation,” Duggan concludes:

The community’s oath taking is a turning point that reorients the community from the past into the future. Their dedication to the law of God (10:30) constitutes their turning away from the rebellious patterns of their ancestors (cf. 9:29a). By making this commitment, the community is no longer the victim of historical effects stemming from past wickedness (cf. 9:33-35). The management of their livestock is symbolic of the new order: whereas the Levities had just declared that the Persians rule over “our livestock” (בְּהָパー, 9:37b), now the people announce their decision to bring the firstborn “of our livestock” (בְּהָパー, 10:37) to the temple.

From the above quotations, we see that Duggan acknowledges that the penitential prayer and covenant renewal ceremony absorb the Mosaic law into the Abrahamic covenant. However, in the initial statement, Duggan includes a portion of Neh 10:30 that notes that the people swear לַלֵּאמֶת בְּהוָה לְהָパー אָבֹא נֶסה בִּין מָשָׁה לְעֵבְרֵי הָパー (“to
walk in the law of God which was given through the hand of Moses the servant of God”).

Therefore, we see that there is already a verbal distinction between God’s direct action in making the covenant with Abraham (Neh 9:8/2 Esd 9:8) and God’s action in giving the law through the agency of Moses (Neh 9:14/2 Esd 19:14; Neh 10:30/2 Esd 20:29).400

While Duggan is certainly correct that in Neh 9-10 the “community’s agreement emerges as the confluence” of the two traditions (i.e., the Abrahamic covenant and the Sinaitic legislation), the passage includes at least a hint of the employment of a mediator in the giving of the law.401

400 The author follows his statement that God elected Abraham (2 Esd 9:7) with a description of God’s direct action in making the covenant with Abraham (9:8). See n.392 above for the relevant portions of the Greek and Hebrew texts. The Greek text of 2 Esd 19:29 is presented in the above discussion. The relevant portion of 2 Esd 19:14 states: εὐντολὰς καὶ προστάγματα καὶ νόμον ἐνετέλεσεν ἀυτῶν ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ δούλου σου (“commandments and ordinances and law you commanded to them by the hand of Moses your servant”). Similarly, this portion of MT Neh 9:14 states: νόμον Μωσῆ βασιλεύς θρόνον ἔδωκεν (“and commandments and statutes and Torah you commanded to them through the hand of Moses your servant.”

401 While it is clear in both Neh and 2 Esd that God commanded the legislation, the agency of Moses as an intermediary is evident in Neh 9:14/2 Esd 19:14. Gilbert (“La place,” 311) notes the clear distinction between Neh 9:13/2 Esd 19:13, which is addressed to God and clearly states that God spoke from heaven at Sinai, and Neh 9:14/2 Esd 19:14, which describes the ordinances, commandments, and law as given by the agency of Moses. For Gilbert, God’s direct action occurred only in the giving of the Decalogue (Neh 9:13) while Moses was employed as an intermediary in the giving of the ordinances, commandments, and law (Neh 9:14). Although we are not dealing with Gal 3:19 at this point in our discussion, Paul’s reference to the law as διαταγέως δι’ ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου (“having been commanded through the angels in the hand of a mediator”) could also be parodically alluding to 2 Esd 19-20. Besides the phrase included in 2 Esd 19:14 (see the above note), 2 Esd 20:29 immediately follows the description of the people “entering into the curse and the oath in order to walk in the law of God” with the notation that the law ἔδωκεν ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ (“was given by the hand of Moses, the servant of God.”). Paul could be repeating ἐν χειρὶ from 2 Esd 19:14 and 20:29 in order to develop further the mediative idea already present in 2 Esd. Rather than naming Moses and acknowledging that God commanded the law “in the hand of Moses, the servant of God,” Paul employs ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου not only to stress the mediative role of Moses in carrying out the orders of the angels, but also to emphasize that a mediator is not one with God (3:20). Importantly, Newman (Praying by the Book, 65-70), in discussing the Deuteronomistic influence evident in the prayer (Neh 9:5-37), notes that the inclusion of the “hosts of heaven” worshiping God in the final phrase of Neh 9:6/2 Esd 19:6 (σύνελθαν στρατιῶν τῶν οὐρανῶν) marks a clear departure from the strict monotheism of Deuteronomistic theology. As Newman (ibid, 68, esp. n.21) points out, the phrase is normally associated with idol worship in Deuteronomic texts and, therefore, carries a negative connotation.
Additionally, if Duggan is correct in his assessment that the written agreement parallels the written text of the Torah, the people, in their oath to “walk in the law of God,” were placing themselves under the curse of the written “law of God.” Therefore, just as the penitential prayer traces the history of the covenant people from the election of Abraham until the post-exilic period, the law of God to which the people pledged faithfulness should be understood to encompass the entirety of their Scriptures. And it is evident in the prayer’s overview of Israel’s history that the faithfulness of Abraham stands in stark contrast to the history of the people’s faithlessness to the written Torah, a faithlessness that has resulted in a condition of slavery. By voluntarily placing themselves under the curse of the law and by covenanting faithfulness to the written law, the people

In comparison with texts that predate or are contemporaneous with Neh, she states (here, 69): “The phrase in Nehemiah thus suggests a new use of this phrase; in a sense the host of heaven has been domesticated, robbed of its threatening role as an idolatrous temptation, and placed at the service of the Divine King himself.” Although she acknowledges the development of angelic liturgy in praise of God’s creation in Second Temple literature (ibid., 69-70, esp. n.25), Newman finds the “terse phrase in Nehemiah 9” to be notably different than “the more elaborate descriptions of the angelic praise” that appear in texts “from the Apocrypha, from Qumran, [and] from early Christian and rabbinic writings.” Paul’s vague reference to the angels’ role in giving the law (Gal 3:19), therefore, has more in common with the “terse phrase” in Neh 9:6/2 Esd 19:6 than it does with the more elaborate descriptions in literature contemporaneous with his letter. If Paul is alluding to 2 Esd 19-20 in Gal 3:19-20, his separation of the mediator from God via the angels could be a further effort to employ rhetorical parody in order to dissociate the covenant that God personally made with Abraham from the law given through the agency of Moses. Thus, rather than subsuming the law into the Abrahamic covenant as in 2 Esd 19-20, Paul is reiterating the points that he made in Gal 3:15-18: 1) the stipulations of the law cannot be added to the Abrahamic covenant as was done in 2 Esd 19-20 (3:15); 2) God, not a mediator, spoke the promises to Abraham and his singular seed, Christ (3:16); 3) the law does not cancel the Abrahamic covenant ratified by God and, therefore, the law cannot nullify the promise God made to Abraham (3:17); 4) the inheritance, which was assumed to be both the land and the right to claim one’s identity as the seed of Abraham in 2 Esd 19-20, is actually part of God’s freely given promise to Abraham and is, therefore, not dependent on the stipulations of the Mosaic law (3:18). Read as a parodic reversal of 2 Esd 19-20, all of Paul’s statements in Gal 3:15-18 are an attempt to separate the confluence of the Abrahamic tradition and the Sinaitic legislation as it was expressed in Nehemiah’s penitential prayer and covenant renewal ceremony.
hope to again be freed from their current situation of slavery. And if Holmgren, Duggan, and Williamson are correct, the covenant renewal ceremony is part of the process by which those who covenant/decree faithfulness to the written law establish/reestablish their identity as the seed of Abraham and, thus, as the legitimate heirs of the benefits included in the covenant that God made with Abraham.

In light of these observations concerning MT Neh 9-10 and our previous investigation of the relationship between Gal 3 and 2 Esd 19-20, we can now make several proposals regarding Paul’s argument in Gal 3 and his employment of rhetorical parody. While we have no way of knowing whether or not the Missionaries had introduced the Galatians to 2 Esd 19-20, a passage that subsumed the Mosaic law into the Abrahamic covenant and apparently represented one position in post-exilic disagreements over which group constituted the true sons/seed of Abraham, interpreting Gal 3 as Paul’s parodic reversal of several of the principles emphasized in 2 Esd 19-20 clarifies many of the more puzzling statements within Paul’s argument. Additionally, if we are correct that the primary audience for much of Paul’s rhetorical parody in the letter is actually the Jewish-Christian Missionaries, his argument in Gal 3 is aimed at solving the crisis in Galatia by transforming the Missionaries’ understanding of faithfulness to God.

402 See n.361 above.

403 Note again three extremely important points emphasized in the above discussion of 2 Esd 19-20: 1) the covenant renewal ceremony describes the people not only placing their brothers under the curse, but also voluntarily entering into the curse and the oath connected with the law; 2) the word order and employment of the neuter auvta in 2 Esd 19:29; and 3) the actual renewal pledge in which the people “covenanted/decreed faithfulness” to the law (2 Esd 19:38).
As mentioned above, Paul’s references to the “sons of Abraham” (3:7) and “the faithful Abraham” (3:9), his correlation of ὀσοὶ...ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου with those who “are under a curse” (3:10), and the word order of his quotation of Lev 18:5 along with the neuter αὐτά (3:10, 12) support the proposal that Gal 3 is a reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20, which is itself a reinterpretation of the laws of the Pentateuch employed to deal with a controversy over the identity of the sons/seed of Abraham. If Paul is reinterpreting the covenant renewal ceremony as it is presented in 2 Esd 19-20, his citation of Deut 27:26 in Gal 3:10 with the substitution of γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, which he draws from Deut 28:58 (and/or Deut 30:10), for λόγοι τοῦ νόμου τούτου makes perfect sense given the noted emphasis on the written Torah in Nehemiah’s penitential prayer and covenant renewal ceremony.404

Therefore, just as the author of 2 Esd 19-20/Neh 9-10 had done, Paul is employing Deuteronomistic terminology to refer to the written law in his scriptural citation in Gal 3:10. As mentioned above, there is no need to presume that there is a missing premise in 3:10 since the focus of Paul’s statement is not the human inability to keep all the law. Rather, the focus of 3:10 is Paul’s acknowledgement that anyone who entered

404 See the second quotation of Duggan and the quotation from McCarthy in n.398 above. Additionally, if Boda (Praying the Tradition, 114) is correct in stating “The rendition of the Abraham tradition in Neh 9 reveals clear reliance on the finished Pentateuch, but there is a propensity to favor the form of the tradition found in Gen 15, sometimes utilizing Dtr terminology with a transformed meaning,” Paul’s conflation of Deuteronomistic passages within his reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20 is logical.
into the oath\textsuperscript{405} and the curse to keep the written law was bound, therefore, to live in compliance with the stipulations and means of atonement for transgressions in the Mosaic law.\textsuperscript{406} From our previous investigation, it is clear that it is only the unrepentant sinner who refused to make use of the atonement methods within the Mosaic law that would actualize the curses connected with the law and would suffer exclusion from the faithful community (Deut 29:19-21).\textsuperscript{407}

In addition to rejecting the “missing premise” proposal, we can also reject Norman H. Young’s proposal of an “unexpressed condition” in 3:10, which focuses on Paul’s retention of \(\pi\sigma\alpha\nu\). Young argues: “Paul admits that anyone who belongs to the Mosaic covenant comes under the curse of the law, if they abandon any of the covenant’s requirements.”\textsuperscript{408} Therefore, according to Young, Paul is agreeing with the Missionaries’ view that if the Galatians were bound by the Sinai covenant, “then truly they would risk the law’s curse, if they purposefully ignored any of its demands such as circumcision.”\textsuperscript{409} Although Young is correct to view the purposeful and unrepentant sinner, who abandons the covenant, as the one who will incur the curses, his explanation for Paul’s retention of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{405} For the importance of Paul’s retention of \(\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\epsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\omega\) in his conflation of Deuteronomic passages in Gal 3:10 and the connection of \(\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\epsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\omega\) with oaths, see n.380 above.
\textsuperscript{406} Cf. Hays (\textit{Galatians}, 258) who notes that Paul’s wording in 3:10 “has the effect of expanding the reference to the canonical Law of Moses as a whole.”
\textsuperscript{407} See 3.1.2.2 above.
\textsuperscript{409} Ibid., 87.
\end{footnotesize}
πᾶσιν seems in error.⁴¹⁰

Considering Paul’s statements in Gal 5:3 and 5:14, in which he is obviously referring to the law as a whole,⁴¹¹ it is highly unlikely that Paul retains πᾶσιν in 3:10 in order to legitimate the Missionaries’ understanding that each and every stipulation of the law must be followed in order to avoid incurring the curse of the law. On the contrary, by retaining πᾶσιν in the conflated quotation, Paul could be parodying not only the Deuteronomic references to “all the things written in the book of the law,” but also the employment of πᾶσας in the reinterpretation of the Pentateuch presented in 2 Esd 20:29.⁴¹² The Deuteronomic phrases and those in 2 Esdras that employ πᾶς in relation to the laws and/or commandments refer to doing all of the individual laws since πᾶς is in the predicate position in every case.⁴¹³ In Gal 3:10, Paul retains the predicate position of πᾶς

---

⁴¹⁰ Young (ibid.) appeals to Gal 6:13a to support his claim that Paul and the Missionaries are emphasizing the importance of keeping every detail of the Mosaic law. In his view, Paul is accusing the Missionaries of inconsistency in 6:13a. His argument, however, is not convincing since Paul does not repeat πᾶς as a modifier of νόμως in 6:13a. Gal 6:13a states: οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περετεμνόμενοι αὐτοῖς νόμον φυλάσσουσιν (“For not even the ones being circumcised keep the law themselves”).

⁴¹¹ Gal 5:3 employs the phrase ὅλον τὸν νόμον. Since ὅλος in the predicate position refers to an entity as a whole (Smyth, §1175), Paul is referring to the law as a whole in Gal 5:3. Gal 5:14 employs the phrase ὅ γάρ πᾶς νόμος. Since πᾶς in the attributive position “denotes the whole regarded as the sum of all its parts” (Smyth, §1174a), Paul is again referring to the law as a whole in Gal 5:14. The importance of 5:3 and 5:14 in the context of Paul’s argument in Gal 5 will be discussed below.

⁴¹² The Greek text of 2 Esd 20:29 is presented in the above discussion. In referring to the people entering “into the oath and the curse in order to walk in the law of God,” 2 Esd 20:29 employs πᾶς to modify “the commandments of the Lord.” However, in discussing the law that was read to the people, 2 Esd 8:8 refers to the law as “the book of the law of God,” and 2 Esd 8:13 repeats the Deuteronomic inclusion of πᾶς by stating that the people assembled ἐπιστήμην πρὸς πάντας τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου (“to attend to all the words of the law”). Regarding Deuteronomic references to all the law, see n.378 above for the text of Deut 27:26 and n.312 above for the text of Deut 11:8a. Deut 28:58 contains the phrase πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου, and Deut 30:10 employs the phrase πάντας τὰς ἐντολὰς.

⁴¹³ According to Smyth (§1174b), πᾶς in the predicate position means all the individual components that make up a whole.
in order to acknowledge the meaning of the phrase in Deuteronomy and in its reinterpretation in 2 Esdras; however, in contrast to Young’s proposal, Paul’s acknowledgement of the Missionaries’ understanding should not be interpreted as an agreement with their position nor should it be seen as the primary emphasis in Paul’s quotation of Scripture. Rather, as Martyn states, Paul, in 3:10, cites “one of the Teachers’ own texts (Deut 27:26)” in order to use it against them.\footnote{\textit{Galatians}, 309.}

Therefore, if we are correct that Paul’s argument in Gal 3:6-14 is alluding to 2 Esd 19-20, his scriptural quotations in 3:10-12 are formulated to demonstrate: 1) that the Missionaries’ emphasis on doing all the individual stipulations of the Mosaic law in order for a person to be deemed faithful and rectified by God presents a conundrum within Scripture\footnote{\textit{Martyn (\textit{Galatians}, 307-16, 328-34) is correct not only in proposing that the Missionaries would have concluded that no inherent contradiction existed between the Scriptures that Paul cites in Gal 3:10-12, but also (here 333) in his understanding that Paul “is concerned to emphasize the contradiction” between Hab 2:4 and Lev 18:5 in 3:11-12. See also n. 358 above. Cf. \textit{Hays, Galatians}, 259-60.} since, as Paul states in 3:6-9, God deemed Abraham as rectified, blessed, and faithful solely on the basis that Abraham believed God’s promise, a promise that was part of God’s initiative act in electing Abraham;\footnote{\textit{As discussed above, in agreement with Martyn (\textit{Galatians}, 297-99), we understand Paul’s description of Abraham as “faithful” (3:9) to refer to Abraham’s belief (Gen 15:6) in God’s promise (Gen 12:3, 18:18) rather than to refer to Abraham’s obedience when tested (Gen 22). Additionally, when Duggan (\textit{Covenant}, 202-4) argues that God’s covenant with Abraham, as described in Neh 9:7-8, refers to Gen 15:6-21, rather than to Gen 22, he notes (here, 203): “Later tradition relates Abraham’s faithfulness to his passing the test of his willingness to sacrifice Isaac (Sir 44:20; 1 Macc 2:52).” However, Sir 44:20 and 1 Macc 2:52 specifically state that Abraham was found faithful in testing. Since there is no explicit mention of Abraham’s testing in Neh 9/2 Esd 19, we cannot conclude that the author of the penitential prayer and covenant renewal ceremony associated Abraham’s faithfulness with the testing described in Gen 22. If, as we argue, Paul is parodying 2 Esd 19-20, his reference to Abraham’s belief and description of Abraham as} 2) that the stipulations of the Mosaic law
should not be subsumed into God’s covenant with Abraham; that faithfulness, in terms of rectification before God, cannot be defined on the basis of obedience to the Mosaic law since the law does not have its origin in faithfulness. By stating, “Now because by the law no one is rectified before God, it is evident that the one rectified on the basis of faithfulness will live” (3:11), Paul is directly combating the confluence of...

“faithful” would agree with the understanding of Abraham’s faithfulness that is presented in 2 Esd 19:7-8, not as it is presented in other passages. If Paul is indeed arguing against the confluence of the covenant with Abraham and the Mosaic law as expressed in 2 Esd 19-20, his insistence that, even in the case of a human covenant, no one would simply reject a ratified covenant or add a supplemental condition to an agreement that had been previously ratified (3:15) is a logical addition to his comments in 3:10-14. However, after arguing that the Mosaic law should not be considered a supplemental condition to God’s freely given promise to Abraham (3:18), Paul would need to explain why the law was given if it should not be combined with the covenant that God previously made with Abraham. Paul provides just such an explanation in 3:19 in which he refers to the law as something that “was added” by employing a form of προστιθημι. Since Paul states in 3:15 that he is speaking on a human level regarding a covenant made between human beings, his employment of προστιθημι in relation to the Mosaic law in 3:19 is significant since the verb was commonly used in secular society to describe a further imposition on a person or to describe adding articles to documents. See LSJ, “προστιθημι,” 1527.

This, of course, does not imply that Paul would condone actions that he considered to be unlawful/unethical. For a discussion of Paul’s understanding of the Jewish law in relation to ethical behavior, see Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People, 93-122. The way in which Paul’s rhetorical parody of scriptural passages illuminate Paul’s conflicting citations in 3:11-12 and contribute to the coherence of his argument in 3:10-14 will be clarified in the following discussion.

NA presents Gal 3:11 as: ὁ δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδὲς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ διήλων, ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ψήσεται. The RSV translates the verse as: “Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the law; for ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’” According to Wright (Climax of the Covenant, 149 n. 42), Christopher Palmer originally proposed a reading of 3:11 that places “the comma before διήλων, rather than after, so that 11a becomes the support for 11b instead of vice versa.” Therefore, in agreement with Wright, Hays (Galatians, 259), Witherington (Grace, 234), and Wakefield (Where to Live, 162), we are translating διήλων with the following ὅτι as if a comma preceded διήλων. Whether ἐκ πίστεως modifies the substantive ὁ δίκαιος or should be read adverbially, thus modifying ψήσεται, is a long-standing debate. While the RSV translates Paul’s emended quotation of Hab 2:4 with ἐκ πίστεως modifying ὁ δίκαιος, this rendering is opposed by some scholars who prefer an adverbial reading. See, e.g., D. Moody Smith, Jr., “O ΔΕ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ,” in Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark (ed. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs; Studies and Documents 29; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), 13-25 and H.C.C. Cavallin, “The Righteous Shall Live by...
the Mosaic law with the Abrahamic covenant as expressed in 2 Esd 19-20.\footnote{Paul again combats the confluence of the Abrahamic covenant with the giving of the law at Sinai in Gal 4:21-31 when he employs allegory in order to explain that there are two separate covenants: the one made at Sinai, which results in slavery, and the one made through the promise to Abraham, which produces freedom. Paul’s allegory is the parodic opposite of the covenant renewal ceremony in 2 Esd 19-20 in which the people attribute their condition of slavery to the failure of the people, past and present, to obey the Mosaic law, which has been incorporated into the one Abrahamic covenant, and they attempt to remedy their present oppression under foreign rulers, a condition which they refer to as slavery (19:36), by covenanted faithfulness to the law (19:38) and entering into the curse in order to conduct their lives according to the Mosaic law (20:29).} Therefore, in the following discussion, we will demonstrate the ways in which reading Gal 3:11-12 as part of Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20 may elucidate Paul’s juxtaposition of the citations from Hab 2:4 and 2 Esd 19:29, which, as discussed above, is itself a rephrased citation of Lev 18:5.

Although Martyn maintains that the Missionaries would have reacted negatively to Paul’s statement in 3:11a,\footnote{Galatians, 330-31.} it is our position that the Missionaries, at least at this point in listening to the letter, would have agreed with Paul on at least two points: 1) it is not the law per se that provides rectification, but it is one’s acceptance of God’s initiative Faith,” \textit{ST} 32: 33-43. Despite strong protests against the RSV translation, numerous commentators interpret \( \varepsilon\kappa\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\varepsilon\omega\varsigma \) as modifying \( \delta\acute{i}k\acute{a}i\varsigma\varsigma \). See, e.g., Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 312-14 and, most recently, de Boer, \textit{Galatians}, 202-6. Additionally, Hays (“‘The Righteous One’ as Eschatological Deliverer: A Case Study in Paul’s Apocalyptic Hermeneutics,” in \textit{Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn} [ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards; JSNTSup 24; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989], 191-215) interprets \( \delta\acute{i}k\acute{a}i\varsigma\varsigma \) as a reference to Christ on the basis that Jews in the first century C.E. would have understood Hab 2:3-4 as carrying “apocalyptic/messianic resonances” and Paul begins the citation with \( \partial\acute{h}\lambda\omicron \) also indicating that his readers would have been familiar with the messianic emphasis in the citation (here, 210-11). In agreement with Martyn (\textit{Galatians}, 313), a messianic reading of the citation of Hab 2:4 accords well with Paul’s argument in Rom 1:17; however, considering Paul’s immediately preceding denial that a person could be rectified by the law (Gal 3:11a), we understand \( \delta\acute{i}k\acute{a}i\varsigma\varsigma \) as referring to the person who is rectified on the basis of Christ’s faithfulness. Cf. de Boer, \textit{Galatians}, 205.}
act\textsuperscript{422} that results in God counting a person as rectified;\textsuperscript{423} and 2) since it is God alone who grants life, the law per se does not have the ability to make anything alive.\textsuperscript{424} In terms of rectification, David Flusser,\textsuperscript{425} in discussing Gal 2:15-21, argues that even though one might be surprised that Paul claims that the Mosaic law does not have the capacity to redeem, such a claim, if properly understood, is actually quite typical of the Judaism of Paul’s day. Flusser states:

Es ist sonderbar, aber soweit ich weiss, wurde jeder vernünftige Jude Paulus

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{422} According to 2 Esd 19:7-8, God’s initiative act included the election of Abraham and the covenant to give him and his seed the land. In the case of corporate Israel, 2 Esd 19:9-15 depicts God’s initiative acts as: 1) the people’s release from slavery in Egypt and the destruction of the Egyptians at the Red Sea; and 2) the gift of the law at Sinai and provisions for travel. When the unfaithfulness of the people is described, their sins are disobeying the commandments, failing to remember God’s miraculous deeds, and desiring “to return to their slavery in Egypt” (19:17). It is only after the people disobey the law given through the hand of Moses that God provides the gift of the Spirit to instruct the people (19:20), presumably in the law.

\textsuperscript{423} We are not ignoring that in Gal 2:21, which was discussed above, Paul clearly states: \textit{ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου δικαιοσύνη, ἀρα Χριστὸς δοερέων ἀπήθηκεν.} However, we are proposing that Paul, especially in Gal 3, is addressing the larger issue at hand: the relationship of the Mosaic law to the Abrahamic covenant. Additionally, our proposal takes into account that Paul began 2:16 by making a statement that he considered to be common knowledge for Jewish Christians: \textit{εἰδότες [ὁ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἔργων νόμου.}

\textsuperscript{424} Note the specific statement addressed to God in 2 Esd 19:6: \textit{καὶ σὺ ἐξοσποιεῖς τὰ πάντα} (“and you make all things alive”). We propose that Paul parodically employs the same verb in Gal 3:21 in order to enlarge the connotation of \textit{ἐξοσποιεῖν} from relating to God’s original creation of the world, as in 2 Esd, to the acknowledgement that God, not the law, bestows life as part of the promise “to those who believe” (3:22) and who currently live in a new creation (cf. Gal 6:15). Gal 3:21 states: \textit{ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν [τοῦ θεοῦ]; μὴ γένοιτο, εἰ γάρ ἔδθη νόμος ὁ διινόμικος ἐξοσποιήσας, δύνατος εἰ νόμοι ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη} (“Is the law, therefore, against the promises [of God]? May it never be! For if a law was given, a law being able to make alive, then righteousness would certainly be on the basis of the law.”). Therefore, we disagree with Wakefield’s interpretation that Paul’s \textit{ἐξοσποιήσαι in Gal 3:21 refers to resurrection. Wakefield (Where to Live, 170 n. 122) states: “In Gal 3:21, \textit{ἐξοσποιέω therefore, may refer not so much to the law’s inability to grant life to us (i.e., salvation), but rather its inability to effect resurrection (i.e., of Christ in particular) and thus to inaugurate the new age.” Although Wakefield is correct that Paul frequently employs \textit{ἐξοσποιέω as a technical term for resurrection (cf. Rom 4:17, 8:11; 1 Cor 15:22, 36, 45), the context of Gal 3, especially Paul’s reference to the previous baptism of the Galatian believers (3:27), indicates that Paul, in 3:21, is referring to the spiritual state of the Galatian believers as “alive,” and thus rectified. Additionally, we maintain that Paul’s focus in 3:21 is not “the law’s inability to grant life to us” (Wakefield’s other option), but that the law is merely tangential in relationship to the promise(s) of God (3:21, 22).

\end{footnotesize}

It is strange, but as far as I know, any reasonable Jew would agree with Paul: obeying the Jewish commandments is not a soteriological entity, or stated more simply: it would appear most curious to a Jew if a person, e.g., a Rabbi, would say to him: “Through the works of the law you will be redeemed.”

Therefore, if we are correct, the vital issue in this part of Galatians is not the ability or inability of the law to produce rectification and/or life. Rather, the vital issue with which Paul is dealing is whether or not the Mosaic law is an inseparable part of God’s covenant with Abraham. According to 2 Esd 19-20, there is one covenant, the covenant with Abraham; however, in the covenant renewal ceremony depicted in the passage, the Mosaic law forms a vital component of that covenant. Additionally, according to 2 Esd 19:19-20, God provided the Spirit to instruct the people in the law after they worshipped the golden calf. If the Missionaries held a similar view of the relationship between the Abrahamic covenant and the Mosaic law, Paul, in Gal 3, primarily seeks to demonstrate that God’s initiative grace bestowed on Abraham stands as the prime example that God gives freely to those who believe God’s word/promise (cf. 3:6, 18). And since God freely gave the covenant, with all of its promises, to Abraham, the further requirement of Torah adherence cannot be a part of God’s covenant with Abraham.

426 Ibid., 33.
427 We will discuss in the following section not only the ways in which Flusser’s comments relate to Sanders’s (Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 205, 470-71, 518n.5, 544) evidence that Palestinian Judaism understood righteousness to refer to one’s faithful standing in the covenant, rather than referring to merit earned via works, but also Sanders’s proposal that Paul understood righteousness as transfer term.
Therefore, in our interpretation, the various points in Paul’s argument are shaped specifically to combat the belief that the Mosaic law was inseparable from God’s covenant with Abraham. Since we understand Paul’s vehement denial that the law is capable of producing blessing/rectification/life/inheritance, along with his specific reference to two covenants in Gal 4:24, as indicating that Paul is arguing against the confluence of the Mosaic law with the Abrahamic covenant, we take 3:11a to be a common point of view between Paul and the Missionaries. As Flusser points out, “any reasonable Jew would agree with Paul: obeying the Jewish commandments is not a soteriological entity.” Because Paul and the Missionaries agree that God alone bestows life and deems a person as rectified and both parties agree that Hab 2:4b expresses a valid statement, Paul employs the entirety of 3:11 as common ground in order to emphasize the dissonance between Hab 2:4b and 2 Esd 19:29/Lev 18:5.

If we are correct in our proposal that the Missionaries viewed the law-free Galatians as unrepentant sinners in dire need of acknowledging that their failure to be Torah-observant is sin and we are correct that the problem in the Galatian churches revolved around an effort to bring Gentile believers under the curse of the law by

428 Paul’s argument includes: the explanation that rectification is not through the law (2:16, 21); the example of Abraham, who responded to God’s initiative with belief and was, therefore, deemed righteous by God (3:6-9); the example of a human covenant and the argument that Abraham’s seed was Christ (3:15-18); Paul’s rationale for the giving of the law (3:19-29); and the allegory, which Paul employs to state specifically that there are two distinct covenants, not one (4:21-5:1).
429 Although some may find it surprising that we propose that Gentiles could be under the curse of the law, several commentators do interpret הָיוָה in 3:13 as referring to Gentiles as well as Jews on a universal level. See, e.g., Martyn, Galatians, 317; Brendan Byrne, ‘Sons of God’ – ‘Seed of Abraham’, (AnBib 83; Rome: 281
requiring them to covenant faithfulness to the law in the manner expressed in 2 Esd 19-20, the two points that Paul makes in Gal 3:12 are clarified. Following his common-ground statement in 3:11, Paul presents the parodic opposite of 2 Esd 19:29 and 38 in Gal 3:12. As noted above, 2 Esd 19:29 states that even though, in past times, the people sinned against God’s law, commandments, and judgments, they remained αἐπειθοῦντα (“disbelieving/disobedient”). And in describing God’s law, commandments, and judgments, the verse quotes Lev 18:5 as ἀ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἀνθρώπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.430 Second Esdras 19:38 stands in contrast to 2 Esd 19:29 in that it describes the correct behavior of those present at the covenant renewal ceremony. According to the passage, correct behavior is characterized by not only acknowledging that sin against God’s law results in a condition of slavery under foreign rulers, but also by covenanting faithfulness to God’s written law,431 which, as 2 Esd 20:29 indicates, involves willingly entering into the curse of the law.

Therefore, in Gal 3:11-12 Paul employs rhetorical parody in a manner consistent with Perelman’s definition of dissociation.432 As mentioned above, dissociation “aims at separating elements which language or a recognized tradition have previously tied

Biblical Institute, 1979), 153; and, most recently, de Boer, Galatians, 209-10. For other interpretations of the identity of those whom Christ freed from the curse of the law, see n.447 below.
430 See above for the entire text of 2 Esd 19:29 and our discussion of the similarity between its wording of Lev 18:5 and Paul’s wording in Gal 3:12.
431 See our previous discussion regarding the emphasis on the written law in Neh/2 Esd and our proposed relationship of that emphasis to Paul’s wording in Gal 3:10.
432 See the introduction to this chapter.
together.”

Previously, the perceived reality, as indicated by 2 Esdras and the Scriptures in general, was that the Mosaic law was an inseparable part of God’s covenant with Abraham. After recalling that God considered Abraham as rectified on the basis that Abraham believed God, Paul reminds his addressees, presumably both the Missionaries and the Galatians, of a principle that they already recognize as valid: rectification actually comes only from God, not the law. He then cites Hab 2:4b, a Scripture with which the Missionaries would no doubt also agree. Although the entirety of Gal 3:11 describes the perceived reality to which the Missionaries adhere, Paul hints that the perceived reality is, in fact, only an appearance of reality even in his citation of Hab 2:4b. As has been well discussed, Paul’s citation differs from the MT and the LXX. If, in agreement with Martyn and de Boer among others, Paul omitted μου from his source, the omission is entirely consistent with the principles involved in

---

433 Perelman, Realm, 49.
434 Note again the importance of Paul’s quotation of Gen 15:6 in Gal 3:6. As Hays (Galatians, 255) states regarding the citation of Gen 15:6: “The passage is crucial for Paul, not only because it links the verb ‘believed’ and the noun ‘righteousness’ but also because it focuses attention on a point in the story of Abraham prior to his circumcision where he is said to be accounted righteous” (emphasis original).
435 Not only does Ziegler’s (Duodecim Prophetae, 264) critical text support the LXX reading of Hab 2:4b as δὲ δίκαιος ἡ πίστις μου σηκυνεῖ, but also Dietrich-Alex Koch (“Der Text von Hab 2:4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament,” ZNW 76 (1985): 68-85, esp. 79-85), after an in-depth study of the variants in the LXX, concludes that the few LXX manuscripts that omit μου (W, 763*, etc.) should be considered secondary readings while those manuscripts that include the pronoun represent “the oldest and original” form of the text (here, 84). On MT Hab 2:4b, see, e.g., Francis I. Andersen, Habakkuk (AB 25; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 208-16 and J. J. M. Roberts, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary (OTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 105-13. As Andersen (Habakkuk, 210-16) notes (MT Hab 2:4b) is best rendered as “but [the] righteous will live by its [i.e., the “vision’s” (mentioned in Hab 2:2)] faithfulness/reliability.” However, since the reliability of the divine communication depends on the faithfulness of God, Andersen does not disagree with translating the masculine pronoun as “his” [i.e., God’s].
436 For the view, based on the context of Gal 3:10-14, that Paul omitted μου from his Vorlage, see esp. Martyn, Galatians, 314 and de Boer, Galatians, 203-5.
rhetorical parody in which the wording of a familiar saying is changed just enough to give the saying a different meaning. If Paul is employing rhetorical parody in order to combat the confluence of the Mosaic law with the Abrahamic covenant, a review of the context of Hab 2:4b will help clarify the importance of omitting the pronoun in Gal 3:11.

As Francis Andersen maintains, the vision of Hab 2:2-5 should be understood as God’s answer to the prophet’s complaints addressed to God in Hab 1.\textsuperscript{437} Additionally, Andersen states: “Hab 1:2-4 does not complain about the Chaldeans, but about the lawlessness in Judah.”\textsuperscript{438} After stressing the “ungodliness” that the prophet has observed (1:3), Hab 1:4 states:

\begin{quote}
διὰ τοῦτο διεσκέδασται νόμος, καὶ οὐ διεξάγεται εἰς τέλος κρίμα, ὅτι ὁ ἀσεβὴς καταδυναστεύει τὸν δίκαιον· ἔνεκεν τούτου ἐξελύσεται τὸ κρίμα διεστραμμένον.
\end{quote}

Therefore the law has been rejected, and judgment is not accomplished in the end, because the ungodly oppress the righteous; for this reason distorted judgment will go forth.

Importantly, Hab 1:4 employs a form of \textit{diaskedazw} to declare that the law “has been rejected.” This is the same verb that appears in Scriptures that demand the ostracism of an unrepentant sinner. As mentioned above, an intentional sinner was to be ostracized from the community because that person “rejected” (\textit{dieskedasev}) the commandments (Num 15:31), and any male who refused to be circumcised was to be ostracized from the

\textsuperscript{437} Habakkuk, 207.
\textsuperscript{438} Ibid., 223.
community because he “rejected” (διεσκέδασεν) the covenant (Gen 17:14).  

If Andersen is correct that Hab 2:2-5 should be understood as God’s reply to the prophet’s complaint that the law has been rejected by God’s people, the Missionaries in Galatia would most likely expect a reference to Hab 2:4b to encourage “the righteous” (i.e., in their opinion, those who had not rejected the law) by reminding them that “the righteous” would live on the basis of God’s faithfulness even though the people around them sinned by rejecting the law. The understanding that God is always faithful to the covenant is not only expressed in numerous Scriptures that describe the people’s unfaithfulness to the law, but it is a prominent idea in 2 Esd 19. In recounting the sins of the people, past and present, 2 Esd 19 depicts God as not only hearing the cries of the people as they suffer the punishment of “slavery” for rejecting the law (vv.26-28), but also as faithfully φιλάσσων τὴν διαθήκην (“keeping/guarding the covenant” in v. 32).

439 See 3.1.2.2 above for the text of Num 15:27-31 and Gen 17:14. Since, as discussed above, it is normally assumed that the Missionaries employed Gen 17 in their insistence that the Galatians be circumcised, the confluence of covenant and circumcision in Gen 17:10-14 further emphasizes the importance of Paul’s quotation of Gen 15:6, a passage in which God declared Abraham righteous purely on the basis that Abraham believed God’s word. While our discussion in 3.1.2.2 dealt primarily with the Scriptures that equated the status of Israelites and proselytes in regards to Torah adherence and the penalties for disobedience, numerous other Scriptures employ forms of διασκεδάζω in discussing the covenant with Israel and/or the Mosaic law. E.g., in discussing the penalties for the people’s disobedience, Lev 26:25b equates failing to do all the commandments with rejecting the covenant (ὡς τε ὑμᾶς μὴ συνελήφετε πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς μου, ὡς διασκέδασατε τὴν διαθήκην μου = “so that you do not do all my commandments, so that [you] reject my covenant”). In recording God’s instruction to Moses to write the song that would be a witness to the people, Deut 31 employs διασκεδάζω twice in declaring that the people will reject the covenant (vv. 16, 20). Additionally, Ps 118:126b states: διεσκέδασαν τὸν νόμον σου (“they rejected your law”).

440 In contrasting the people’s rejection of the covenant with God’s faithfulness to them, Lev 26 references four covenants that God “will remember”: “the covenant with Jacob, the covenant with Isaac, and the covenant with Abraham” (v. 42), and the covenant that God made with the Israelites at Sinai, the Mosaic law (vv. 45-46). Lev 26:44 employs διασκεδάζω to state that God did not reject the covenant with the people even though they were unfaithful.
When Paul omits the pronoun from his quotation of Hab 2:4b, he is changing the focus of the verse. In its original context, Hab 2:4b promises that the person who remained righteous, while others rejected the law, would live on the basis of God’s faithfulness to the covenant made with the people. And, as we noted above, the “covenant” in 2 Esd 19-20 was understood to combine the Mosaic law with the promises made to Abraham and his seed. It is our contention, therefore, that the deletion of μου from the quotation of Hab 2:4b serves two purposes in Paul’s argument, which attempts to dissociate God’s covenant with Abraham from the Mosaic law.

First, by deleting the pronoun, Paul is forming a bridge that connects the example of the faithful Abraham, whom God considered “rectified” solely on the basis that he believed God (3:6), with the Galatians, who should not reject the blessing/grace that has been freely given to them (3:7-8; cf. 2:21a). The connection between Abraham and the Galatian believers is supported by the vocabulary that Paul employs in 3:18 when he states: “God has freely given to Abraham through the promise.”

---

Dunn (Galatians, 187) is certainly correct not only in stressing that χαρίζωμαι in 3:18 is the verbal equivalent of χάρις (2:21), but also in noting “the interlocking character of the three concepts, grace-promise-faith,” in Gal 3. However, we differ with Dunn on several important points. First, we understand “the grace of God” that Paul does not reject (2:21a) to relate directly to the rectification that comes through Christ, not the law (2:21b; 3:11a), since Christ became a curse for us (3:13). Therefore, we do not agree with Dunn that τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ (2:21a) is “the grace of God’ manifested in his [i.e., Paul’s] calling and in his successful missionary work” (ibid., 147). Additionally, the concept of “faith” that Dunn refers to in discussing “the character of Abraham’s inheritance” in 3:18 is not, in our interpretation, the believer’s faith in Christ. It is the faithfulness of Christ that allows the Gentiles not only to receive the blessing of Abraham and the promise of the Spirit (3:14), but also the inheritance that was promised to Abraham (3:18). Our interpretation is supported by Paul’s understanding that Christ is the “seed” of Abraham (3:16).
performed by either Abraham or the Galatians, but rather as faithfulness in the sense that both Abraham and the Galatians believe God’s promise and accept God’s free gift at face value. Just as God freely gave to Abraham (Gal 3:18), the Galatians should realize that they should accept the freely given gift of God, which in their case is the faithfulness of Christ along with the reception of “the promise of the Spirit” (Gal 3:14).

Second, while Hab 2:4b in its original context encourages the person who has not rejected the law to depend on God’s incessant faithfulness to the covenant people that is demonstrated by God’s continuous attempts to turn the people back to their covenant obligations, which in Habakkuk and in 2 Esdras requires obedience to the Mosaic law, Paul’s deletion of the personal pronoun allows him to discuss “faithfulness” in a way that dissociates God’s faithfulness to the promises spoken to Abraham and his seed from divine efforts to turn a lawless people back to Torah obedience. With the deletion of μου

442 We are not proposing that the connection between Abraham and the Galatians should be understood as a call for the Galatians to be faithful in the manner of Abraham. Although Paul’s citation of Hab 2:4b resonates with his account of Abraham in 3:6–9 due to the presence of δίκαιος and πίστις, Abraham is not being presented as an example of faithfulness to be emulated. As mentioned above in our discussion of Gal 3:8, Paul quotes Gen 15:6 in 3:8, which emphasizes that Abraham was considered righteous prior to his circumcision or any other act of obedience (cf. Hays, Galatians, 255). The following discussion of 3:13–14 will demonstrate that the “faithfulness” referenced in 3:11b is Christ’s.

443 As mentioned above, Andersen (Habakkuk, 223) understands the subject of the prophet’s complaint in Hab 1 to be lawlessness in Judah. Additionally, regarding Hab 2, he (ibid., 222) states: “The words of encouragement in vv 2–3 are addressed to the prophet, who, we suggest, is himself the righteous person of v 4b.” However, Andersen (ibid., 216) clearly associates Hab 2:4b with the commandments as he indicates by stating: “In a famous exposition by Rabbi Simlay (a Palestinian rabbi of the third century C.E.) in Makkoth 23b-24a the question is how many rules a person has to keep: ‘but Moses received 613 precepts; but David reduced them to eleven (Psalm 15); but Isaiah reduced them to six (Isa 33: 1516); but Micah reduced them to three (Mic 6:8); but Amos reduced them to two (Amos 5:5).’ Hab 2:4 is then adduced as another way of comprehending all God’s commandments in one aphorism.” In terms of 2 Esd 19, it is important that not only does the passage continuously stress God’s merciful dealings with an unfaithful people, but also that the citation of Lev 18:5 in 19:29 occurs in conjunction with a statement that God witnessed to the people “to turn them back to the law.”
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from the quotation, Paul employs a common form of rhetorical parody, the omission of a word in a known hypotext, in order to reorient the conception of faithfulness away from God’s attempts to turn the people back to the law and toward the faithfulness of Christ, who is not only the seed of Abraham to whom, along with Abraham, God spoke the promises, but is also the one who releases believers from the curse of the law/slavery (Gal 3:13).

Moreover, we find another example of Paul’s dissociation of faithfulness from the law in Gal 3:12. The dissociation is especially evident when we contrast 3:12, which includes Paul’s citation of 2 Esd 19:29/Lev 18:5, with the context of 2 Esd 19. While 2 Esd 19:38 follows a confession of the people’s failure to obey the Mosaic law with the specific declaration that the people now “covenant faithfulness” to the law, Paul follows his quotation of Hab 2:4b with a declaration of his own in 3:12a: ο` ἂν δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως (“now the law is not in accordance with faithfulness”). Additionally, 2 Esd 19:29 depicts the people’s confession of their sin in not obeying the law, which included the specific mention of commandments and judgments, and then immediately quotes Lev 18:5 in order to promise life to those who keep the law. In contrast, Paul follows his quotation of Hab 2:4b with a declaration of his own in 3:12a: ο` ἂν δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως (“now the law is not in accordance with faithfulness”).

444 We have proposed above that Paul is arguing against the confluence of the Abrahamic covenant with the Mosaic law by parodying several items that were emphasized in the covenant renewal ceremony as vital in order for the people to be faithful to God: 1) confession of sins against the law (2 Esd 19:33-35); 2) the need to covenant faithfulness to the law (2 Esd 19:38); and 3) the need to convince one’s “brothers” to enter into “the oath and the curse in order to walk in the law of God” (2 Esd 20:29). If Paul is indeed arguing against these emphases, Dunn’s (Galatians, 188-90) interpretation of Gal 3:19a fits quite well within the context of Paul’s argument. When Paul states in Gal 3:19a that the law “was added because of transgressions,” he is, as Dunn claims, presenting “a positive description of the role of the law in the period prior to the coming of Christ” (here, 189) in which transgressions could be dealt with through the sacrificial system.
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declaration that the law is not in accordance with faithfulness with his quotation of Lev 18:5, which as noted above is closer to the wording of 2 Esd 19:29 than it is to Lev 18:5, in order to emphasize the conundrum inherent in covenanting faithfulness to the law when the law does not have its origin in faithfulness.\footnote{Of the various scholarly works discussing Paul’s scriptural quotations in Gal 3:10-14 that were mentioned above in n.362, Wakefield’s \textit{(Where to Live, 65-96)} overview of the numerous attempts to explain the contradiction (or deny that a contradiction exists) between the citations is an excellent reference.}

Furthermore, if we are correct that Paul is alluding to 2 Esd 19-20 in Gal 3:10-14, his choice of vocabulary in 3:13 directly relates to the people’s admission in 2 Esd 19:36 that they “are slaves today” because of their failure to obey the law.\footnote{The Greek text is presented above.} Since εξαγοράζω literally means “buy back” and was frequently employed commercially to depict purchasing a person back from slavery,\footnote{See BDAG, “έξαγοράζω,” 343. Although many commentators note the commercial connotation of εξαγοράζω that relates to the emancipation of slaves (e.g., Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 150; Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 317; de Boer, \textit{Galatians}, 210; Hays, \textit{Galatians}, 260; and Witherington, \textit{Grace}, 238), only Hays and Witherington relate the verb in 3:13 to Paul’s discussion of slavery and freedom in Gal 4. While Martyn acknowledges that the verb does mean “to deliver from slavery,” his claim that εξαγοράζω should be viewed as synonymous with δικειμόνιο to recognize the connection between Christ’s action in buying us back from slavery in 3:13 and Paul’s allegory representing two covenants: one from Mt Sinai that bears children for slavery (4:24-25), and one that produces freedom (4:26-28, 31). In contrast to Martyn, we view the connotation of emancipation from slavery as a vital part of properly interpreting not only 3:10-14, but also the rest of the letter.} this connotation of the verb should be considered not only when discussing the relationship of 3:13 to Paul’s previous references to “the law” (vv.10-12) and “curse” (v.10), but also in relationship to his subsequent discussion of slavery and freedom in Gal 4. Therefore, when Paul states: Χριστὸς ἠμᾶς ἐξαγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου (“Christ bought us back from the curse of the law”), he is declaring that Christ bought back those who reject Torah-
observance from the curse of slavery, which is described in 2 Esd 19-20 as the penalty for rejecting the law.\(^{448}\)

In our interpretation, ἡμᾶς (“us”) in 3:13 and λάβωμεν (“we might receive”) in 3:14 apply to Gentile believers as well as Jewish believers.\(^{449}\) Since according to the

---

\(^{448}\) As Duggan (Covenant Renewal, 224, 232) notes, the covenant renewal ceremony not only reinterprets the Priestly and Deuteronomic materials as a “mosaic of traditions,” but also “represents a transition in the manner of the community’s defining itself: no longer in terms of the exile (cf. Neh 7:6-72a), but rather of commitment to Torah (Neh 10:29-40; cf. 9:13-14).” Therefore, it is not surprising that 2 Esd 19-20 depicts the curse of the law as “slavery” to enemies while in the land promised to Abraham and his seed rather than as dispersion among the nations. Although certain elements from Lev 26 and Deut 28 are maintained as representative of the curses that would be incurred as a result of disobeying Torah (e.g., slavery to enemies who occupy the land as in Lev 26:25, 32 and Deut 28:48, 68; and the authority of enemies over the produce and cattle of the people as in Lev 26: 16, 25, 32 and Deut 28:48), there is no mention of the penalty of dispersion in other lands in 2 Esd 19-20 (contrast Lev 26:33 and Deut 28:25, 64). However, although there is no mention of exile, 2 Esd 19:29 still affirms Lev 18:5, and, as mentioned above, the covenant renewal ceremony most likely reflects a disagreement over which group(s) could claim to be the sons/seed/heirs of Abraham. Therefore, if Paul is combating the confluence of the Abrahamic covenant and the Mosaic law as it appears in the covenant renewal ceremony, he must not only deal with the relationship of Torah observance to life/death, blessing/curse, and slavery/freedom, but he must also explain the way in which Gentiles could be considered the sons/heirs of Abraham apart from the law. As mentioned above in our discussion of Gal 2:15-21, Paul has already given his own interpretation of the curse of the law as spiritual death to those who reject the law. However, he has assured the Galatians that even though he suffered spiritual death by rejecting the law, he lives to God via the faithfulness of Christ, who now lives in him (2:20). Paul will again address the relationship of the law to life in 3:21. And in Gal 4:6 Paul reiterates that Christ lives in believers via the Spirit: “And because you are sons, God sent the spirit of his son into our hearts crying: ‘Abba, Father.’” Additionally, we maintain that Paul, after declaring that Torah-observant behavior, such as that demanded of the faithful in 2 Esd 19-20, is no longer necessary since the Galatians are rectified through the faithfulness of Christ, includes Gal 5:13-26 to ensure that his comments regarding slavery under the law and freedom in Christ could not be misinterpreted in a way that would condone immoral behavior. In contrast to 2 Esd 19:20, which states that God gave the Spirit to instruct the people in the law (or cause the people to understand the law), Paul describes the fruit of the indwelling Spirit (5:22-23) and states that the believer lives by the Spirit (5:25a).

\(^{449}\) Of course, to whom ἡμᾶς refers is a debated issue. For the view that ἡμᾶς in 3:13 refers exclusively to Jews, see e.g.: Betz, Galatians, 148, esp. n. 101; Terrence L. Donaldson, “The ‘Curse of the Law’ and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3:13-14,” NTS 32 (1986): 94-112; Wright, Climax of the Covenant, 151-53; Hays, Galatians, 262; Matera, Galatians, 124; and Witherington, Grace, 236-37. For the view that Paul has everyone, Jew and Gentile, in mind on a universal level, see e.g.: Martyn, Galatians, 317; Brendan Byrne, Sons of God, 153; and, most recently, de Boer, Galatians, 209-10. Dunn (Jesus, Paul and the Law, 228-29; 235-36 n. 58) argues that Paul has Jews primarily in mind in Gal 3:13; however, because Gentiles are affected by Jewish exclusiveness, Gentiles could also be included in the pronoun. In Galatians (176), Dunn interprets ἡμᾶς as meaning “both Jew and Gentile.” For the understanding that ἡμᾶς in 3:13 refers to Jewish and Gentile believers, see e.g.: Williams, “Justification,” 91-92; James M. Scott, Adoption as Sons.
Scriptures mentioned above the native-born Israelite and the proselyte living among the covenant people were equal in terms of requirements and penalties, it is likely that the Missionaries maintained that anyone, whether Jewish non-believer in Christ, Jewish believer in Christ, or Gentile believer in Christ, who rejected the law would be subject to the penalties and curse of the law. Since, as we have argued above, the Incident at Antioch was the result of law-free Gentile believers being viewed as unrepentant sinners who should be ostracized from the community of the faithful, it is also likely that the Missionaries followed Deut 29:19-21 in associating all the curses of the law with the unrepentant sinner and demanding that such a person be excluded so that the “righteous” within the community would not be subject to harm. Additionally, we know from Gal 4:17 that the threat of exclusion was a reality for some within the Galatian churches.

Therefore, if some of the Galatians feared that they would incur the curse of the law and be excluded from the community of the faithful as a result of remaining Torah free, it would have been necessary for Paul to state that all believers, Gentile and Jewish alike, were bought back from the curse of the law by Christ’s action in “becoming a curse of God.”

---


450 See 3.1.2.2 above.
451 See n.296 above for the punishment that any unrepentant person who rejected the law would suffer as a result of the curse of the law.
452 For the text of Deut 29:19-21, see 3.1.2.2 above. For a discussion of Deut 29:19-21 in relation to Paul’s argument in Gal, see nn.291-93 above.
453 Gal 4:17 states: ἵνα σὺν καλῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκκλείσαι ἵμας θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοῖς ζηλοῦτε (“They strive after you, not correctly, but they desire to exclude you, in order for you to strive after them”).
for us.”

3.1.6.1 Galatians 3:26-29 as support for including Gentiles in ἰμάς (3:13)

An interpretation of ἰμάς that is inclusive of all believers regardless of ethnic background is supported by a careful reading of Paul’s declarations in 3:26-29. These verses state:

26 Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ;
27 ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐφαπτόμεθα, Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθη.
28 ὡκ ἐν τούτῳ Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἑλληνικὸς, οὐκ ἐν δώδεκα οὐδὲ ἐλευθεροφόρος, οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλη, πάντες γὰρ ἰμείς εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
29 εἰ δὲ ἰμείς Χριστοῦ, ἂρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.

26 For you are all sons of God through the [previously mentioned] faithfulness [that was evident] in Christ Jesus; 454
27 For as many of you as were baptized into Christ, you entered into Christ. 455
28 Neither Jew nor Greek is inside Christ, neither slave nor free person is inside Christ, not male and female inside Christ; for you all are one in Christ Jesus.

---

454 As Matera (Galatians, 124-25, 142), Hays (Galatians, 261, 271), and de Boer (Galatians, 215, 242) emphasize, διὰ τῆς πίστεως (3:14, 26) refers back to the “faithfulness of Jesus Christ” first mentioned in 2:16. Paul includes the article in διὰ τῆς πίστεως (3:26 and in 3:14) in order to clarify that he is referring to Christ’s faithfulness mentioned in 2:16, 20; 3:22. Cf. the anaphoric article in διὰ τῆς ἐγάπης in 5:13, which refers back to διὰ ἐγάπης in 5:6. Additionally, in agreement with Sam K. Williams (“Again Pistis Christou,” CBQ 49 [1987]: 431-46, esp. 437-38, 444-45), Matera (Galatians, 135-36), Hays (Galatians, 269-70), and de Boer (Galatians, 238-39), we interpret τὴν πίστιν and τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν in 3:23, ἐκ πίστεως in 3:24, and ὑλοῦσας . . . τῆς πίστεως in 3:25 to refer to the faith of Christ; however, we consistently translate πίστις as “faithfulness.”

455 LSJ (“ἐνδύω I. 2,” 562) defines ἐνδύω as “to go into.” Our translation of ἐνδύσασθε as “you entered into,” rather than the typical “you put on” (RSV) or “you have clothed yourselves with” (NRSV), compliments Paul’s employment of ἐνέμει in 3:28. On ἐνέμει, see the following note.

456 See BDAG, “ἐνεμάι, 1,” 334; “ἐνεμαί,” 336; and esp. LSJ, “ἐνεμάι, 1, 2,” 562. These lexical entries show that ἐνεμαί was employed to indicate that one thing was inside or within another. Therefore, the verb should not be understood as synonymous with εἰμί. Although Martyn (Galatians, 376 n. 252) acknowledges that ἐνεμιμι is the contracted form of ἐνέμει, his translation, which views ἐνεμαί as synonymous with εἰμί, fails, in our opinion, to follow his own recognition that Paul states in 3:26 that the Galatian believers “became sons of God by being incorporated into God’s Son” (here, 375).
And if you are of Christ, then you are the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise.

Although the RSV and the NRSV begin v. 26 with “for in Christ Jesus,” we propose that ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ should be understood in relationship to διὰ τῆς πίστεως. If we are correct that Paul is seeking to counter any requirement that the Galatians must covenant faithfulness to the Mosaic law, given the understanding that the law is an integral part of God’s covenant with Abraham as expressed in 2 Esd 19-20, Paul is declaring that the faithfulness exhibited in Christ has already resulted in the Galatians becoming “sons of God.” As has been well noted, the explanatory γὰρ indicates that v.26 presents the rationale for Paul’s declaration in v.25, which states: “Now after the faithfulness [of Christ] came we are no longer under [the restrictive confinement of] the paidagogos.” While it is generally recognized that the emphatic placement of πάντες (“all”) is intended to promote unity and acceptance within the fellowship of believers, many find Paul’s declaration that the Galatians are “sons of God” rather than “sons of Abraham” abrupt given the frequent references to Abraham in 3:6-18. However, if we understand that the Galatians can now be called “sons of God” via the faithfulness that was evident in Christ and that those baptized into Christ enter into Christ, who was the

457 The Greek text of Gal 3:25 is: ἐλθόσθε δὲ τῆς πίστεως οἰκέτες ὑπὸ παιδαγωγὸν ἐσμέν. For a historical overview of the various interpretations of παιδαγωγός in Gal 3:25, see de Boer, Galatians, 240-41. See n.454 for the importance of the anaphoric article in τῆς πίστεως.
458 Cf., e.g., Hays, Galatians, 271; Martyn, Galatians, 374; Byrne, Sons of God, 165.
459 See esp. Byrne, Sons of God, 165; and Martyn (Galatians, 374) who refers to the phrase “sons of God” as “shifting the ground abruptly and fundamentally by speaking of descent from God through Christ.” On the inclusion of Gentiles as “sons of God” in relationship to the OT epithet “sons of God” as an exclusive reference to Israel, see e.g., Hays, Galatians, 271 and Dunn, Galatians, 202.
Son of God, the term “sons of God” can logically be applied to all those who are in/inside Christ.

Although Williams\(^{460}\) claims that ένδυω with the connotation of “to put on” is “an idiomatic figure of speech meaning ‘to be characterized by the named quality or attribute,’” this metaphorical meaning does not interpret ένδυω in 3:27b in relationship to ένεμι in 3:28. However, translating ένεδύσασθε as “you entered into” continues Paul’s stress on being “in Christ” (3:26) and “baptized into Christ” (3:27a). Additionally, our interpretation takes seriously the emphatic placement of είς Χριστόν before ἐβαπτίσθητε (v.27a) along with the emphatic placement of Χριστόν before ένεδύσασθε (v.27b).

Although Paul does state that baptism results in the believer’s position “in Christ,” he is emphasizing “in Christ” rather than “you were baptized.” There is no reason, therefore, to interpret ένεδύσασθε in relationship to baptismal practices when Paul’s main emphasis in 3:26-28 is to declare the equality of all believers in Christ. Consequently, we disagree with those who propose that Paul’s words in these verses are based on a “baptismal formula.”\(^{461}\)

---

\(^{460}\) Galatians, 104-7, esp. 105.

\(^{461}\) See, esp., Martyn (Galatians, 378-80) who maintains that even though the exact baptismal liturgy cannot be identified “with precision,” he is confident “that the formula is confined to vv 26-28.” But note Hays’s (Galatians, 271) assessment of 3:27: “The wording here is probably not a direct quotation of a liturgical formula, since early Christian baptism was performed ‘in the name of Jesus Christ’ or some variant thereof (cf. Matt 28:19; Acts 2:38; 1 Cor 6:11).” Hays (ibid., 272), however, does view 3:28 as a “probable” quotation of “an early Christian baptismal formula (cf. 1 Cor 12:13; Col 3:11).” Betz (Galatians, 181-84) discusses numerous sources from which Paul could have drawn the baptismal formula; however, all the sources that are verbally similar to Gal 3:26-28 postdate Galatians. While I agree with Troy W. Martin (“The Covenant of Circumcision [Genesis 17:9-14] and the Situational Antitheses in Galatians 3:38” JBL 122 [2003]: 111-25) that the baptismal-formula explanation does not adequately explain Paul’s references
Although Hays, following Wayne A. Meeks,\textsuperscript{462} views ἁγιασμὸς as an allusion to the baptism practices of early Christians, who were baptized naked and then reclothed, he is correct in connecting the significance of being baptized into Christ with the mysterious union of being “in Christ.”\textsuperscript{463} Translating ἁγιασμὸς as “you entered into” further highlights the connection that Hays has already made and coheres well with Paul’s argument regarding the status of the Galatian believers within the community of the faithful. The common existence \textit{in/inside Christ} of \textit{all} believers allows \textit{all} believers, regardless of ethnicity, social status, or gender, to be referred to as “sons of God” (3:26) and the “seed of Abraham” (3:29) because, as Paul previously explained, Christ is τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (2:20) and the singular “seed” of Abraham (3:16).

Nevertheless, a fair question at this point would be whether or not it is likely that Paul would have employed ἁγιασμός with the connotation of “entering into,” especially considering that the majority of the canonical passages that employ forms of ἁγιασμός are most properly translated with the connotation of “putting on.”\textsuperscript{464} However, there are

\begin{itemize}
\item to slave/free person or male/female, I disagree with his view that \textit{all three pairs} of opposites are \textit{fully explained} in light of the covenant of circumcision as presented in Gen 17. L. Ann Jervis (\textit{Galatians} [NIBCNT 9; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999], 107) has also proposed: “The inclusion of the phrase “male nor [sic] female” in Galatians may be because of the issue of circumcision.” See below for our interpretation of the importance of the slave/free person pair in relationship to the threat of enslavement as just punishment for the rejection of the law.
\item \textit{Galatians}, 272.
\item E.g., ἁγιασμός is employed with the connotation of putting on: clothing (Gen 3:21); priestly garments (Exod 28:41); royal robes (Isa 22:21); sackcloth (Ps 35:12), etc.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{463} \textit{Galatians}, 272.
\textsuperscript{464} E.g., ἁγιασμός is employed with the connotation of putting on: clothing (Gen 3:21); priestly garments (Exod 28:41); royal robes (Isa 22:21); sackcloth (Ps 35:12), etc.
several canonical examples that do employ ἐνδύω with the connotation of “entering into.”

For example, two verses in Chronicles (1 Chr 12:19 and 2 Chr 24:20) describe the Spirit of God “entering into” (ἐνδύω) a human being. And most importantly when Paul’s statements in 1 Cor 15:53-54 are read with the connotation of “entering into,” they accord much better with his quotation of Isa 25:8 than when they are read with the connotation of “putting on.” First Corinthians 15:53-54 states:

53 ἐὰν γὰρ τὸ φθορτὸν τὸ ἑκκόρος ἁθανασίαν καὶ τὸ θυσια τὸ ἑκκόρος ἁθανασίαν.
54 οὕτως δὲ τὸ φθορτὸν τὸ ἑκκόρος ἁθανασίαν καὶ τὸ θυσια τὸ ἑκκόρος ἁθανασίαν, τότε θεωρήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος.

53 For this perishable [body] must enter into incorruptibility and this mortal [body] must enter into immortality.
54 Now when this perishable [body] enters into incorruptibility and this mortal [body] enters into immortality, then the saying that has been recorded will occur: “Death has been swallowed up in victory.”

Considering that a substance must be put inside something else in order to be swallowed up by it, interpreting the passage with ἐνδύω rendered as “entering into” leads logically toward Paul’s quotation of Isa 25:8 in which death is swallowed up into victory.⁴⁶⁵

⁴⁶⁵ On the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Isa 25:8, see Koch (Schrift, 61-63), Stanley (Language, 210-11) and Thiselton (First Corinthians, 1299). I am in agreement with Koch, Stanley, and Thiselton that Paul’s source for Isa 25:8 must have been a Greek text, which existed prior to the reading presented in the LXX, and most likely agreed with the sense of MT Isa 25:8. As Stanley (Language, 210 n.101) points out, the LXX rendering of the verse “is in clear contradiction to the surrounding verses (cf. vv. 6a, 8b).” Further support for our interpretation of ἐνδύω comes from the surrounding context of Isa 25:8, which contains numerous references to thirst and the act of drinking: God is described as a shade for the thirsty (25:4) who have been unjustly treated and who thirst in Zion (25:5); and a feast prepared by the Lord is described at which all nations drink gladness and wine (25:6). If Paul took the context of Isa 25:4-6 into consideration when he alluded to v. 8, the connotation of ἐνδύω that describes one thing entering into
Consequently, we can be fairly certain that Paul employs ἐνδοῦω with our proposed connotation in at least one other passage besides Gal 3:27.

Therefore, if our reading of 3:26-29 is correct, Paul’s references to slave/free person and male/female in 3:28 are just as relevant to the Galatian situation as is his reference to Jew and Greek. And if we are correct that Paul is arguing against the confluence of the Abrahamic covenant and the Mosaic law as it is represented in 2 Esd 19-20 and he is declaring “Christ bought us back from the curse of the law” (3:13) in order to dispel the belief that the curse of the law included enslavement as just punishment for an unfaithful community that rejects the law, he would naturally want to deny that the rejection of the Mosaic law, a law previously viewed as a vital component in being faithful to the covenant between God and Abraham, would still result in enslavement. As we have proposed above, Paul assures the Galatians in 3:26-29 that the mystical union with Christ, which results from their baptism into Christ, allows them to be considered “sons of God” based on their new existent in/inside Christ. Therefore, it another fits the context of drinking wine at the Lord’s feast much better than “putting on” something since wine must enter into the mouth in order to be swallowed.

466 Regarding 3:28, Martyn (Galatians, 376) claims that Paul names pairs of opposites that “were identified as the elements that give to the cosmos its dependable structure”; however, in terms of the crisis in Galatia, Martyn maintains that Paul “is interested only in the first pair.” Cf. de Boer, Galatians, 243-47.

467 See 3.1.1.3 above in which we noted: 1) the scriptural punishment for failing to keep all the commandments is stated as a return to slavery (Deut 28:41, 48, 68); and 2) Josephus includes the warning that the people “would be sold into slavery” in his discussion of Deut 28 (A.J. 4.312-12). Additionally, see the above discussion not only of 2 Esd 19:28-35 in which the punishment for the people’s apostasy is stated to be a return to slavery, but also of the people’s confession in 2 Esd 19:36-38 in which the people admit that they are slaves because of a lack of faithfulness to the law.
stands to reason that the same existence in/inside Christ allows the Galatian believers to participate in the faithfulness of Christ, which has forever invalidated the Deuteronomic curses associated with unfaithfulness/rejection of the law (cf. 3:10-13, 23-25; 4:1-7, 21-5:1). Thus, since believers now exist in/inside Christ, they are free to reject the Mosaic law as a requirement for faithful members of the covenant community. In other words, participation in Christ through baptism allows the Galatian believers to “live in the faithfulness of the Son of God,” which now supplants human faithfulness to the law and its prescribed methods of atonement for transgressions, just as Paul has previously acknowledged that he lives in Christ’s faithfulness (2:20). Therefore, the faithfulness of Christ ends forever the Deuteronomic threat of the community’s future enslavement, which was clearly affirmed in the covenant renewal ceremony described in 2 Esd 19-20. 468

In our opinion, Paul’s repudiation of the Deuteronomic threat of future enslavement as the just penalty for the community’s rejection of the Mosaic law focuses on two main points: 1) the Mosaic law was not an original component of God’s covenant with Abraham; however, it was added until the time that Christ would come (3:19) as a separate covenant in a two-covenant structure, which consisted of the everlasting covenant of promise to the seed of Abraham (i.e., Abrahamic covenant) and the temporary covenant of blessings and curses made at Sinai (3:19-25; 4:21-5:1); and 2) the faithfulness of Christ freed all believers, who participate in Christ’s faithfulness as a

468 See the preceding note.
result of baptism (3:27), from the curse of the law/threat of enslavement because Christ actualized the curse upon himself (3:13) and, thus, annihilated its power of enslavement over humanity (4:1-7).

Additionally, if we are correct in our proposal that the law-free Galatian believers were threatened with exclusion from the faithful community because they refused to adopt the requirements of Torah and were therefore considered unrepentant sinners,\textsuperscript{469} Paul’s argument nullifying the scripturally predicted future enslavement of the people if they allowed “Torah-free sinners” to remain as full members of their community may very well have been aimed at reassuring the Missionaries and the entire community of believers that continued fellowship with the law-free Galatians would not harm the community as a whole. This seems highly probable since Paul allegorically identifies the covenant at Sinai with slavery in 4:24 even though Deut 28 repeatedly states that a return to slavery would be the just punishment for rejecting covenantal requirements (vv. 41, 48, 68). In our opinion, Paul’s allegory describing the women as representing two different covenants continues Paul’s parodic reversal of texts demanding obedience to the law. In this particular case, Paul reverses the Deuteronomic threat of a return to slavery by declaring that the law itself enslaves (4:24; 5:1). In our interpretation, Paul mentions the slave/free person pair of opposites in order to alleviate any concern on the part of the community as a whole that a failure to ostracize the uncircumcised male believers would

\textsuperscript{469} See 3.1.1 above, esp. n.20; 3.1.1.3 above, esp. nn.88-89.
result in corporate slavery.⁴⁷⁰ Therefore, far from being irrelevant, the slave/free person pair of opposites directly addresses a probable concern of the community.

Even though we disagree with the consensus opinion that the slave/free person pair of opposites does not directly relate to the Galatian crisis,⁴⁷¹ the common opinion that Paul’s final pair of opposites, citing a phrase from Gen 1:27, is an implied reference to new creation and, therefore, should be read in conjunction with καὶ νησίς (“new creation”) in Gal 6:15 is certainly correct.⁴⁷² However, since Paul’s singular explicit reference to καὶ νησίς in the letter is clearly connected to his argument insisting that circumcision has no relevance for the Galatian believers,⁴⁷³ it stands to reason that if we understand ἀρσεν καὶ θηλυ (3:27c) in conjunction with καὶ νησίς (6:15) we must read

---

⁴⁷⁰ See 3.1.3.1 above for our previous discussion of Josephus’ (A. J. 4.312-13) understanding of Deut 27-34 in which he stressed the prohibition against overlooking sins within the community. The scriptural basis for his position was taken from Deut 13:6-8. In his discussion, Josephus clearly states that the failure of the community to deal appropriately with transgressions of the law would bring about the Deuteronomic curses, which included the threat of the future enslavement of the people. Additionally, see 3.1.2.2 above for Philo’s insistence that apostates must be banished (Spec. 1.54-59) and that those who remain in the community must be perfect in the law (Spec. 1.60-65).

⁴⁷¹ E.g., de Boer (Galatians, 243-44) states: “In citing the baptismal formula, Paul is interested primarily in the distinction between Jew and Greek (=non-Jew or Gentile); between people who practice (male) circumcision as the determinative mark of their communal identity and those who do not (cf. 2:7-10; 5:6; 6:15). Elsewhere in Galatians, Paul makes metaphorical use of the language of slavery and freedom for theological ends (cf. 1:10; 2:5; 4:1-7; 4:21-5:1); yet the social distinction between slave and free person in v. 28 plays no further role in Galatians” (emphasis original). For the common view, in agreement with de Boer, that Paul is not abrogating social distinctions in society in general, see, e.g., Dunn, Galatians, 207; Hays, Galatians, 272-73; Martyn, Galatians, 376. While this view is certainly correct, in our reading of Gal 3:28 Paul mentions the slave/free person pair in order to dispel the belief that slavery would be the just punishment for rejecting the law and its demands, especially the demand that all males, ethnic Jew and Gentile alike, be circumcised in order for that person to remain a part of the community.

⁴⁷² See, e.g., Martyn, Galatians, 376; Hays, Galatians, 273; and Witherington, Grace, 279. However, we do not agree that Paul repeats the phrase because it is part of a baptismal formula.

⁴⁷³ Gal 6:15 states: οὔτε γὰρ περιτομή τί ἔστιν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἄλλα καὶ νησίς. Hays (Galatians, 344) suggests a translation that accurately expresses Paul’s syntax: “For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything, but - new creation!” (emphasis original).
While we do interpret Gal 3:28c in relation to Gen 17, we disagree with Martin ("Covenant of Circumcision," 117) who states: "Connecting the male/female pair to the covenant of circumcision is preferable to connecting it to the creation story."

The relevant phrase in Gen 1:27 is: ἄρσεν καὶ ἡλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς ("[God] made them male and female").

Grace, 279. However, we are not in agreement with Witherington’s proposal that the issue also included the demand for women “to be married to Christian men who were adopting such a lifestyle.”

"Covenant of Circumcision," 119.

There are, of course, other proposed explanations. E.g., Dennis Ronald MacDonald (There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism [HDR 20; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987]) proposes that Paul is quoting a dominical saying; and Wayne A. Meeks (“The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity,” HR 13 [1974]: 165-208), while agreeing that the phrase was part of a baptismal formula, understands it as a reference to the androgyny of Adam. Cf. Betz, Galatians, 195-200.
of a Scripture that uses the neuter forms.\textsuperscript{479} Since, according to Wevers’s critical edition,\textsuperscript{480} Gen 17 does not employ the neuter form of ἀρσην nor any form of θήλυς, there is no verbal correspondence between Gal 3:28c and Gen 17. Although Martin appeals to Meeks’ assessment that Gen 1:27 is not applicable to Paul’s argument in Galatians,\textsuperscript{481} we propose that Paul again employs rhetorical parody in his quotation of ἀρσην καὶ θήλυ from Gen 1:27 in order to dissociate the covenant of circumcision as expressed in Gen 17 from the believer’s existence \textit{in/inside} Christ.

While Paul has denied the existence of the first two pairs of opposites \textit{inside Christ} in order to argue against the confluence of the Mosaic law with the Abrahamic covenant and to insist that \textit{all} are “sons of God” because they are \textit{inside} Christ and, therefore, are the \textit{seed} of Abraham, Gen 17:9-14 still presents a problem for Paul’s insistence that the Galatians do not need to be circumcised. Gen 17:9-14 describes the covenant of circumcision as not only a \textit{covenant between God and Abraham}, but also as an \textit{everlasting covenant between God and Abraham’s seed}. Additionally, Gen 17:14 specifically requires the exclusion of any male who refuses to be circumcised. Gen 17: 9-14\textsuperscript{482} states:

\begin{quote}
9 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Αβραὰμ Σὺ δὲ τὴν διαθήκην μου διατηρήσεις, σὺ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σὲ εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν.
10 καὶ αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἢν διατηρήσεις, ἀνὰ μέσου ἐμοῦ καὶ ἱμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ...
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{479} See Smyth, §291a; and Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 195.
\textsuperscript{480} \textit{Genesis}, 176-82.
\textsuperscript{481} Meeks (“Androgyne,” 181) denies that the third pair of opposites in Gal 3:28 is connected to Gen 1:27 since it is not related to “the immediate context” of Gal 3:28 “nor with any of Paul’s themes in Galatians.”
\textsuperscript{482} The Greek text is from Wevers, \textit{Genesis}, 178-79.
And God said to Abraham, “And you will carefully observe my covenant, you and your seed after you for their generations.

And this is the covenant, which you will carefully observe, between me and you and between your seed after you for their generations; every male of you will be circumcised,

And you will be circumcised [in] the flesh of your uncircumcision, and it will be for a sign of the covenant between me and you.

And a child of eight days will be circumcised by you every male for your generations, the one born of your house and the one that is bought with money from any son of a foreigner, who is not from your seed.

The one that is born in your house and the one that is bought with money will surely be circumcised, and my covenant will be upon your flesh for an everlasting covenant.

And an uncircumcised male, who will not be circumcised [in] the flesh of his uncircumcision on the eighth day, that person will be ostracized from his people because he has rejected my covenant.

As Gen 17 clearly indicates, the covenant that God made with Abraham, while predating and totally separate from the covenant at Sinai, requires the circumcision of all males and is an everlasting covenant applicable for all generations of the seed of Abraham. Therefore, Paul’s argument for the distinctiveness of the Abrahamic covenant from the Mosaic law, while logical in refuting any threat that the Galatian believers could be subject to the Deuteronomistic curses associated with rejecting the Mosaic law, would
have not been effective in countering the Missionaries’ insistence on circumcision. In fact, the Missionaries could have easily used Paul’s stress on the permanence of the Abrahamic covenant, as opposed to the temporary nature of the law, as a rationale for the circumcision of Gentile believers who were now, according to Paul, the seed of Abraham (3:29b).

However, by quoting Gen 15:6 in 3:6 Paul has already emphasized that the divine promise to Abraham was initiated by God as a free gift of grace and he has supported his parodic reinterpretation of Gen 15 by quoting, in 3:8, Gen 12:3, a text that according to Scripture occurred earlier than Gen 15:6. It is our opinion that, in an effort to counter any argument based on Gen 17 that circumcision is still a necessary requirement for Gentile believers, Paul again appeals to an earlier account in Genesis, the first creation story. But Paul not only uses rhetorical parody in quoting ἄρσεν καὶ ἡμῖν from Gen 1:27 in order to negate that ἄρσεν καὶ ἡμῖν exist inside Christ, he also adds: “for you all are one in Christ Jesus.” And in 3:28d Paul switches from the neuter adjectives used in the creation story to the masculine εἷς (“one”). Although the masculine cardinal is grammatically necessary in order to agree with the masculine πᾶντες, the change to the masculine gender is also important for Paul’s argument.

483 See 3.1.5 above.
484 In noting the masculine cardinal, Kari Elisabeth Børresen (“God’s Image, Man’s Image? Patristic Interpretation of Gen 1,27 and 1 Cor 11,7” in The Image of God: Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition [ed. Kari Elisabeth Børresen; Fortress: Minneapolis, 1995], 187-209, here 188) states: “The negating citation of Gen 1,27b in Gal 3:28: ‘there is not male and female, for you are all one (collective male) in Christ,’ is interpreted as including women instead of abolishing femaleness” (emphasis original).
In the same way that we have argued above that the Galatian believers do not have to fear divine punishment for rejecting the law on the basis that their mystical union inside Christ allows them to participate in the faithfulness that Christ exhibited to the point of death, we now propose that Paul declares that all believers are incorporated into the masculine εἰς inside Christ in order to participate mystically in the previous circumcision of Christ. Paul states in 4:4: “God sent his son, born of a woman, born under the law.” Since a male born “under the law” would have been circumcised on the eighth day, it is safe to assume that Christ was circumcised in accordance with the stipulations presented in Gen 17. Therefore, the mystical union of all believers inside Christ makes the post-conversion physical circumcision of a male Gentile unnecessary. Not only are the uncircumcised Galatian believers in compliance with the covenant between God and Abraham by virtue of their mystical union inside Christ, but also they are “the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise” (3:29). And, according to Paul, even though God made “male and female” as part of the original creation of the cosmos, “God’s apocalypse in Christ”485 has in effect brought about κατὰ νῆν κτίσισιν inside Christ, thus negating gender distinctions inside Christ.486

Returning to the inclusion of the Gentiles in Paul’s Ἰησοῦς, not only does an all-inclusive interpretation of Ἰησοῦς prevent the Missionaries or anyone in the Galatian churches from viewing the Torah-free Gentiles as unrepentant sinners who should be

485 The phrase is Martyn’s (Galatians, 39).
486 See Hays (Galatians, 272-73) for a discussion of “the ‘already/not yet’ tension in Paul’s thought” in relation to common social practice in the first-century Graeco-Roman world.
excluded for the well-being of the community, but also since Paul states that all those
baptized into Christ are *one* inside Christ *in* whom there is neither Jew nor Gentile, it
stands to reason that ίμαζ would necessarily have to include all believers who are now
*one inside* Christ. Additionally, interpreting 3:13-14 in conjunction with 3:26-29 not only
clarifies that all believers are those who are bought back from the curse of the law, but
also it indicates that Paul’s arguments in 3:10-14, 15-18, 19-22, and 23-29 should be seen
as four elements that Paul needed to discuss in order to combat both the confluence of the
Abrahamic covenant with the Mosaic law and the threatened exclusion of the law-free
Galatians from the community of believers.

3.1.6.2 Additional examples of Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20

When we recognize that all four elements within Paul’s argument in Gal 3:10-29
are related to the aforementioned two issues, several additional examples of Paul’s
parodic reinterpretation of the covenant renewal ceremony described in 2 Esd 19-20
become obvious. As mentioned above, Paul parodically reinterprets the original meaning
of Hab 2:4b in 3:11b in order for the Missionaries and the Galatians to: 1) recognize that
Abraham was deemed “faithful” solely on the basis that he believed God; and 2)
understand that life is freely granted on the basis of the faithfulness of Christ. And we
stated above that the connection between Abraham and the Galatian believers is
strengthened by 3:18c, which states: “God has freely given to Abraham through the
promise.” However, we propose that Paul’s recurring references to “promise” (3:14, 16,
17, 18, 19, 21, 22), “seed” (3:16, 19, 29), and “inheritance”/“heir” (3:18, 29) are very
likely borrowed from the account of Israel’s history as it is presented in 2 Esd 19.\footnote{This statement, of course, takes into consideration that Paul could also be parodying Deut 33:3 in his references to “inheritance.” In the blessing of Israel (Deut 33:1-29), Deut 33:3 notes that Moses received the law from the words of God, which is immediately followed in 33:4 by a statement regarding the law: νόμου, δὲ ἐνετέλεσεν ήμιν Μωυσῆς, κληρονομίαν συνεγγράψεις Ιακωβ (“the law, which Moses commanded to us, an inheritance for the assemblies of Jacob”). However, since, as discussed above, 2 Esd 19-20 is itself a reinterpretation of the Pentateuch and was shaped by a controversy over the land and the identity of the true “seed/sons of Abraham,” the emphasis on the law as part of the “inheritance” that was promised to Abraham is totally consistent with the probable reinterpretation of Deut 33 in 2 Esd 19-20. In fact, this is likely given the confluence of the Abrahamic covenant and the Mosaic law, which was discussed above.}

Although in 3:16d Paul quotes καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου (“and to your seed”), a phrase that occurs thrice in Genesis (13:15; 17:8; 24:7), it is important to recognize that Paul begins his discussion of Abraham’s seed by stating: τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἔρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (“now the promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed”). Therefore, Gal 3:16a is verbally aligned with the reinterpretation of the covenant with Abraham that is presented in 2 Esd 19:7-8 since the phrase καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ appears in 2 Esd 19:8.\footnote{The Greek text is presented in 3.1.6 above.} And, importantly, 2 Esd 19 continually employs forms of κληρονομέω (19:15, 22, 23, 25) in discussing the fulfillment of God’s promises, which in the covenant renewal ceremony are reinterpreted from the Genesis account of the covenant that God made with Abraham. Second Esdras 19:23 states: καὶ εἰσήγαγες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἢν εἰπας τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκληρονόμησαν αὐτὴν (“and you [i.e., God] led them into the land, which you spoke to their fathers, and they inherited it”). So in 2 Esdras, the divine words of promised inheritance are spoken to the plural fathers rather than to Abraham. Since, in our interpretation, Paul is seeking to separate God’s original covenant with Abraham from later covenants with Israel, his insistence on the
singular nature of the seed, “who is Christ,” stands in contrast to 2 Esd 19:23. Therefore, Paul’s argument in Gal 3:15-18 has several points of contact with the reinterpretation of the Abrahamic covenant that is presented in 2 Esd 19: 1) the emphasis on “inheritance” (κληρονομία in Gal; κληρονομέω in 2 Esd 19); and 2) the words of God that were spoken in making the covenant (ἐγρέθησαν in reference to the promises that were spoken by God in Gal 3:16 and ἤνε ἵπας τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν in reference to the inheritance of the land that 2 Esd 19:23 records that God “spoke to their fathers,” which is itself a reinterpretation of the previously mentioned covenant, recorded in 2 Esd 19:7-8, that God made with Abraham and his seed). Consequently, we maintain that Paul’s argument resonates with allusions to the covenant renewal ceremony while, in agreement with the principles of ancient rhetorical parody, Paul adjusts the wording of his quotations and allusions in order to change the meaning of the hypotext. In this case, Paul parodically reinterprets a major theme of the historical narrative presented in 2 Esd 19, which inseparably combines the Abrahamic covenant with later promises to “the fathers” and the Mosaic law. In Gal 3, all the promises are made to Abraham and his singular seed, Christ, in whom all believers, both ethnic Jews and Gentiles, are now one, and, therefore, the seed of Abraham.

In summary, Paul, therefore, is not arguing that the curse of the law does not exist equally for Jew and proselyte. Neither does he deny that anyone who rejects the law will suffer the curse of the law. Interpreting many of Paul’s statements as a parodic reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20 makes a distinctive contribution to our understanding of
Paul’s theological arguments in the letter. Although Paul, in upholding the validity of the law and its blessings and curses, acknowledges that all who reject the law will suffer spiritual death as he did (cf. 2:19), he can still urge the Galatian believers to be as he is (cf. 4:12) because Christ has already bought Jew and Gentile alike back from the curse of the law. Just as the Scriptures maintained that native-born Israelite and proselyte were equal under the law prior to the coming of Christ, Paul can now claim that in the new creation (cf. 6:15) there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile in Christ Jesus (cf. 3:28). However, even though the blessings and curses inherent in living “under the law” no longer apply to those who have died to the law and now live on the basis of the faithfulness of Christ (2:19-20), Paul makes it quite clear that humanity’s newfound freedom is not an “opportunity for the flesh” (5:13) since the believer is now led by the Spirit (5:18).

### 3.2 Other Passages in Galatians That Are Clarified By Understanding Paul’s Rhetorical Parody

Most commentators agree that Paul begins a new section of the letter in 3:1 in which he directly addresses the crisis produced by the Missionaries’ insistence that the Galatians become Torah-observant.\(^{489}\) We have argued above that the Incident at Antioch involved the withdrawal of Jewish Christians from Gentile Christians because “certain

\(^{489}\) See, e.g., Hays, *Galatians*, 249; Martyn, *Galatians*, 281; Dunn, *Galatians*, 150; Betz (*Galatians*, 128) understands 3:1-4:31 as the *probatio* (“proof”) of Paul’s argument; and Witherington (*Grace*, 197) views 3:1-6:10 as the *probatio*. 
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ones from James” (2:12) thought that Gentile Christians who refused to become Torah-observant were unrepentant sinners. We have also argued that Paul employs rhetorical parody in order to counter the understanding that a person must adhere to the requirements of the Mosaic law in order to be viewed as righteous. We will argue below that not only does the recognition of Paul’s rhetorical parody in Gal 1-2, which led to our understanding that the Missionaries were seeking to exclude the law-free Galatians as unrepentant sinners, clarify several of Paul’s statements in Gal 3-6, but also that a recognition of Paul’s continued employment of rhetorical parody throughout the letter enables the reader to see the cohesiveness of the entire correspondence.

3.2.1 Paul’s Second Rebuke Section in Relation to Threatened Exclusion (3:1-5)

As mentioned above, Paul’s argument moves naturally from his explanation in 2:16 that a person is deemed righteous ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (“by means of the faithfulness of Christ and not by means of works of the law”) to the Galatians’ reception of the Spirit (3:2, 5) as decisive proof that they, as law-free Gentile believers, were viewed as righteous by God (3:6-9). Therefore, Torah-observant Jewish Christians should not claim that the law-free Galatian Christians were unrepentant sinners who should be excluded from the faithful community. Although Paul’s argument flows smoothly from righteousness via Christ to the experience of the Spirit as proof of righteousness apart from the Mosaic law, 3:1 should still be viewed as the beginning of a new section of the letter since Paul now turns all of his attention to addressing the
specific concerns of the Galatian believers.

Many commentators understand Paul’s “O foolish Galatians”) in 3:1 as the letter’s second rebuke and as typical of diatribe, and most commentators translate as “who has bewitched you.” However, this translation may not be the best considering the various connotations of ψακαίνω and its cognates common in Greek literature from the fourth century B.C.E. through the fourth century C.E. Forms of ψακαίνω were indeed frequently employed with the connotation of “casting a spell” or “bewitching” and this connotation was frequently associated with “the evil eye.” Nevertheless, ψακαίνω along with numerous cognates were also quite frequently employed with the connotation of

---

490 See, e.g., Betz, Galatians, 130; Martyn, Galatians, 281; and Dunn, Galatians, 151.
491 See, e.g., Martyn, Galatians, 282; Hays, Galatians, 250; Dunn, Galatians, 151-52; Betz, Galatians, 131; and Witherington, Grace, 201-4. Although Betz and Witherington translate 3:1a as “Who has bewitched you,” they maintain that the Galatians have been “bewitched” in the sense of being rhetorically “enchanted by the sophistic strategies” of the Missionaries.
492 This statement is based on a search of all forms of ψακαίνω and its cognates in TLG.
493 See, e.g., Theocritus (bucolic poet of the fourth-third centuries B.C.E.), Id. 6.39 in which a character spits on his chest three times and states, “so that I might not be bewitched” (ος μη βασκαμαι); Plutarch (Quaest. conv. 680C-682B) devotes an entire discussion to questioning whether or not “the evil eye” has the power to harm another; however, “the evil eye” is also discussed in the context of envy, and “casting a spell/bewitching” is frequently expressed by καταβασκαίνω, which is a strengthened form of ψακαίνω. See LSJ, “καταβασκαίνω,” 884. Dio Chrysostom (c. 40/50-110 C.E.) mentions “warding off/defending oneself against” (αμφύόμενος) “those who cast an evil eye on you and me” (τοις έμοί καὶ ίμαίν βασκαίνοντας) in Pol. 2.4. Athenaeus (Deipn. 9.394b-c) describes male birds spitting on newly hatched young “so they might not be bewitched” (ός μη βασκαμαθοι). Also, see T. Sol. 18:39: βασκαίνω πάντα ἄθρωπον (“I bewitch every person”).
494 See, e.g., LSJ, “βασκαίνω, βασκανία, βασκάνιον, βάσκανος, βασκαντικός,” 310. The entries indicate that the word group could connote not only “witchery/evil/the evil eye,” but also either “jealousy/envy” or “slander/malignity, etc.” without any connection to witchery. Although BDAG (“βασκαίνω, βασκανία, βάσκανος,” 171) does include “envy” as a possible connotation for the word group, the entries do not mention the connotation of “slander/malignity, etc.” However, primary sources listed in the following footnote demonstrate that the word group retained the connotation of “slander/malignity, etc.”
“slander/malign/disparage”495 or “being envious/jealous”496 apart from any connection with bewitching or “the evil eye.” And importantly Liddell and Scott note that when βασκαίνω means “to slander/malign/disparage” its object is in the accusative, but when the verb means “to envy/be jealous” the person or thing that has provoked the jealousy occurs in the dative.497

Although βασκαίνω in Gal 3:1 is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament, the verb does occur in the LXX: twice in Deuteronomy (28:54, 56) and twice in Sirach (14:6, 8). In Deut 28:54, 56, the dative τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ is employed instrumentally with βασκάνει (“he/she will envy with the eye” or “he/she will bewitch with the eye”). The context of the entire discussion in Sir 14:3-10 deals with envy, stinginess, and the mishandling of

495 For the connotation of slandering/maligning/disparaging or nonverbally intending malice without any connection to “bewitching” or “the evil eye,” see, e.g., Demosthenes, *Cor.* 108.10, 189.7, 242.2, 307.6, 318; *Meg.* 19.3; *Chers.* 19.3, 22.2; *Mid.* 209.9; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 35.23, *Thuc.* 52.8; Philo, *Congr.* 71.5; *Abr.* 21.4, 199.3; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.72; Plutarch, *Per.* 12.1; *Dem.* 16.4; *Pomp.* 29.1; *Ages.* 22.4; *Inv. od.* 538D; *Pel.* 25.14; *Adul. amic.* 60E; *Inim. util.* 92B; *Frat. amor.* 485E; Dio Chrysostom, *Conc. Apan.* 18.7, *Invid.* 25.12; Aristides (117-after 181 C.E.), *Or.* 45.1.1; *Or.* 29.1; *Athenaeus, Deipn.* 5.211b; Hermogenes, *Id.* 1.6.73; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.19.3; 5.7.1; Origen, *Exp. Prov.* (PG 17:245); *Fr. Ps.* 34:11; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 4.51. Sextus Julius Africanus (third century Christian philosopher/historian) provides another important example of this connotation in *Κέσων* 1.8.26. Although this work is known for discussions of military strategy and medicine along with magic, including charms and spells, Africanus still employs βασκαίνω with the connotation of “disparaging.” After stating that the juice from ivy leaves could be used to treat cataracts in horses, Africanus concludes: Ὑ catapult de τῆν ἑρατείαν καὶ τοῖς ἑπών ἑκτέρους κτήσεων (“Now I do not disparage the medical treatment even in the secondary herds of horses”).

496 For the connotation of envy/being jealous, see, e.g., Theocritus, *Id.* 5:13; Demosthenes, *Lept.* 24.7; Philo, *Flacc.* 29.2, 143.4; *Agr.* 113.1; *Jos.* 144.6; Josephus, *A. J.* 1.260.4; 10.250.5; 10.257.5; *Vita* 425.4; *C. Ap.* 2.285.5; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 21.4; *Caes.* 59.6; *Cam.* 36.1; *Pract. ger. ret. publ.* 806A; *De laude* 540B, 542E; *Inim. util.* 91B, 92C; *Mulier. virt.* 254E; *Tranq. an.* 471A; Dio Chrysostom, *Invid.* 15.6, 37.7; Ign., *Rom.* 3.1; Ps-Ign., *Hero* 5.1; Aristides, *Or.* 46.8; Hermogenes, *Inv.* 1.157-70; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 3.16.4; 5.33.1; 6.12.1; 7.31.1; 8.7.15; Origen, *Sel. Ps.* (PG 12:1197); *Fr. Jo.* 129.2.

497 “βασκάίνω II,” 310. When a direct object occurs in the examples listed in n.495, the case is accusative. When the source of the jealousy is named in the examples listed in n.496, the case is dative. However, as evidenced in the examples cited in n.493, when βασκάίνω means “bewitch,” the object can occur in either the dative or the accusative.
wealth in which a person ignores the needs of others.\textsuperscript{498} Sirach 14:8 has ὁ βασκαίνων ὁφθαλμῷ (“the person envying with the eye”) and is followed by an unflattering description of the characteristics inherent in πλεονέκτου ὁφθαλμῷ (“the eye of a greedy person”). Therefore, the context of Sir 14 indicates very clearly that the connotation of βασκαίνω is envy, not bewitch.

However, βασκαίνω in Gal 3:1 is not immediately followed by ὁφθαλμῷ as in the LXX.\textsuperscript{499} Although it is sometimes claimed that Paul’s reference to “eyes” in the phrase ὁς κατ’ ὁφθαλμῷ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος (“before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified”) lends support to the view that Paul employs βασκαίνω with the connotation of “bewitching” and the “evil eye,”\textsuperscript{500} this interpretation ignores the rhetorical importance of ἐνάργεια/evidentia (“vividness”). The concept of ἐνάργεια/evidentia was the practice of bringing a subject vividly “before the eyes” of the audience. It was described as early as Aristotle and continued to be important in rhetorical instruction until well after Paul’s lifetime.\textsuperscript{501} An orator understood that a vivid

\textsuperscript{498} Additionally, Sir 14:3 employs βάσκανος with the connotation of “envious.”

\textsuperscript{499} Dunn (Galatians, 151-52), in discussing the use of βασκαίνω in the LXX and in Gal, stresses that envy should be understood as the motivation behind “casting the evil eye.” Jerome H. Neyrey (“Bewitched in Galatia: Paul and Cultural Anthropology,” CBQ 50 [1988]: 72-100) proposes that βασκαίνω must be understood in terms of a society that believed in witchcraft and demon possession and βασκαίνω in Gal 3:1 is Paul’s “witchcraft accusation” aimed at purifying “the holy group” by expelling “the witches” (here, 99). In a similar vein, see John H. Elliott, “Paul, Galatians, and the Evil Eye,” CurtTM 17 (1990): 262-73. Alternately, Susan Eastman (“The Evil Eye and the Curse of the Law: Galatians 3.1 Revisited,” JSNT 83 [2001]: 69-87) understands Paul’s βασκαίνω as an intertextual echo of the Deuteronomic curse presented in Deut 28:53-57 and as an introduction to a childishness-vs.-maturity theme.

\textsuperscript{500} This assumption is central to Elliott’s (“Evil Eye,” 268-69) argument.

\textsuperscript{501} Aristotle (Rhet. 3.11.1-2) refers to the concept as πρὸ ὄμωτον ποιεῖν (“to create before the eyes”). Ps.-Demetrius (Eloc. 209) and Hermogenes, (Progymnasmata, 10) discuss ἐνάργεια (“vividness”); Dionysius
portrayal or description of an image in a manner in which the speaker and the audience actually felt that they were eyewitnesses to an event was a vital component in a rhetorically successful speech. Although many commentators acknowledge that Paul is referring to the rhetorical concept of ἐνάργεια/evidentia in his reference to “eyes” and Christ’s crucifixion,502 those who understand βασκαίνω as connoting bewitchment, or even “rhetorical enchantment” via sophistic strategies, do not adequately explain the connection between either sorcery or rhetorical enchantment in 3:1 and the Spirit in 3:2.503

However, translating τίς ἴματες ἐβάσκανεν as “who has maligned you” would not only clarify the relationship between 3:1 and the mention of the Spirit in 3:2, but also the

of Halicarnassus (Lys. 7) refers to ἐνάργεια (“vividness”) and states that a person in the audience “will assume to see the things being described as happening.” See LSJ, “ἐνάργεια,” 556. Aelius Theon (Progymnasmata, 71) stresses the importance of making a speech ἐναργής (“vivid”). Ps.-Longinus (Subl. 15) instructs an orator to employ ὕλη λόγως ἐνάργεια (“vividness in words”), which he equates with φαντασία (“making visible”), so that “you seem to see” the things described and “you place [them] before the eyes of the ones hearing.” Quintilian (Inst. 8.3.61-71) translates ἐνάργεια as evidentia and notes: “It is a great virtue . . . to relate [things] in a manner so that they may be seen with the eyes” (here 8.3.62).

502 See, e.g., Betz, Galatians, 131; Witherington, Grace, 205; Dunn, Galatians, 152. This possibility is noted by Hays (Galatians, 250-51) who also suggests that Paul is employing προγράφω “to mean ‘written beforehand’” since Paul could have interpreted the lament psalms as “prefigurations of Christ’s crucifixion.”

503 Betz (Galatians, 131) and Witherington (Grace, 204) understand βασκαίνω to indicate that the Galatians had been tricked by sophistic rhetoric, but neither relates 3:1 to 3:2. Dunn (Galatians, 152), arguing that envy is the cause of “casting the evil eye,” states that the Missionaries “begudge the Galatians’ experience of the Spirit” apart from the law. However, if the Missionaries have already acknowledged that the Galatians have received the Spirit apart from the law, what does Paul hope to gain by 3:2? Martyn (Galatians, 283-84) argues on the basis of 3:5 that the Teachers maintain that Torah observance leads to “a steady supply of the Spirit.” However, he does not connect Paul’s argument in 3:1 directly to 3:2 and notes the reason for the mention of the Spirit in 3:2 is not “immediately clear.” Hays, (Galatians, 250-51) relates 3:1b to 3:2 and correctly assesses Paul’s rationale behind introducing the Spirit in 3:2 (see n.256 above); however, he does not directly relate βασκαίνω to 3:2.
accusative ὑμᾶς would conform to the correct grammatical construction when βασκαίνω means “malign/slander/disparage.” In this interpretation, Paul is not employing βασκαίνω to express either magical or sophistic techniques. Rather, in asking the Galatians “who has maligned you” and reminding them of his vivid portrayal of Christ’s crucifixion, he is directly leading up to his second question regarding the basis for their reception of the Spirit. Galatians 3:2 emphasizes that the Galatians have already received the Spirit apart from works of the law, and, therefore, they could not be considered unrighteous or unrepentant sinners due to their failure to observe Torah. Here, Paul is not only addressing the Galatian situation directly, but he is also logically continuing his line of thought in 2:15-21: since righteousness comes through the faithfulness of Christ (2:16), not through “works of the law” or “law” (2:16, 21), the Galatians, likewise, received the Spirit ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως (“from the proclamation of faithfulness”), not ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (“from works of the law”).504 Since the Galatians have already received the Spirit as proof of their righteousness before God, they have no need to be made perfect or

504 For an in-depth discussion of the possible meanings of ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως, see Hays, Faith, 124-32. While we agree with Hays (ibid., 130) that ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως stresses God’s activity, rather than human activity, we are translating πίστεως in 3:2, 5 as “faithfulness” since it seems likely that Paul is employing πίστεως to refer again to the “faithfulness” of Jesus Christ (cf. 2:16). Therefore, the activity of God in the “proclamation of the faithfulness [of Jesus Christ]” is the basis upon which the Galatians received the Spirit (3:2) and is the source of the miracles among them (3:5). Although the “proclamation of the faithfulness [of Jesus Christ]” is, of course, the gospel message, the emphasis should remain on the faithfulness of Christ since, as Hays (ibid., 132-62) notes, Paul goes on to argue that Christ is the singular seed of Abraham (3:16), and it is on the basis of the faithfulness of Jesus Christ that “the promise is given to those who believe” (3:22). Since Hays (ibid., 153) equates the promise of 3:22 with “the promise of the Spirit,” which Paul and the law-free Galatians might receive (ἀφομοιωτίζωμεν) through the faithfulness of Christ Jesus (3:14), it is highly likely that Paul means that the Galatians received the Spirit “from the faithfulness [of Jesus Christ]” in 3:2, 5, especially since Paul also states that it is Christ who “bought us back from the curse of the law” (3:13).
complete by the flesh (3:3). And they should realize that anyone who claims that “works of the law” are needed for “completion” or righteousness is maligning their status before God.

Admittedly, we do find ancient examples that employ βασκαίνω to mean “bewitch” and have a direct object in the accusative case;\(^\text{505}\) however, the proper connotation of βασκαίνω in these examples is usually quite clear from the context. For example, *T. Sol.* 18:39 presents the words of a demon with which Solomon struggles: βασκαίνω πάντα ἐνθρωπον καταργεῖ με δὲ ὁ πολυπαθής ὀφθαλμὸς ἐγχειραττόμενος (“I bewitch every person. But the much suffering eye, being inscribed, renders me powerless”).\(^\text{506}\)

Even when our ancient sources do not employ a direct object, the context clarifies the connotation of the verb. In Plutarch’s discussion of the evil eye, the subject is introduced with Περὶ τῶν καταβασκαίνειν λέγομένων καὶ βασκαίνον ἔχειν ὀφθαλμόν (“Concerning the ones who are said to cast a spell and to have an evil eye”).\(^\text{507}\) And when Plutarch employs the simple verb βασκαίνω, he still makes the connotation clear through additional descriptions of the subject under discussion. For example, in discussing τὸ βασκαίνειν (“the casting of spells”) he clarifies the meaning with καὶ πῶς διὰ τῆς ὀψιως

\(^{505}\) See n.493 above.

\(^{506}\) *T. Sol.* is known for its emphasis on demonology, magic, and medicine. See the introduction and Greek text complied by Chester Charlton McCown, *The Testament of Solomon* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922). For the view that the “much suffering eye” was an amulet to ward off the evil eye, see Campbell Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950), 96-100.

\(^{507}\) *Quaest. conv.* 680C.
τὴν βλάβην εἰς ὑρωμένους διαδίωσιν; (“and how does [the casting of spells] give harm through seeing to the ones being seen?”). Therefore, we can conclude that βασκαίνω alone does not necessitate the connotation of “casting a spell” or “the evil eye,” but that the context of the discussion should determine which one of the connotations of βασκαίνω is the most likely in each situation.

3.2.1.1 Other passages in Galatians that have been used to support translating βασκαίνω as “bewitch”

In discussing the context of Gal 3:1, we have already determined the rhetorical meaning of οἱ κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς. However, some scholars appeal to two other passages in Galatians for support of their translation of βασκαίνω in 3:1 as “bewitch”: 4:14 and 5:20.

3.2.1.1.1 Galatians 4:12-15

Although commentators cite Paul’s use of ἔκπτω (“spit out,” “spit at in disgust,”) in describing his first meeting with the Galatians (4:12-15) as an allusion to warding off “the evil eye,” a comparison of ἔκπτω in Gal 4:14 with other descriptions

508 Quaest. conv. 681D.
509 For scholars who appeal to 4:14, see n.511 below. For 5:20, see n.525 below.
510 LSJ, “ἔκπτω,” 518. LSJ does list “abominate” as a possible definition; however, the only source referenced for this meaning is Gal 4:14. Evidence will be presented below that questions the legitimacy of “abominate” as a definition of ἔκπτω. L&N (“ἔκπτω,” 1:451) and Thayer (Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997], 199) define ἔκπτω as “to spit out,” “to reject,” “to disdain,” or “to spurn” without indicating that the verb has the connotation of spitting in order to ward off evil.
511 Elliott (“Evil Eye,” 268-69), Betz (Galatians, 225), Martyn (Galatians, 421) and Witherington (Grace 311) emphasize that ἔκπτω in 4:14 indicates that Paul is referring to the practice of spitting in order to ward off evil spirits. Dunn (Galatians, 234) notes that ἔκπτω can mean “distain,” but he leans toward the
of spitting in order to ward off the evil eye indicates otherwise.\textsuperscript{512} Although BADG notes that \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\tau\omega\) means “to spit to ward off evil spirits,” the sources referenced in support of this meaning actually use \(\pi\tau\omega\) (“spit”), not \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\tau\omega\).\textsuperscript{513}

Additionally, Schlier, after asserting that the apotropaic use of \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\tau\omega\) “is here our only concern,”\textsuperscript{514} proceeds to support this connotation of the verb by citing sources that actually employ forms of \(\epsilon\pi\phi\theta\varsigma\omega\), \(\pi\tau\omega\), and \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\tau\omega\). Although \(\epsilon\pi\phi\theta\varsigma\omega\) does mean “spit at so as to avert a spell of witchcraft” and the sources referenced by LSJ to support this definition (Theocritus, \textit{Id.} 2.62, 7.127)\textsuperscript{515} are those cited by Schlier under \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\tau\omega\), the meaning of \(\epsilon\pi\phi\theta\varsigma\omega\) should not be used to define \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\tau\omega\). Similarly, even though Schlier cites sources that employ \(\pi\tau\omega\), which we have already mentioned as evidence that \(\pi\tau\omega\) did connote spitting to ward off evil, there is no evidence that \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\tau\omega\) or \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\tau\omega\) carried this connotation. In fact, the only definition for \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\tau\omega\) listed in LSJ is: “spit upon or

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Gal} 4:14 states: \textit{kai. to.n peirasmo.n u`mw/n evn th/| sarki, mou ouvk evxouqenh,sate ouvde. evxeptu,sate( avlla. w`j a;ggelon qeou/ evde,xasqe, me( w`j Cristo.n VIhsou/n} (“and you did not disdain nor reject your trial in my flesh, but you received me as angel of God, as Christ Jesus”).
  \item \textit{evkptu,w},” 244. The references listed erroneously as employing \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\tau\omega\) are: Theocritus, \textit{Id.} 6.39, which states: \textit{τρίς εἰς ἑμὸν ἐπισαρκᾶ κόλπον} (“I spat three times on my chest.”); ibid., 20.11, which states: \textit{τρίς εἰς ἑν ἐπισαρκᾶ κόλπον} (“she spat three times on her chest”); Theophrastus, \textit{Char.} 16.15, which, in describing a superstitious man, states: \textit{μεμνημόνευς δὲ ἵδων ἡ ἐπιλεπτηγμένη φρίζας εἰς κόλπον πτώσατ} (“And when he sees a madman or an epileptic, after shuddering, he might spit on [his] chest.”); Lucian, \textit{Nav.} 15.20, which states: \textit{kαὶ ἐς τὸν κόλπον οὐ πτώςες} (“and you do not spit on the chest”); idem, \textit{Merc. cond.} 6.13, which states: \textit{οὐκ εἰς τὸν κόλπον πτώσας πρότερον} (“not having spit on the chest earlier”).
  \item \textit{TDNT} 2:448.
  \item LSJ, “\(\epsilon\pi\phi\theta\varsigma\omega\),” 671.
\end{itemize}
at, especially as a mark of abhorrence or contempt.” Since PGL also indicates that καταπτύω continued to mean “spit upon” or “reject” in early Christian literature, we have no evidence that the compound καταπτύω was employed with the connotation of warding off spells or the evil eye. Therefore, many of the examples that Schlier uses to support his contention for the apotropaic connotation of ἐκπτύω in actually indicate that πτύω and ἐπιφθύζω, but not ἐκπτύω or καταπτύω, were used apotropaically.

Similarly, we find πτύω employed twice in a spell to promote memory in PGM III.410-23; however, ἐκπτύω is not used in the Greek portions of the magical papyri. And when the Gospels refer to spitting in conjunction with healing (Mark 7:33, 8:23; John 9:6), the verb employed is πτύω, not one of the compounds. Therefore, just as non-Christian sources employ πτύω in the context of warding off evil spirits, Mark and John employ πτύω in connection with healing.

516 Ibid., 907.
517 “καταπτύω,” 715. There is no entry for ἐκπτύω in PGL, which indicates that the Fathers did not use the verb with a different meaning than presented in LSJ (see PGL, iv).
518 Even Schlier (449) in citing an example of καταπτύω in his discussion of ἐκπτύω admits that the source employing καταπτύω actually uses the verb with the literal connotation of “despise;” however, he justifies his apotropaic interpretation of καταπτύω by claiming that the source is discussing baptism. He then appeals to third century C.E. Latin sources that discuss sputatio as part of the baptismal rite to support his apotropaic definition of καταπτύω.
519 The Greek text edited by Karl Preisendanz, (Papyri graecae magicae: die griechischen Zauberpapyri [2d ed.; Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973]) contains imperatives of πτύω in III.421 and III.423; however, the compound form ἐκπτύω does not appear in this edition of the magical papyri. Although verbs meaning “to spit” do occur in the Demotic portions of the magical papyri (e.g., PDM XIV.555, 557) translated by Janet H. Johnson (The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation Including the Demotic Spells [ed. Hans Dieter Betz; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986], 226-27) the meaning of Demotic verbs has no barring on either our discussion of the meaning of ἐκπτύω or the ancient evidence that demonstrates the consistent use of πτύω, rather than ἐκπτύω, in Greek texts that describe spitting for the purpose of warding off evil.
520 Athenaeus (Deipn. 9.394b-c) also employs πτύω, not ἐκπτύω, in conjunction with βασκάινω. See n. 265 above. Neither Plutarch (Quaest. conv. 680C-682B) nor Dio Chrysostom (Pol. 2.4) discusses spitting as a remedy for the evil eye in conjunction with their use of βασκάινω.
Furthermore, a lemma search on ἐκπτύω in TLG covering the period from Homer through the fourth century C. E. demonstrates that ancient sources employ ἐκπτύω with one of four connotations: “spitting out,” “spitting out in disgust,” “rejecting,” or “despising.” However, no ancient source from within this period employs ἐκπτύω with the connotation of spitting in order to ward off evil spirits or the evil eye. Additionally, neither the early commentators on the Greek text nor the early commentators on the

521 Besides medical texts that describe various illnesses in which something is “spit out” (Hippocrates [fifth–fourth century B.C.E.], Morb. 1.22.44; 1.27.14; 3.15.29, 64; 3.16.59; Int. 9.8; Dioscorides Pedanius [first century C.E.], Mat. med. 1.86.1; 5.77.2; Oribasius [fourth century C.E.], Collectiones medicae 45.24.7), other examples of the connotation of “spitting out” or “spitting out in disgust” include: Homer (Od. 5.322) in which Odysseus spits sea water out of his mouth because it is bitter; Aristophanes (Vesp. 792) in which Philocleon spits mullet scales out of his mouth in disgust; Theocritus (Id. 24.19) who describes the spitting out of venom by serpents; Epictetus (Diatr. 3.12.17 and Ench. 47.1) who mentions “spitting out” cold water from one’s mouth; Dio Chrysostom (Isthm. 6) who mentions “spitting out” bitter honey; Irenaeus (Haer. 1. Prologue) who states that those who believe the teachings of Valentinus have not “spit out that which is within the brain” (ἐγκέφαλων ἐξεπτύκασιν) and who states (Haer. 5.5.2) that Jonah “was spit out” from the belly of the whale onto land; Eusebius (Praep. ev. 9.37.3) who describes the High Priest’s fountain as having pipes that “spit out” water; and Gregory of Nyssa (Hom. 1 in Eccl.) who declares that the vanities of life are like the sand that “is spit out” by the sea of life and who (Eun. 2.1.306, 3.2.68) accuses Eunomius of “spitting out” abuse against the Cappadocians and “having spat out” an invalid argument. For the connotation of “rejecting” or “despising,” see, e.g.: Plutarch who describes the manner in which the public “despised” and “turned away from” some public leaders (Praec. ger. rei publ. 801A) and the manner in which some of Socrates and Plato’s pupils “rejected” or “despised” their teachings (Alex. Fort. 328C).

522 Contra Betz (Galatians, 225) who claims that ἐκπτύω was originally an apotropaic term: “While the term originated in primitive superstition, it later became more or less identical with ‘despise.'”

523 Origen (Fr. Eph. 14.32), in commenting on Eph 3:13 in which the author admonishes the Ephesians not to lose heart in light of his afflictions, quotes Gal 4:14 and states that Paul praises the Galatians for not rejecting or despising their trial in his flesh. Origen does not mention the possibility that Paul might be praising the Galatians because they did not spit in order to ward off evil spirits. Chrysostom in commenting on Gal 4:14 (PG 61:659) originally quotes the verse without a second verb, which is in agreement with P⁴⁶; however, he goes on to state that Paul tells the Galatians: ὥσκ ἐξοσμησάσιτε ὄσκ διεπτύσσατε ("you did not despise nor did you spit upon"). LSJ (409) defines διαπτύω as having one meaning: “spit upon.” There is no indication that this compound of πτύω was ever used to ward off evil. In Chrysostom’s interpretation, the trial in Paul’s flesh was his physical condition that resulted from “being driven [out], being flogged, and the thousands of deaths,” which he “endured preaching to you [i.e., the Galatians].” Chrysostom then states: “But he says, nevertheless, this did not scandalize you nor did you spit upon (διαπτύσσατε) me because of the things I suffered and the persecutions (διογμούς); for he calls these things [i.e., his suffering and
Latin text of Gal 4:14 interpret the verse with the connotation of spitting in order to ward off evil. Therefore, there is no historical justification for interpreting ἐκπτύω in 4:14 as a reference to warding off evil.

524 E.g., Jerome in Comm. Gal. 2.4.14 (PL 26:380C-381B) quotes the verse as: Et tentationem vestram, quae erat in carne mea, non sprevistis, neque respuitis: sed sicut angelum Dei excipistis me, sicut Christum Jesum (“And you did not despise or reject your trial/temptation, which was in my flesh: but you received me with approval as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus”). Spernō means “to separate” or “to despise/reject with scorn” (OLD, 1803). The compound verb respūō (OLD, 1636) has several meanings: “to spit out,” “to repel,” “to reject with disdain or abhorrence,” “to spurn,” and “to refuse to listen to or consider.” There is no indication that respūō connotated spitting in order to ward off evil. However, spūō (OLD, 1811) not only means “to spit” or “spit out,” but also “to spit as a charm against the nemesis of pride or sin” or, as Lewis and Short (1748) state, “to spit as a charm against fascination.” Therefore, as OLD and Lewis and Short note, spūō is equivalent to ππω, but, just as with the compounds ἐκπτύω, καταπτύω and διαπτύω, respūō has no connection with spitting to ward off evil. Additionally, one of the meanings of excipiō (OLD, 635) is “to receive with approval.” Jerome’s discussion of the obscurity of 4:14 confirms that he understands respūō with the connotation of “to reject with disdain or abhorrence.” He does not propose that Paul is praising the Galatians for not spitting in order to ward off evil. And he discusses the possibility that Paul is praising the Galatians for not rejecting him because of the “abuses” (contumeliaes), “persecutions,” and “wounds of the body” (plagas corporis) that “he suffered from those who were opposing the gospel.” We have further confirmation that Jerome does not interpret 4:14 as a reference to spitting to ward off evil in his reference to the verse in Comm. Eph. 3:13 (PL 26:485A-486A) in which he quotes Gal 4:14 as: Tentationem vestram in carne mea non sprevistis, neque abiecistis (“You did not despise nor reject your trial/temptation in my flesh”). Abicieō (OLD, 6; Lewis and Short, 7) can mean: “to throw away,” “to degrade/belittle,” or “to abandon,” but the verb has no connection to spitting to ward off evil. Augustine in Exp. Gal. 37.3-5 interprets Paul’s “weakness of the flesh” (4:13) as “persecution” and quotes 4:14a as: Et tentationem vestram in carne mea non sprevistis neque respuitis. He interprets the temptation of the Galatians as a test to see if they would “desert (deserēō) him [i.e. Paul] out of fear or embrace him out of love.” And he interprets neque respuitis as Paul’s way of saying that the Galatians did not reject the test by refusing to share in his danger. The Latin text of Exp. Gal. is that edited by Johannes Divjak (Augustinus, Sanctus Aurelius, Opera, Sect. IV, Par I: Expositio Quaestam Propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos; Epistolae ad Galatas Expositionis Liber Unus; Epistolae ad Romanos Inchoata Expositio [CSEL 84; Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1971], here 105).
3.2.1.1.2 Galatians 5:19-21 within the context of Gal 5

Besides Paul’s reference to “eyes” in 3:1 and his use of ἐκπτύω in 4:14, neither of which, as demonstrated above, should be interpreted as an allusion to the evil eye, Paul’s inclusion of φαρμακεία (“sorcery/witchcraft/magic”) in his list of τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός (“the works of the flesh”) in 5:19-21 is the only reference to witchcraft in the letter that could possibly be used to support the translation of τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν in 3:1 as “who has bewitched you.” However, we should interpret Paul’s juxtaposition of “the works of the flesh” and the “fruit of the Spirit” in light of the preceding discussion in Gal 5, which contrasts freedom in Christ with the enslaving yoke of the law (5:1) while explaining that in the current eschatological age the Spirit has replaced the Mosaic law as the sole efficacious control over “the desire of the flesh” (5:16). But before we discuss the connection between Gal 5:19-26, including φαρμακεία in v.20, and Paul’s references to the Mosaic law earlier in the chapter (vv. 3, 4, 14, 18), which I propose are additional examples of rhetorical parody, we need to review the work of others who have proposed interpretations of 5:16-18.

525 Elliott (“Evil Eye,” 271) notes that Paul’s reference to magic (φαρμακεία) in 5:20 is a further indication that the letter is full of references to the “Evil Eye belief and practice.”

526 We are neither challenging the view that 5:1 is the conclusion of Paul’s theological argument that began at 3:1 nor are we denying that Paul begins his pastoral counsel, which addresses the specific issue of circumcision, at 5:2. (See Dunn’s [Galatians, 260-61] discussion; cf. Hays, Galatians, 306, 312, 320; and Martyn, Galatians, 432-33, 467-69. For the view that 3:1-6:10 is the probatio, which includes additional arguments in 5:2-15, 5:16-26, and 6:1-10, see Witherington, Grace, 359-438.) we are proposing, however, that if we recognize Paul’s rhetorical parody of demands for obedience to the Mosaic law in Gal 5-6, we will not only appreciate the unity of the entire correspondence, but also we will have a better understanding of several of Paul’s statements in Gal 5-6.

527 In the following pages, we will present evidence to support our proposal that Paul is employing rhetorical parody in his references to the law in Gal 5.
First, John M.G. Barclay correctly stresses not only the strength of Paul’s emphatic negation in 5:16 (καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός οὐ μὴ τελέσητε = “and you will never carry out the desire of the flesh”), but also notes that the Galatians are not “free ‘to do whatever you want’ because, as they walk in the Spirit, they are caught up in the warfare” between the Spirit and flesh (5:17).528 And “the Spirit provides sufficient moral direction and protection against ‘the flesh’” so that the Galatians have no need to be ὑπὸ νόμου (“under the law” in 5:18). Therefore, the “restraining, disciplining, and directing influence,” typically understood as a function of the law, is now provided by the Spirit.529

Second, Joel Marcus demonstrates that ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός (“desire of the flesh”) in 5:16 is equivalent to the Hebrew הבטח (“inclination of the flesh”) in 1QH 10.23 by tracing the development of the concept of הרוח (“the evil inclination”) from Gen 6:5 and 8:21 to Sir 21:11, which included the understanding that following Torah provided a way to control human thoughts, through Qumran texts to Rabbinic literature. Marcus

528 Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul’s Ethics in Galatians (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 111-16. Hays (Galatians, 325) correctly stresses the conditional nature of Paul’s emphatic negation in 5:16, which requires that the Galatians “walk by the Spirit.”
529 Barclay, Obeying, 115-116. In contrast to Paul’s conditional promise based on the Spirit as a replacement for being “under the law,” see Philo’s (Spec. 1.51-65) connection between Torah and Spirit discussed above in 3.1.3.1. Also, Philo claims (Spec. 3.209) that following the Mosaic law assimilates one’s soul to piety while the impious person is controlled by passions and is “unclean” in the proper meaning of the term. Although Philo (Spec. 1.8-11) allegorizes the meaning of circumcision as representing the “excision of pleasures that blind the mind” and the repudiation of self-conceit in procreation, he (Migr. 92) insists that attributing an allegorical meaning to the rite does not mean that the established law concerning circumcision should be abolished. Also 4 Macc 7:15-18, in praising Eleazar for his willingness to die for the law, attributes a “law-abiding life” as producing the “pious reasoning” that ἕγεμὼν ἔστειν τῶν παθῶν (“is ruler of the emotions”). Additionally, Barclay (Obeying, 107-8, n. 3) lists sources in Diaspora literature (Josephus, A. J. 210-11; 16.43; C. Ap. 2.174; Let. Aris. 139, 142) and Rabbinic literature that describe the restraining and disciplining effect of the law.
notes that *yeser* was a “technical term” by Paul’s lifetime “and that Paul knew of it is most clearly demonstrated by Gal 5:16.”

Finally, Martyn argues that the “impulsive desire of the flesh” is a “cosmic power arrayed against God.”

“The Spirit and the Flesh constitute an apocalyptic antinomy, in the sense that they are opposed orbs of power, actively at war with one another *since* the advent of the Spirit.”

Martyn is certainly correct to stress the new age brought about by the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, which resulted in the reception of the promised Spirit (3:14); however, his translation of 5:17d as “you do not actually do the very things you wish to do” and his proposal that Paul is speaking only to the Galatians who have been swayed by the Missionaries’ teaching fails to achieve the coherent reading of the entire passage that is accomplished by Barclay’s rendering of the verse.

In agreement with Barclay and Hays, we understand 5:18 to indicate that the Spirit, not the law, is now the sole and sufficient force necessary to control the Flesh (flesh), both as a power warring against God and as its manifestation within the individual as “the evil inclination.” Also, if we interpret 5:17-18 to be addressed to all the Galatians in order to stress the sufficiency of the Spirit, which has now replaced the Mosaic law as the efficacious antidote for the Flesh (flesh), Paul’s unusual terminology in

---

531 *Galatians*, 493.  
534 Cf. Hays, *Galatians*, 326. *Contra* Dunn (*Galatians*, 299) who states: “But the opposition of flesh and Spirit is mutual. So the implication must be rather that ‘those things you want’ are associated with the desirings of both flesh and Spirit.”
v.17 may be explained, especially if we read v. 17 as a parodic reversal of the description of the Song of Moses presented in Deut 31:21. Deut 31:21 states:

καὶ ἀντικαταστήσεται ἡ ὁδή αὐτῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον μαρτυροῦσα σὺ γὰρ μὴ ἐπιλησθῇ ἀπὸ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ στόματος τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τὴν ποιημάν αὐτῶν ὅσα ποιοῦσιν ὡς σήμερον πρὸ τοῦ εἰσαγαγεῖν με αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἣν ὄμοσα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν

And this song will stand witnessing against every person; for it will never be forgotten from their mouth and from the mouth of their seed. For I know their wickedness, as many things as they are doing here today, [even] before I lead them into the good land, which I swore to their fathers.

Although a parody of the verse would be based on the LXX, it is important in this case to note that the final portion of MT Deut 31:21 reads:

וּהֶן יְשֵׁר שְׁפֵךְ נֶפֶשָׁהּ מְסֹכְלַת הַיָּדָה לְהַכִּי יָדְתִּי אָנִי לְהַכִּי

For I know his inclination (yeser), which he is doing, in the time before I will bring him into the land that I swore.

If Marcus is correct in his contention that by Paul’s time yeser was a technical term and that Paul demonstrates his knowledge of the yeser concept most clearly in Gal 5:16, it is possible that Paul, just as the LXX translator of Deut 31:21, would have

535 Martyn (Galatians, 493) notes: “Aside from the present text, there is no instance known to us of the Greek expression epithymeô kata and the genitive.” Therefore, he appeals to Hebrew syntax and the Babylonian Talmud to explain Paul’s “strange expression.” However, rather than appeal to a source from the third-sixth century C.E., it seems much more likely that Paul’s “strange expression” can be explained by understanding his rhetorical parody of Deut 31:21.

536 Contra Waters (End, 2 n. 7) who claims: “There are no discernable engagements of Deut 31 in Paul’s letters.” See 3.1.2.1 above for our discussion regarding the citation of Deut 31:21a-b in 2 Macc 7:6.

537 The citation of MT Deut 31:21 does not imply that we know the exact Hebrew text that formed the basis of LXX Deut 31:21 or that either the LXX or the MT remained consistent throughout their transmissions. However, BHS does not include any variant reading for יְשֵׁר שְׁפֵךְ נֶפֶשָׁהּ . And Wevers (Deuteronomium, 341) does not include any textual variant in his critical apparatus for יָוֵן דְּקָרָם אֵלֶּה.
associated τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν in v. 21 with the yeeser concept.\footnote{Regarding MT Deut 31:21, Gerhard von Rad (Deuteronomy [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966], 190) states: “The interesting concept of yeeser (v. 21) which can be rendered by ‘tendency,’ ‘disposition,’ ‘nature’ is already approaching here closely to the late-Jewish theologumenon of the ‘evil impulse.’”} And, as mentioned above, the Mosaic law was typically understood as the sole antidote for the evil inclination. Therefore, if LXX Deut 31:21, with its reference to the human tendency for wickedness, is in the background as Paul argues that the Spirit has now replaced the law as the effective antidote for the evil inclination, there should be additional allusions to or parodic reinterpretations of Deut 31:21\footnote{Referencing the law here, rather than the Song of Moses, does not necessitate agreement with von Rad’s (ibid.) proposal that Ἰ ὅδη ἀὐτη in Deut 31:21 is secondary in that it replaced an original reading of “Torah.” However, while the Song of Moses in Deut 32 recounts the history of God’s dealings with Israel, the Mosaic law obviously plays an undeniable role in that history and is specifically mentioned not only in Deut 27-30, chapters which continuously reiterate the blessings and curses connected with the law and the need to choose life over death, but also in Deut 31:9, 11-12, 24, 26 and in 32:44-47. Additionally, “breaking the covenant” is mentioned in 31:9, 11-12, 16, 20, the “lawlessness” of the people in 31:29, and Israel’s sin in 32:5. For a discussion of Paul’s reading of the Song of Moses “as a prophetic prefiguration of God’s dealings with Israel through the gospel,” see Richard B. Hays, Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 164.} in the rest of Paul’s argument regarding the efficacy of the Spirit in controlling the desire of the flesh.

In discussing other possible parodic reinterpretations of Deut 31:21, it is important to note that Paul couches 5:16 in parodic allusions to scriptural demands for observing the Mosaic law. As many note, Paul begins 5:16 with an imperative of περιπατέω (“walk,” “conduct one’s life,” “behave”), which is equivalent to ἐλευθεροδοξία with its metaphorical meaning of walking in God’s laws.\footnote{Dunn (Galatians, 295) states: “Paul, therefore, is deliberately using the language of OT moral obligation, precisely with a view to its impact on those familiar with or attracted to the Jewish lifestyle.” Cf., e.g., Hays, Galatians, 325 and Martyn, Galatians, 492.} But it is just as important that Paul ends the verse by employing the subjunctive of τελέω (“carry out,” “bring to
perfection”). 541 As part of his emphatic negation. Given that Paul employs περιπατέω with the metaphorical meaning that ἔλεος carried in its relation to walking in the law, it is logical to propose that Paul is also employing τελέω with the connotation of “bringing to perfection” as a parodic reversal of the typical Jewish understanding that a person would be viewed as perfect before the Lord by adhering closely to the law. 542 In this case, Paul is not only emphatically assuring the Galatians that walking in the Spirit would prevent them from “bringing the desire of the flesh to perfection,” but he is also parodically reversing a concept to which he previously alluded in Gal 3:3, a concept that is normally assumed to be part of the Missionaries’ teaching. 543 ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε; (“Having begun in the Spirit, are you now bringing yourself to perfection in the flesh?”). 544

Therefore, since Paul parodically alludes to the law in 5:16, we should not be surprised if, in his next sentence, he also parodically reverses the idea that the Song of Moses witnesses against the wickedness of every person, which is equivalent to “the evil inclination/the desire of the flesh.” Martyn is certainly correct in stating, “Paul moves

541 Although τελέω in 5:16 is usually translated as “carry out,” LSJ (“τελέω,” 1771-72, I. 5) lists “bring to completion or perfection” as one meaning for the verb in the active voice.

542 In referring to being perfect before the Lord, the LXX employs τέλειος (e.g., Deut 18:13; 1 Kg 8:61; 11:4; 15:3, 14; Sir 44:17) and τελέω (e.g., Wis 4:16).

543 Dunn (Galatians, 297) ties 5:16 to 3:3 by noting that τελέω is “the simpler form of the verb” ἐπιτελέω in 3:3. See also Hays (Galatians, 252) who cites m. Ned. 3:11 as linking “circumcision explicitly with perfection in light of Gen 17.” Martyn (Galatians, 285) notes that Paul in 3:3 “with considerable sarcasm . . . refers to an important aspect of the Teachers’ message.”

544 Although the ASV and the NASB translate ἐπιτελεῖσθε as passive, the RSV and NRSV take ἐπιτελεῖσθε to be in the middle voice. My translation assumes that ἐπιτελεῖσθε is in the middle voice.
from the noun *epithymia* [in v.16] to the verb *epithymeô* [v.17].” However, Paul’s use of ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ plus the genitive may not be as strange as Martyn assumes. If Paul is rhetorically parodying Deut 31:21, with its insistence that the Song of Moses stands witnessing against the wickedness/*yeser* of the people, he has merely substituted a form of ἀντίκειμαι in Gal 5:17c for the synonymous ἀντικαθίστημι in Deut 31:21 while retaining the preposition κατὰ from κατὰ πρόσωπον in Deut 31:21, which he uses in 5:17ab in conjunction with ἐπιθυμεῖ. But since Paul employs κατὰ to introduce the idea of opposition in v.17ab, rather than as a distributive as in Deut 31:21, he follows the preposition with the genitive rather than the accusative, which results in what Martyn terms “an un-Greek expression.”

The likelihood that Paul is rhetorically parodying Deut 31:21 in order to stress that the Spirit has now replaced the Mosaic law/Song of Moses as the effective antidote for and witness against wickedness/*yeser* is increased when we note that Deut 31:20 specifically mentions three future sins of the people: “they will worship foreign gods;” “they will provoke” (παροξυνοῦσιν) God; and “they will reject” (διασκεδάσωσιν) “the covenant” that God made with Israel. Since we have already discussed the common Jewish belief that the Spirit would not indwell a person who provokes God and we have

---

545 LSJ (“ἀντικαθίστημι,” 156) lists “set against” and “oppose” as possible meanings of ἀντίκειμαι and “to be set over against,” “to be opposite or opposed” as possible meanings of ἀντικεῖμαι (“ἀντίκειμαι,” ibid.). Besides Gal 5:17, Paul employs forms of ἀντίκειμαι two other times in the undisputed letters: 1 Cor 16:9 and Phil 1:28 (cf. 2 Thess 2:4); however, ἀντικαθίστημι does not occur in the Pauline corpus. The only occurrence of ἀντικαθίστημι in the NT is in Heb 12:4.

546 *Galatians*, 493.
explained that Paul appeals to the Galatians’ previous experience as evidence that they do not need to be Torah-observant in order to receive the Spirit, we need to discuss the ways in which rejecting the covenant and idolatry relate to Paul’s argument.

In considering the particular actions that the Missionaries construed as constituting a rejection of the covenant and the relationship of their teaching to Paul’s argument in Gal 5, many commentators note that in 5:2 Paul identifies circumcision for the first time as the issue facing the Galatians and that he begins his pastoral counsel regarding the conflict with a voice of authority. But Paul’s vocabulary in 5:3a is interesting: μαρτυρομαι δὲ πᾶλιν παντὶ ἀνθρωπῷ περιτεμνομένω (“Now I in turn bear witness to every man receiving circumcision”). Although Dunn specifically mentions that Paul employs “formal legal terminology” by using μαρτυρομαι, I have not encountered any commentator who discusses the possibility that Paul employs πᾶλιν in 5:3 as “a marker of contrast” even though this is a normal connotation of the adverb and some scholars maintain that Paul employs πᾶλιν with this connotation in 2 Cor 10:7. If we interpret πᾶλιν as a marker of contrast in 5:3 and agree with Dunn that Paul does indeed

547 See nn.252-253 above for sources supporting Sanders’s interpretation that the righteous person was the opposite of the person who “provoked God.” Regarding the Jewish understanding that the Spirit would indwell the righteous, but not the unrighteous, see 3.1.3.1.
548 See nn.490, 504.
549 Galatians, 265.
550 See BAGD, “πᾶλιν, 4,” 606-7, which renders πᾶλιν as “on the other hand” or “in turn.” Cf. BDAG, “πᾶλιν, 4” 752-53; and LSJ, “πᾶλιν II & III,” 1292.
551 In addition to BAGD, “πᾶλιν, 4,” 607 and BDAG, “πᾶλιν, 4,” 753, which cite 2 Cor 10:7 as an example of this connotation, see Margaret E. Thrall, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians II: Commentary on 2 Corinthians VIII-XIII (ICC 9; Edinburgh: Clark, 2000), 623 and esp. n.206; and Rudolf Bultmann, The Second Letter to the Corinthians (trans. Roy A. Harrisville; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985), 188.
employ legal terminology, then it is likely that Paul is rebutting the eternal witness of the Song of Moses against the people’s future rejection of the law, especially since Deut 31:12 requires “the proselyte that is in your cities” to be present in the future assemblies when the law is read and the people are charged \( \text{ποιεῖν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου} \) (“to do all the words of this law”). In this case, Paul’s testimony that any man being circumcised \( \text{ὅφθειλέτης ἐστὶν ὄλον τὸν νόμον ποιήσαι} \) (“is under obligation to do the whole law”) is an allusion to the Deuteronomical requirement that all the people, including proselytes, must “do all the words of this law.”

Additionally, if Paul is parodically countering the Missionaries’ insistence that the Galatians must “do all the words of this law,” the attributive position of \( \text{πᾶς} \) in Gal 5:14

\[\text{552} \quad \text{Martyn (Galatians, 469) and Dunn (Galatians, 265) understand \text{πᾶς} in v.3 to indicate that Paul is reiterating what he had already said in v.2. Although Martyn does consider Paul’s reference to \text{“the whole law”} to relate to \text{“the plural law,”} as in Deut 27:28, he does not understand \text{πᾶς} as Paul’s expression of contrast. Dunn notes Paul’s \text{“play on words”} between vv.2 and 3. Although vv.2 and 3 employ a form of \text{περιέχειν} and v.3 employs \text{φειλέτης} (“debtor”) while v.2 has \text{φειλέω} (“to be of benefit”), translating \text{πᾶς} as \text{“again”} with reference to v. 2 does not necessitate Paul’s immediate reference in v.3 to the \text{“whole” law}. But understanding \text{πᾶς} as expressing a contrasting statement to an eternal witness to keep “all the words of this law” does explain Paul’s immediate reference to the \text{“whole” law}.
\]

\[\text{553} \quad \text{As mentioned above, according to Smyth (§1175), \text{όλος} in the predicate position denotes an entity \text{“as a whole”} or in its entirety. Therefore, Paul’s phrase \text{όλον τὸν νόμον} is referring to the law in its entirety.}
\]

\[\text{554} \quad \text{Hays (Galatians, 313), noting the connection between 3:10 and \text{“the whole law”} in 5:3, understands Paul’s reference to \text{“the whole law”} to be a reaction against the Missionaries’ quotation of Deut 27:26. Although Paul cites Deut 27:26a in 3:10, he substitutes the phrase \text{γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ} for \text{λόγοις}. Since Paul conflates Deuteronomical verses that stress the requirements of the law in his citation of Scripture in 3:10 (see n. 270 above), he could also be parodying a conflation of Deut 27:26 with other Deuteronomical verses that demand obedience to \text{“all the words of the law”} in Gal 5:3, 14. In addition to Deut 27:26, which states \text{ἐν πάσῃ τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου} (“and they will understand to do all the words of this law”), Deut 32:46 records the words of Moses as: \text{καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς προσέχετε τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους οὓς ἔγαγε διαμαρτύρωμα Ἰακώβ σήμερον ἐν εὐτελείᾳ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰακώβ πυλάσειν καὶ ποιεῖν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου} (“And he said to them, With [your] heart, pay close attention to all these words which I testify to you today which you will command your sons to guard and to do all the words of this law”). And importantly, Deut 32:47 declares that the law is \text{“life.”}}
\]
may also be clarified.\textsuperscript{555} Since \( \pi\alpha\zeta \) in the predicate position means “all”\textsuperscript{556} while \( \pi\alpha\zeta \) in the attributive position “denotes the whole regarded as the sum of all its parts,”\textsuperscript{557} Paul could be employing \( \pi\alpha\zeta \) in the attributive position in order to continue his parody regarding the “whole law” that he introduced in 5:3. Since the Missionaries are insisting that the Galatians must “do all the words of this law,” Paul alludes to the Deuteronomic phrase in 5:14 by including \( \pi\alpha\zeta \) and \( \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\zeta \).\textsuperscript{558} Therefore, Paul begins a parodic reversal of the Deuteronomic witness of Moses “to do all the words of this law” by stating in Gal 5:3: “Now I in turn bear witness to every man being circumcised that he is under obligation to do the whole law,” which, of course, is in parodic agreement with the command of Moses that the Israelites, and equally the proselytes, are to do all the words of the law. In 5:3 Paul employs an infinitive of \( \pi\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omega \), which is in agreement with the Deuteronomic phrase.\textsuperscript{559} Since Paul immediately refers in 5:4 to \( \epsilon\nu \ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\ \delta\omicron\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \delta\omicron\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) (“you being rectified in the law”), \( \pi\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omega \) in 5:3 is an additional allusion to the Mosaic

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{555} Gal 5:14 states: \( \omicron \ \gamma\alpha\rho \ \pi\zeta\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\ \epsilon\nu \ \epsilon\nu \ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\zeta \ \pi\epsilon\omicron\lambda\iota\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \epsilon\nu \ \tau\omicron\gamma\ \acute{\alpha} \gamma\acute{\alpha} \pi\acute{\epsilon}r\acute{e} \tau\omicron \ \pi\lambda\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \sigma\omicron \ \acute{\omega} \ \sigma\acute{\kappa} \alpha\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron \) (“For the entire law has been fulfilled in one word, in which: “You will love your neighbor as yourself”).
\textsuperscript{556} Ibid., §1174b. Therefore, \( \pi\zeta \) in the attributive position is equivalent to \( \acute{\omega} \omicron\zeta \) in the predicate position. See n. 326 above.
\textsuperscript{557} Although Hays (Galatians, 323-24) and Martyn (Galatians, 491, 506) note that the attributive \( \pi\zeta \) expresses totality and that Paul employs \( \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\zeta \) rather than \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\omicron\omicron \), neither views Paul’s references to \( \pi\zeta \) and \( \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\zeta \) as parodic reinterpretations of the Deuteronomic phrase. Martyn explains the use of \( \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\zeta \) as Paul’s attempt to distance his statement from the Mosaic law. Hays proposes that Paul understands Lev 19:18 “not as a commandment, but as a word of prophetic promise.” However, if we view Paul’s choice of vocabulary as a parodic reinterpretation of commands to do all the words of the law, we are not negating the possibility that Paul also understood Lev 19:18 as a prophetic promise.
\textsuperscript{558} Martyn (Galatians, 470) notes the importance of the verb \( \pi\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omega \) in 5:3 and its relationship to Deut 27:26; however, he posits, on the basis of 6:13, that the Teachers may not be requiring the Galatians to observe all the law. But on this point see Hays (Galatians, 312-13) who notes, based on 3:10, 4:10, and 4:21 that the Galatians are already familiar with the requirement to do the whole law.
command. The Galatians that are seeking to be rectified in the law are still obligated under the conditions presented in the witness of Moses “to do \( \piοιέω \) all the words of this law.”

However, in 5:14 Paul declares that “the entire law \( \piάζ \) has been fulfilled/brought to completion \( \piπ\lambda\'ρωπε\) in one \( λόγος \): ‘You will love your neighbor as yourself’” (Lev 19:18). If we understand Paul’s references to “the whole law” in 5:3 and to “the entire law” that has been fulfilled in one \( λόγος \) in 5:14 as parodic plays on the phrase “to do all the words of the law” that is frequently repeated in Deut 28-32, we see that Paul is not in any way discussing the ability or inability of humans to keep the law perfectly. Rather, he is correcting the misconception introduced by the Missionaries that, even in light of the death of Christ on the cross, Gentiles, or in the Missionaries’ view ‘proselytes,” must “do all the words of the law.” The advantage of reading 5:14 in light of the Deuteronomic phrase is that it explains Paul’s employment of \( λόγος \) and the attributive placement of \( πάζ \) as elements of his rhetorical parody of the Mosaic witness to do all the law. By employing these parodic elements, Paul accentuates his declaration that the self-sacrificing death of Christ, as the supreme act of loving one’s

---

560 Contra Hans Hübner (Law in Paul’s Thought: A Contribution to the Development of Pauline Theology [trans. James C. G. Greig; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1984], 37) who claims:” It is possible to give some consistent sense to these two utterances only if \( \delta\, πάζ \, νόμος \) in 5:14 does not mean the same as \( \sigmaς \, τόν \, νόμον \) in 5:3.”
561 Cf. Hays, Galatians, 312; Martyn, Galatians, 470.
neighbor, has already brought the Mosaic requirements to completion. \(^{562}\) Therefore, in 5:14 Paul logically substitutes πληρώω for ποιέω since he is no longer addressing the consequences of seeking to “be rectified in the law” as in 5:3-4, but, as clarified in 5:13, he is addressing the conditions of grace under which “brothers” who “were called to freedom” should be living. In the new age brought about by the death and resurrection of Christ, the period of time in which the law’s requirements, along with its blessings and curses, are in effect for all of God’s people has been brought to completion.

This interpretation of ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπληρώται is supported by Paul’s reference to Christ’s self-sacrificing act in 5:1:\(^{563\text{a}}\) Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν· στήκετε οὖν καὶ μὴ πάλλων ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. (“For freedom Christ liberated you [from the curses of the law]; stand firm, therefore, and do not on the other hand be entangled in the yoke of slavery”). Earlier in the letter, Paul expressed similar lines of thought: 1) Christ “bought us back from the curse of the law having become a curse for us” (3:13); 2) the law was a temporary παιδαγωγός (“constraining guardian”) until the coming of Christ, whose actions rendered the constraining function of the law obsolete; and 3) therefore, there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile (3:23-28) since all are now inheritors of the promises to Abraham through the faithfulness of the singular seed, Christ (3:14-18).

Additionally, when we note that Deut 31:20 specifically identifies those to whom

\(^{562}\) Regarding the translation of πεπληρώται as “has been brought to completion/fulfillment” by Christ, see e.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 488-89; Hays, *Galatians*, 322-23; Barclay, *Obeying*, 139.

\(^{563\text{a}}\) Martyn (*Galatians*, 489) also relates 5:14 to 5:1.
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the Song of Moses will witness against as those who “will reject” (διασκεδάζουσιν) the covenant that God made with Israel and when we consider, as discussed above, that Gen 17:14 demands that any male who refuses to be circumcised should be ostracized because “he rejected” (διεσκέδασεν) God’s covenant, Deut 31:20-21, as well as Gen 17:14, could be in the background of Paul’s argument in Gal 5.\textsuperscript{564} Sam K. Williams proposes that 5:9, with its reference to the diffusing effects of yeast, and 5:10, with its reference to judgment/condemnation, should be interpreted as Paul’s command to expel the Missionaries whose distortion of the gospel would spread and corrupt the entire community if they were not removed.\textsuperscript{565}

Therefore, it is our contention that Paul, in his argument against circumcision in Gal 5, is parodically reversing a combination of Scriptures that are tied together by the common use of διασκεδάζω. We argued above that the Missionaries’ insistence that the Galatians become Torah-observant was based on Scriptures that required proselytes to adhere to the same law as native-born Israelites.\textsuperscript{566} We also argued above that the reason for Peter’s withdrawal from the Gentiles at Antioch was that “the ones from James” had convinced him, along with Barnabas and the other Jews, that the Galatians who refused to

\textsuperscript{564} See LSJ, “διασκεδάζω, 5,” 411.
\textsuperscript{565} Galatians, 140. Cf. Hays, Galatians, 315. Gal 5:9-10 state: μικρά ζύμη ὄλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. ἐγὼ πέπουσα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ ὅτι νῦν ἄλλο φρονήσετε· ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα, ὡστε ἐὰν γίνη. (“A little yeast leavens the whole lump [of dough]. I have confidence in you in the Lord that you will think no other thing; and the one who is troubling you, whoever he is, will bear the condemnation.”)
\textsuperscript{566} See 3.1.2.2 above for the passages that required one law for native born and proselyte. Additionally, although Lev 26:15 does not discuss one law for proselytes and Israelites and, therefore, was not included in the previous discussion, it employs διασκεδάζω and discusses the penalties for rejecting the covenant.
be circumcised were intentional sinners and, therefore, should be ostracized.⁵⁶⁷ Of the Scriptures discussed above, in which Gen 17:14 was included, it is especially important to note that Num 15:30-31 requires that an intentional sinner must be “driven out” (ἐκτρίβω) because that person “has provoked (παροξύνω) God,” “disparaged the word of the Lord” and “has rejected (διασκεδάζω) God’s commandments.”

If Williams is correct in his proposal that Paul in 5:9-10 tells the Galatians “to expel” the Missionaries from the community, it is easy to see how Paul moves from his discussion of slavery under the law vs. freedom in Christ in the Allegory of Hagar and Sarah, with its command to “cast out (ἐκβάλλω) the slave woman and her son,” to his direct address against circumcision in 5:2 and his “implicit injunction” in 5:10, which demands the expulsion of the Missionaries.⁵⁶⁸ Additionally, Paul’s implicit injunction in 5:10 includes the comment: ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα (“and the one troubling you will bear the judgment/condemnation”).⁵⁶⁹ While this phrase does not agree verbally with the ending of Num 15:31, it certainly expresses the same sentiment as ἐκτριβήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἡ ἀμαρτία αὐτῆς ἐν αὐτῇ (“that person will be driven out, his sin is on him”). But if Paul is parodically reversing Num 15:31, which requires the banishment of an uncircumcised male as an intentional sinner, by applying it to the Missionaries who are insisting that the Galatians be circumcised or face ostracism, why

---

⁵⁶⁷ See 3.1.2.3.
⁵⁶⁸ Williams, Galatians, 140.
⁵⁶⁹ Williams (Galatians, 140) is certainly correct here that κρίμα in 5:10 refers not only to God’s future judgment, but also to the “initial punishment” of banishment. Cf. Hays, Galatians, 315. Contra Martyn (Galatians, 475) who interprets κρίμα as referring only to God’s future judgment.
would Paul not say, ἡ ἁμαρτία αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, ὡστὶς ἐὰν ἦ ("his sin is on him, whoever he is")?

Based on Paul’s question in Gal 2:17 (ἀρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; = “Is Christ then a minister of sin?”), Barclay argues that the Missionaries had made “the charge that Christ promoted ‘sin’” and, therefore, Paul avoids employing ἁμαρτία in Gal 5, choosing instead to address the issue facing the Galatians by substituting the term σάρξ for ἁμαρτία. If Barclay is correct, Paul’s ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ἵματα βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα not only expresses the concept of personal responsibility conveyed in Num 15:31 without employing ἁμαρτία, but also it calls attention to God’s final judgment as well as expressing the present punishment carried out by the community.571

We have argued that in Gal 5 Paul parodically alludes to Scriptures that employ διασκεδάζω (Gen 17:14; Deut 31:20-21; Num 15:30-31) to describe the people’s rejection of God’s covenant with Israel and that he parodically reverses the required ostracism of those who refuse circumcision by calling for the ostracism of those who proclaim the value of circumcision. Such a parodic reversal of Scripture may also explain Paul’s choice of vocabulary when he declares, “the works of the flesh are evident” (5:19) and, after presenting a representative list of such works (vv.19b-21a), discusses the “fruit of the Spirit.” Although most commentators correctly note that Paul shapes the lists so that

570 Barclay, Obeying, 109-10; 211. Barclay’s proposal does not negate the validity of Martyn’s (Galatians, 493) understanding that Paul used “the Flesh” as an abbreviation for the “Evil Impulse.”
571 Cf. Hays, Galatians, 315. Contra Martyn (Galatians, 475) who interprets κρίμα in 5:10 as referring solely to God’s future judgment.
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the qualities mentioned stress the issues challenging the Galatians, particularly the need for unity,

572 it is also likely that Paul once again parodically reverses Scripture. While some verses, such as Gen 8:21, employ τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων (“the works of humans”) as synonymous with the evil inclination,

573 other verses employ ἔργα in connection with the law-abiding behavior of the righteous.

574 However, as we noted in our introductory chapter, the correlation between Paul’s juxtaposition of “the works of the flesh” (5:19) vs. “the fruit of the Spirit” (5:22) and Prov 10:16 is striking since Prov 10:16 is the only passage of Scripture, besides Paul’s discussion, that employs “works” and “fruit(s)” as the by-products of two opposing types of individuals. Prov 10:16 states:

ἐργα δικαίων ζωὴν ποιεῖ καρποί δὲ ἁσβῶν ἁμαρτίας
The works of the righteous bring about life, but the fruits of the ungodly [bring about] sins

In the proverb, the types are the righteous as opposed to the ungodly with the implied understanding that the “righteous” ones adhere closely to the law.

576 Based on

572 Cf. Hays, Galatians, 327; Barclay, Obeying, 208; Dunn, Galatians, 304-6; Martyn, Galatians, 532-33.
573 While LXX Gen 8:21 states the synonymous phrase as ἔγκειται ἡ διάνοια τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ ποιημα ἐκ νεότητος (“the intention of a human insists thoroughly on evil things from youth”), MT 8:21 reads "the yeser (inclination) of the heart of the man is evil from his youth”). See above for the role that Gen 8:21 plays in Joel Marcus’ discussion of “the evil inclination.” Other examples of ἔργα with this connotation include, e.g.: Exod 23:24; 2Chr 17:4; 32:19; 34:25; 1 Esd 4:37; 8:83; Ps 16:4; 27:3-4; 105:34-35; Prov 13:9; Wis 12:4; Pss. Sol. 17:8.
574 See, e.g., Exod 18:20; 1 Esd 1:21; Prov 16:2; 1 Macc 2:50-51; Isa 32:17; 60:21. For the phrase “works of the law” in Gal (2:16; 3:2, 5,10), see n.363 above.
575 Regarding “works of the flesh,” Dunn (Galatians, 301) notes: “the echo of the earlier repeated phrase ‘works of the law’ (2:16; 3:2, 5, 10) is no doubt intentional.”
576 That the righteous adhere to the law is certain since Prov 10:16 declares that their actions “bring about life.” Considering Paul’s earlier argument in which he countered the typical Jewish understanding that “works of the law” made a person righteous (2:16-21), we can be fairly certain that the Missionaries had associated “righteousness” with adhering to the requirements of the law. And considering Paul’s denial that
Gal 5:18, for Paul the two types of people are those led by the Spirit and those who are “under the law.” As has been noted, Paul’s association of those “under the law” with those whose behavior is characteristic of the Flesh is quite shocking. However, given that Paul makes this association, we propose that Paul, in order to drive home his point, employs rhetorical parody to reverse the positive connotation of “works” and the negative connotation of “fruits” that occur in Prov 10:16. Although we have no way of knowing whether or not the Missionaries quoted Prov 10:16 to support their teaching that the Galatians must observe all the law, the likelihood that Paul is drawing on the proverb to enhance his argument is increased when we again consider Barclay’s proposal that Paul avoids employing ἀμαρτία in Gal 5, choosing instead to address the issue facing the Galatians by substituting the term σάρξ. If Barclay is correct regarding ἀμαρτία, it is very likely that Paul would also avoid ἁσεβής for the same reason. Additionally, if, as we have proposed, Paul’s intended audience includes the Missionaries as well as the Galatians, the Missionaries would have most likely recognized Paul’s parodic reversal of the proverb.

But if Paul is parodically reversing Prov 10:16, how do we explain his substitution of the singular “fruit” for the plural form that occurs in the proverb? As many the law had the ability to “produce life” (3:21), we can be fairly certain that Paul believed that the Missionaries made this claim, presumably based on Deut 30:15-20.

577 Cf. Dunn, Galatians, 301-2; Martyn, Galatians, 495-96.
578 This is extremely likely since ἁσεβής and ἀμαρτωλός are synonymous. See BDAG, “ἁσεβής, 1,” 141 and sources cited there.
commentators stress, Paul is not listing a set of vices and virtues that can be avoided or instilled by human effort. Rather, he is discussing the “effects of the Flesh” that are exhibited in a community controlled by the Flesh and the harvest/produce of the Spirit that is exhibited in a community controlled by the Spirit. In an effort to drive home the unifying harvest of a community under the control of the Spirit as opposed to the divisive effects of a community under the power of the Flesh, it is quite logical and appropriate that Paul would retain the plural ἔργα of Prov 10:16 while changing καρποῖ to the singular καρπός, thus emphasizing the unity that is a product of a community that is walking in the Spirit.

In summary, we have proposed that Paul employs the devices of rhetorical parody and parodic reversal in Gal 5. He parodies Deut 31:20-21, Gen 17:14, and Num 15:30-31, which employ διασκεδάζω to describe the rejection of God’s covenant with Israel, and he also performs a parodic reversal of Prov 10:16, which employs ἔργα and καρποῖ to describe the behavior of the righteous as opposed to the ungodly. Our interpretation clarifies several of Paul’s statements in Gal 5. In addition to explaining Paul’s unusual Greek expression in 5:17, a parodic reading of the chapter not only highlights the
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580 As mentioned above, Dunn (*Galatians*, 301, 308) notes τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός is an intentional echo of “works of the law (2:16; 3:2, 5, 10).”
581 Cf. Hays, *Galatians*, 237-38; Martyn, *Galatians*, 499; Dunn, *Galatians*, 308-09. Additionally, in Phil 1:11, Paul employs the singular καρπός when he describes the characteristics that he desires the Philippian Christians to possess: πληρωμένοι καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης τῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (“having been filled with the fruit of righteousness, the fruit [that comes] through Jesus Christ”).
polemical dimension of 5:3 while explaining the attributive πᾶς in 5:14, but also emphasizes the cohesiveness of Gal 5 and the preceding theological arguments presented in Gal 3-4. Although Paul begins a new section of the letter in 5:2 that directly addresses the issue of circumcision, recognizing his continuing rhetorical parody of Scriptures that require obedience to the law, as discussed above, should influence our interpretation of the particular items that he includes in “the works of the flesh,” especially items such as idolatry and φαρμακενία (v.20) that are frequently associated in Scripture with Gentiles⁵⁸² who do not obey the requirements of the law. While we are not disputing that Paul shapes the particular items in his lists of “the works of the flesh” and the “fruit of the Spirit” to stress the need for unity in the community, we are emphasizing that we need to interpret the specific items mentioned in light of Paul’s preceding argument. Therefore, it is helpful at this point to summarize 5:2-18:

Listen, I Paul say to you if you are circumcised, Christ will not benefit you in any way. [Although certain ones are telling you that according to the witness of Moses you must obey all the words of the law or be cut off from the community of believers] now I, in turn, bear witness to any man receiving circumcision that he is under obligation to do the whole law. You have been severed from Christ, you – whoever are being rectified in the law, you have fallen from grace. For we in the Spirit eagerly await the hope of rectification derived from [Christ’s] faithfulness. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision accomplishes anything, but faith working through love.

You were running well; who cut in on you so that you do not obey the truth?

⁵⁸² Dunn (Galatians, 301) notes that Paul’s “challenge to the other missionaries is as sharp as it could be . . . Judaism, after all, was more opposed to these things than others were (particularly idolatry and sorcery).”

⁵⁸³ Martyn (Galatians, 472) translates ἵστησις as “accomplish,” which seems to be the best option given that the Missionaries most likely espoused the constraining aspect of the law. See BDAG, “ἵστησις 2,” 484. Paul employs ἵστησις with this connotation in Phil 4:13, which is the only other occurrence of the verb in the Pauline corpus.
The persuasion does not come from the one who calls you. A little leaven leavens the whole lump. I have confidence in you in the Lord that you will have no other opinion; and [that you will ostracize] the one troubling you [and the trouble maker] will bear the condemnation, whoever he is. But I, brothers, if I am still preaching circumcision, why am I still being persecuted? In that case, the scandal of the cross is abolished. [But since] the ones unsettling you [cannot get past the scandal and understand that Christ has freed us from the obligation to do all the words of the law and the curse of the law for those who reject the law.] I wish that they would castrate themselves.

For you were called to freedom, brothers [not to obedience to all the words of the law as a constraining guardian over your actions]; only not freedom [that becomes] a starting point for the Flesh, but through love become slaves to one another. [You will not be forcibly enslaved as part of the curse that results from a rejection of all the words of the law because Christ has bought you back from from the threat of slavery forever] for the entire law has been brought to completion in one word, in which: You will love your neighbor as yourself. [Since Christ has already epitomized this one word by becoming a curse for us, you should also embody his example and become slaves to one another.] But if you bite and devour one another, beware that you are not consumed by one another.

Now I say walk in the Spirit and you will never bring to perfection the desire of the Flesh. For the flesh desires against the Spirit and the Spirit desires against the Flesh, for these are opposed to one another, so that you may not do whatever things you want. Now if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law.

In light of Paul’s argument in vv. 2-18, which we contend employs rhetorical parody in order to counter the Missionaries’ insistence that the Galatians must adhere to all the words of the Mosaic law, we should note that sorcery, along of course with the obvious sin of idolatry, is often mentioned as a Gentile practice that is particularly abhorrent to God. Sorcery is described as characteristic of those who oppose God:

584 Barclay, Obeying, 112-15.
585 We refer here not only to the noun φαρμακεία (“sorcery”) that Paul employs, but also to the verb φαρμακεύω (“practice magic/make potions”) and other cognates: φαρμακεύς (“sorcerer”), φάρμακος (“sorcerer”), φάρμακον (“charm/spell”). See BDAG, 1049-50.
586 The plethora of Scriptures that condemn idolatry makes it unnecessary to discuss the practice further than to reiterate that Deut 31:20, in the preface to the Song of Moses, specifically mentions “worshipping foreign gods” as provoking God and rejecting the covenant.
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Pharoah and the Egyptians (Exod 7:11, 22; 8:3, 14, 18; Wis 18:13); the Canaanites (Wis 12:4); Jezebel (4 Kgdms 9:22); Manasseh (2 Chr 33:6); and Babylonia (Isa 47:9, 12). Additionally, sorcery is mentioned in connection with the Gentiles that oppose the “remnant of Jacob” ( Mic 5:11) and those who contradict the warnings of God’s prophets (Jer 34:9). In stipulating the rules for the covenant community, Exod 22:17 states that a sorcerer is not permitted to live; Deut 18 demands that the covenant people must “be perfect before the Lord” (v.13) and must not adopt the practices of the Gentiles, including sorcery (v.11). And, interestingly, Deut 18:12 states πᾶς ποιῶν ταύτα (“all the ones doing these things”) are an abomination to the Lord and κύριος ἔξολεθρεύει αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ σοῦ (“the Lord will ostracize them from you”).

As is commonly accepted, Paul does not include the initial five elements in the list of “the works of the flesh” because they are specific sins that are occurring within the community, but he is expressing characteristics that the Missionaries would agree were obviously not of God. Certainly Martyn is correct in noting, “Paul begins his list with three terms used in Jewish polemic against Gentiles,” and Dunn correctly observes that the first five items “would evoke warm assent in any Jewish or God-fearing audience.”

It is only with the next eight items, which Hays refers to as “community-destroying behaviors,” that Paul “shows that his primary concern is for the unity and peace of the

587 On ἔξολεθρεύει, see n.190 and the discussion of ostracism in 3.1.2.2 and 3.1.2.3 above.
588 See, e.g., Martyn, Galatians, 496; Hays, Galatians, 327; and Dunn, Galatians, 302.
589 Galatians, 496.
590 Galatians, 304.
Galatian churches.”

Therefore, returning to our discussion of the most likely connotation of \( \beta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \omega \) in 3:1, there is absolutely nothing in the context of Paul’s letter that would support the translation of \( \beta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \omega \) as “bewitch.” If the common translation of \( \beta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \omega \) as “bewitch” is correct, Paul’s question in 3:1 has nothing to do with any explicit statements that he makes in the letter or the situation that the Galatians are facing in light of the Missionaries’ teaching. And as Martyn observes, Paul’s reason for referring to the Spirit in 3:2 is not immediately discernable. However, if we translate \( \tau \iota \zeta \ \omicron \mu \alpha \zeta \ \epsilon \beta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \epsilon \nu \) as “Who has slandered you,” Paul’s question fits entirely within the context of the letter. The uncircumcised Galatians were being maligned and threatened with exclusion from the community of faith because the Missionaries considered them to be intentional sinners. Not only does this translation explain Paul’s reference to the Galatians’ previous experience of the Spirit as proof of their rectification through Christ (v.2), but also it logically follows 2:15-21 in which Paul expounds that rectification is on the basis of the faithfulness of Christ and not through the law.

3.2.2 Reading Gal 4:12-20 As Rhetorical Parody

As Ben Witherington correctly notes, Paul utilizes the standard rhetorical convention of appealing to emotions within his argument in Gal 4:12-20. However,
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591 Galatians, 327.
592 Galatians, 283.
593 Witherington, Grace in Galatia, 303-06. According to Quintilian (Inst. 6.1.53), an appeal to emotions was appropriate in any part of a speech.
acknowledging Paul’s use of emotion does not clarify several of Paul’s more enigmatic statements within this section. For example, what does Paul really mean by \( \text{Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἴμεῖς?} \) While it is possible that Paul, due to the strained situation he has encountered with the Galatian churches, presents himself as a paradigmatic model in the \textit{implicit} manner in which Gaventa proposes,\textsuperscript{594} another possibility is more likely in light our previous discussion of Num 15:13-16.\textsuperscript{595} Paul’s enigmatic statement in Gal 4:12a is not puzzling at all if we understand it as a parody of Num 15:15c.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Gal 4:12a}: \textit{Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἴμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ἴμων}
Be as I am, brothers, because I am also as you are, I beg you.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Num 15:15}: \textit{νόμος εἰς ἔσται ἴμών καὶ τοῖς προσηλύτοις τοῖς προσκεμένοις ἐν ἴμων νόμος αἰώνιος εἰς γενεάς ἴμων ὡς ἴμεῖς καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ἔσται ἐναντίον κυρίου.}
There will be one law for you and for the proselytes who are closely attached to you, an eternal law for your generations, as you are so will the proselyte be before the Lord.
\end{quote}

While the passage in Numbers instructs the sons of Israel (15:2, 13) concerning offerings and is insisting that proselytes must be as the “sons of Israel” are in terms of obedience to the Law, Paul’s imperative is that the Galatians should be as he is because he is as they are. Rather than stressing that a Gentile believer is obligated to become like

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{594} See our discussion of Gaventa’s work in 3.1.2.1 above. As noted earlier, Gaventa (“Autobiography as Paradigm,” 326) demonstrates that Paul’s statements about his apostleship were an “indirect” way for the apostle to offer himself as a “paradigm of the gospel.” However, Gaventa does note that due to the “jeopardized” relationship with the Galatians, “Paul is unable to make an explicit call to believers to follow him or to imitate him” (321). She also proposes that the autobiographical section is multi-functional (313). As we proposed in 3.1.2.1 above, Gaventa’s emphasis on Paul’s desire to present himself as an \textit{implicit} example for the Galatians does not preclude the additional function of Paul’s \textit{explicit} comments as the parodic reversal of numerous scriptural demands for obedience to the law.
\textsuperscript{595} See 3.1.2.2 above.
\end{quote}
a Jewish believer, Paul is equating himself with the Galatians. He has already stated that he “died to the Law through the Law, in order that he might live to God” (2:19).

Therefore, Paul has already become like the Galatians in the sense that he is no longer under the law because the law is what he has torn down (2:18). Since Paul is now as the Galatians are in terms of the Law, the directive is that they should remain as he is. Paul’s parodic play on words in 4:12a is the reversal of the command in Num 15:15c. Although Num 15:15 concerns the procedures for incense offerings to the Lord, the idea that there is one Law for Israelites and proselytes encompasses all areas of the law, and the statement in 4:12 would have indicated to the Galatians that Paul is now saying that they should become as he is because he is now free from the requirements of the Mosaic law.

But before this parodic reinterpretation of Scripture in Gal 4:12 can be assumed to be a valid interpretation of the passage, we must question whether or not such a parody of Num 15:15 would have been expected by Paul’s audience in the context of the letter. If, as we have claimed above, Paul employs the rhetorical device of parody in order to strengthen his argument against the need for circumcision, a parody of a Scripture that originally called for “one law” (Num 15:15) for the “sons of Israel” (Num 15:2, 13) and for “the proselytes/converts” who are “the ones closely attached” or “living among” them would definitely have a relevant meaning for the Galatians. But a previous reference in the letter that would clue the Galatians into Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of a statement in Numbers that referred to “one law” for the “sons of Israel” and “proselytes” would

596 In addition to the passages discussed in 3.1.2.2 above, see Deut 5:14; 12:18; 16:11-14; 26:11.
certainly help support this contention. And, in fact, Paul’s argument in Gal 3:15-18, which was discussed above, concerning the promise to Abraham and his seed may have paved the way for Paul’s reversal of Num 15:15c in Gal 4:12a.

Accepting the initial parody in Gal 4:12, we should continue to explore other parodic statements in the rest of the passage. After Paul recalls his initial meeting with the Galatians and their gracious treatment of him in trying circumstances, he again alludes to Scripture in Gal 4:15-16 with a play on Moses’ final blessing of the Israelites in Deut 33:29. Paul’s question ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; strategically placed between his commendations of the Galatians’ loving behavior, is not referring to “praise”597 or “intense elation,”598 but, as Hays contends, it refers to a pronouncement of a blessing.599 However, considering the connection to 33:29, we are not reading the question as referring to the Galatians’ previous blessing of Paul. Rather, the blessing refers to God’s blessing of the Galatians. Paul’s question to the Galatians is a polemical reinterpretation of God’s blessings of the Israelites as the chosen people and the possessors of the Law. Deut 33:29 states:

μακαρίος σὺ Ἰσραήλ τίς ὁμοίος σοι λαὸς σωζόμενος ὑπὸ κυρίου ύπερασπιέται ὁ βοηθός σου καὶ ἡ μάχαιρα καὐχημά σου καὶ πεψὶσται σε οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου καὶ σὺ ἐπὶ τὸν τραχῆλον αὐτῶν ἐπιβήσῃ.

The initial part of the verse points out the specificity of the Israelites as the people who received God’s blessing and affirms that they are saved and protected by the Lord.

597 Betz, Galatians, 226.
598 Martyn, Galatians, 421.
599 Hays, Galatians, 294.
When Deut 33:29 is understood in the context of the final blessing of Moses on the sons of Israel (33:1), it is clear that the blessing was in the form of the Law (33:2-4) that was given to God’s people who were set apart by God (33:3) and that the Law was understood as the κληρονομία of the synagogues/assemblies of Jacob (33:4).

Since Paul has earlier urged the Galatians to understand that they have been made righteous ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἕξ ζηγων νόμου (Gal 2:16) and that they are sons of Abraham because they are οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (Gal 3:7), Paul’s witness to the kindness that the Galatians showed to him, stated in hyperbolic fashion (4:15b), answers the preceding question and demonstrates that their blessing from God is not in the same form as the blessing pronounced on Israel in Deut 33 (i.e., as the specific people chosen by God to be the possessors of the Mosaic law). In contrast, their blessing, as those who have become sons and heirs through God (4:7) is demonstrated in their loving actions toward others, not in their obedience to the Law. Later in the letter, Paul reiterates the same concept: ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐτε περιτομή τι ἱσχύει οὐτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ πίστες ὀντι ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη (5:6), which is demonstrated by being enslaved to one another through love (5:13) so that one’s love of one’s neighbor is equal to one’s love of self (5:14).

Additionally, Deut 33:29 includes the prediction or warning that the enemies of the Israelites would lie to them in the future. Paul asks the Galatians if he had become their enemy by telling them the truth (4:16; cf. 1:20). It is our contention that this question is another allusion to Moses’ final blessing. After redefining the nature of the blessing of God’s people, Paul is now reversing the words recorded as Moses’ warning.
He is insisting that he is not the realization of the predicted enemy of the covenant people who would lie to them in order to lead them away from the Law. Just as Paul previously defended the divine nature of his gospel in order to counter any charge that he was an apostate along the lines of the false prophet in Deut 13:5,\textsuperscript{600} he now parodies Moses’ final blessing in order to reiterate that he is not committing apostasy. On the contrary, he is telling them the truth. Therefore, the Galatians should realize that he could not be their enemy. Immediately following Paul’s insistence of his honesty, he addresses the disturbing situation in the Galatian churches that the false teachers have created by attempting to exclude the uncircumcised Gentile Christians (4:17-18) and expresses his anguish that his Gentile converts have failed to realize that their primary concern should be that Christ be formed in them (Gal 4:19-20).

3.2.3 A Suggested Translation of Gal 6:6 in Light of the Threat of Exclusion

In the introduction to this chapter, we proposed that understanding Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of Scripture helps to clarify many of Paul’s perplexing statements in what is normally presumed to be the theological portion of his letter (1:6-5:1). However, in the above exegesis, we demonstrated that a reading of the letter that interprets many of Paul’s statements as rhetorical parody not only reveals that the nature of the Galatian conflict was the threatened exclusion of the law-free Galatian believers from the community of

\textsuperscript{600} See 3.1.1.1 above for our previous discussion of the importance of Deut 13 in Paul’s anathemas in 1:8-9 and 3.1.1.2-3.1.2.1 for other parodic allusions to the apostate in Deut 13 who leads the people away from the law. Especially important is n.161 above.
believers because they were viewed by the Torah-observant Missionaries as apostates, but also clarifies that Paul’s τίς ἤματος ἐφάσκανεν in 3:1 should be translated as “Who has slandered you?”. Therefore, it is very likely that the Missionaries were slandering the law-free Galatians by referring to them as “apostates” or “unrepentant sinners.” If our interpretation is correct, it is also very likely that other perplexing statements in what is normally assumed to be a section containing pastoral advice may also be clarified by our interpretation of the Galatian conflict. Therefore, we propose that Paul’s imperative in 6:6 should also be translated a little differently than is normally presumed. Galatians 6:6 states:

ηματος δε ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦτι ἐν πᾶσιν ἁγαθοῖς.
“Let him who is taught the word share all good things with him who teaches.”
(RSV)

Most commentators understand Gal 6:6 to mean that Paul is instructing the Galatians to support their spiritual teachers by sharing their material possessions with them. According to Longenecker, “the verb κοινωνέω (‘share’) when used with reference to things connotes ‘be a partner of’ or ‘share in,’ though with persons [it] means

601 In most interpretations of this section of the letter, Paul is understood as providing pastoral counsel for the Galatian Christians by presenting behavioral guidelines for the community of faith. These guidelines are usually interpreted as stressing the importance of: mutual correction and restoration within the corporate body (v. 1); self-examination on the individual level (vv. 3-4); personal responsibility before God in light of the inevitability of eschatological judgment (vv. 5, 7-8); the need to support those who edify the community by teaching (v. 6); and doing good to both those outside and inside the community of faith (vv. 9-10). See, e.g., Hays, Galatians, 311, 331; however, Hays (ibid., 333) does acknowledge the possibility of polemical undertones at certain points in the section, e.g., 6:2. An exception, however, is Martyn who (Galatians, 543-544) maintains that Paul had the specific Galatian situation in the back of his mind when he wrote 6:1-10.

602 See, e.g., Martyn, ibid., 551-2; Longenecker, Galatians, 278; Betz, Galatians, 3046; Hays, Galatians, 335-6; Dunn (Galatians, 326) and Barclay, Obeying the Truth, 162-3.
‘give to’ or ‘contribute a share ‘to someone.” Additionally, he claims that in Gal 6:6 the person who is shared with is expressed grammatically in the dative case and “what ‘the one who receives instruction’ is to share is also expressed in the dative, viz. ἐν πᾶσιν ἄγαθοῖς (‘in all good things’).” Longenecker appears to cite the grammatical construction as conclusive evidence that: (1) Paul uses κοινωνεῖω in 6:6 with the connotation of “to share” rather than “to participate in”; and (2) since the phrase “all good things” occurs in the dative case, it must be the object shared. However, this type of grammatical construction is neither conclusive evidence that the verb must connote “to share” nor is it conclusive evidence that the object in the dative must be the thing shared. Classical usage and examples from the New Testament period provide evidence that contradicts his understanding. According to LSJ, classical grammatical constructions with forms of κοινωνεῖω used to connote “to share” or “to take part in a thing with another” are usually expressed by the object that is shared in the genitive case and the person with whom the object is shared in the dative case. LSJ and BDAG also explain that the connotation of participation can be expressed with the use of prepositions following a form of κοινωνεῖω. From the discussion of the verb in LSJ and BAGD, the dative case of “all good things” in Gal 6:6 is not conclusive evidence that Paul uses
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603 Longenecker, Galatians, 278-9.
604 Ibid.
605 LSJ, “κοινωνεῖω,” 1, 969.
606 LSJ, “κοινωνεῖω,” 4, 969. BDAG (“κοινωνεῖω” 1, 552) notes the use of the verb with both the connotation of “participating in something” as well as the connotation of “contributing to” or “giving a share of something.” Since Heb 2:14 uses the classical form of the construction with the thing shared in the genitive, this type of construction had not disappeared by the New Testament period.
koinwneō in this verse with the connotation of “to share.” Neither does Paul’s use of the dative case necessitate that “all good things” be understood as the thing shared.

In further support of the fallacy of assuming that the dative case of “all good things” determines the nuance of the verb in Gal 6:6 and that the dative case also determines that “all good things” must be the thing shared, we note that Did. 4:8 states:

οὐκ ἀποστραφήσῃ τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἄδελφῳ σοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐρείς ἵδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ κοινωνοῖ ἔστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς; (“Do not turn away the one in need, but share all [things] with your brother and do not say it is my own; for if you are sharers in the immortal, how much more in the mortal?”). In this statement from the Didache, the πάντα (all things) are the objects to be shared, and the word occurs in the accusative.

Therefore, this example from the post-New Testament period shows that the use of a form of koinwneō, or its compounds, did not necessitate the use of the dative case for the object that was to be shared. Additionally, if as Longenecker argues, the phrase “all good things” appears in the dative because it indicates the object to be shared, why did Paul include the preposition when the case of the article and the adjective would have adequately expressed Longenecker’s proposed meaning? We propose that: (1) Paul is using koinwneō to connote the meaning of participation; and (2) the thing that is participated in (i.e., πᾶσιν ἄγαθοῖς) is governed by the preposition ἐν and, therefore, is expressed in the dative.

Since, in the grammatical construction of 6:6, koinwneō does not have to be
understood as connoting the sense of “sharing,” but can be interpreted as connoting the sense of “participation,” we propose that Κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς should be translated as: “Let the one who is taught the word participate with the one who teaches in all good things,” rather than as “Let him who is taught the word share all good things with him who teaches” (RSV). In our translation, Paul is not issuing a directive for the Galatians to share of their material possessions with their spiritual teachers, but he is commanding the Galatians to allow each believer to enjoy an equal freedom of participation in the good things offered by the faith community.

A look at Paul’s other uses of the verb κοινωνεῖω is helpful in order to determine if our translation is plausible. In addition to Gal 6:6, forms of the verb are used in Rom 12:13, Rom 15:27, and Phil 4:15. In Rom 12:13, Paul states ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνοῦντες, τῆν φιλοξενίαν διακονοῦντες (“contributing to the needs of the saints, practicing hospitality”). Although he uses κοινωνεῖω in this verse in order to encourage the Romans to share of their material possessions, this verse does not relate to the direct financial support of teachers or ministers. Instead, Paul is instructing the church to look after the needy within the faith community.607 The specific meaning of the verse is not determined by the use of κοινωνεῖω, but it is determined by the context of the sentence (i.e., ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων). Although Rom 15:27 also discusses the financial support

607 See, e.g., the discussion of James D. G. Dunn, Romans 9-16 (WBC 38B; Dallas: Word, 1988), 754.
of those in need, in this case the Christians in Jerusalem. Paul does not use the verb \textit{koinwnei\w} in this sentence to specify financial support. Rather, in 15:27, \textit{koinwnei\w} is used to indicate that the Gentiles have participated “in the spiritual things” (\textit{tois pneumatikoi\z}) of Christianity. In this verse, Paul uses the phrase \textit{dheilousin kai en tois sarkikoi\z} \textit{leitourgy\v sa a\v to\v} (“they are also obligated to serve them in material things”) to indicate that the Gentiles should share of their material possessions in order to support those in need.

In the last occurrence of the verb in his undisputed letters, Phil 4:15, Paul uses \textit{koinwnei\w} to describe the participation of the Philippians in his ministry. The surrounding verses make it clear that the church at Philippi had sent a gift that took care of Paul’s physical needs (4:14-18). However, in the context of Paul’s discussion, \textit{koinwnei\w} means much more than just financial support. Philippians 4:15 states: \textit{O\v idate de kai i\v mei\v, Filip\v sioi o\v ti eu\v arch\v tou e\v uaggelio\v, o\v te e\v\v el\v on ap\v Makedon\v as, o\v\v demia moi ekkl\v sia ek\v in\v n\v n\v se\v en e\v is lo\v g\v on do\v se\v w\v kai l\v m\v pe\v w\v e\v i\v mh i\v mei\v m\v noi.} The full sense of \textit{koinwnei\w} is brought out by the rendering of the RSV: “And you Philippians yourselves know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I left Macedonia, no church entered into partnership with me in giving and receiving except you only.” Commentators on Phil 4:15 acknowledge that Paul’s phrase \textit{ek\v in\v n\v n\v se\v en e\v is lo\v g\v on do\v se\v w\v kai l\v m\v pe\v w\v e\v}
expresses the notion of friendship and participatory partnership. Therefore, in each of these three Pauline uses of κοινωνία, the verb is not limited to denoting the financial support of ministers or teachers. In fact, in only one of these verses does the verb refer to the financial support of a minister, and even in Phil 4:15 the context of the verse implies a fuller participation in Paul’s ministry than financial support alone.

Also, it is important to note that even some interpreters who maintain that Paul is commanding the Galatians to share their material possessions with their teachers acknowledge that the apostle uses substantially different reasoning in this verse than he does in his 1 Cor. In 1 Cor 9:14, he states: “those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel” (RSV). The emphasis in Paul’s reasoning in this verse is to aver that those “who preach and teach” have the right “to claim support.” However, if Gal 6:6 is interpreted as commanding support for the teachers, the emphasis is on the “the duty of those who are taught to make material provision for their teachers.” We have already noted that when Paul discussed the “obligation” or “duty” of the Gentiles to offer financial support to the needy Jerusalem Christians he used a form of the verb ὀφείλει but rather than a form of κοινωνία (Rom 15:27). While Paul’s choice of verbs in Gal 6:6 certainly does not preclude interpreting the verse as a command to support the teachers,

609 See the discussion of O’Brien (Philippians, 530-5) who, building on the views of Peter Marshall (Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul’s Relations with the Corinthians [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987], 163-4), maintains that Paul’s expression indicates participation in the sense of friendship and partnership that entails much more than financial support.
610 Longenecker (Galatians, 278) points out the differences between Gal 6:6, 1 Cor 9:3-14, and 1 Tim 5:18. He also acknowledges that the “exhortation of v 6 is the most puzzling of all Paul’s directives in 6:1-10.”
611 Ibid.
we posit that our interpretation has a distinct advantage over the commonly espoused interpretation.

If Paul were using the imperative κοινωνεῖτω in the sense that those who were taught should be allowed to participate in all good things, his statement would relate directly back to Gal 4:17 in which he criticizes the Missionairies by saying ἀλλὰ ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε (“but they wish to shut you out so that you might strive after them”). Additionally, 6:6 would also remind the Galatians of Paul’s criticism of Peter whose hypocrisy resulted in his withdrawal from the uncircumcised Gentiles (2:11-14).

In summary, Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of numerous Scriptures in the theological portion of the letter helps us understand that the nature of the problem at Galatia included not only false accusations of apostasy, but also the threaten exclusion of the law-free Galatians from the community of believers. Therefore, not only does our understanding of Paul’s rhetorical parody clarify numerous statements in 1:6-5:1, but also it enlightens our interpretation of 6:6, a puzzling statement in what is normally assumed to be the exhortation portion of the letter. Additionally, the realization that Paul is imitating and altering Scriptures that demanded Torah obedience for both Jewish believers and Gentile believers in order to defend polemically his law-free gospel most likely widens the expected audience for the letter. Since the Jewish-Christian Missionaries would most likely have been more familiar with the hypotexts than the Gentile Galatians, it is highly probable that Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of these
passages sought to convince the Missionaries that the confluence of God’s covenant with Abraham and the Mosaic law was only an appearance of the new reality that now existed in light of God’s revelation of Christ. Our proposal that Paul is parodically reversing the appearance model of faithfulness to God as it is depicted in the Maccabean literature and the covenant renewal ceremony in 2 Esdras makes a distinct contribution to understanding his letter to the Galatians.
4. Conclusion

In the present study, we sought to investigate four issues related to the study of Galatians: 1) whether or not a parodic reading of Galatians might clarify not only some of the more puzzling statements in the letter (e.g., Paul’s apparent contradictory scriptural quotations in 3:10-14 and the relationship between Paul’s juxtaposition of slavery and freedom with his argument that rectification is through Christ, not the law), but also the relationship between Paul’s exhortations in Gal 5-6 and his previous theological discussion; 2) the reason for Peter’s fear of the circumcision party and his withdrawal from the Gentiles at Antioch; 3) the reason for Paul’s statement in 4:17 that apparently indicates that part of the problem in Galatia was that one group desired to exclude another group; and 4) whether or not one must assume that Paul had an extensive rhetorical education in order to interpret properly the rhetorical structure of Paul’s arguments in the letter. Methodologically, we began our investigation with the premise that one should be able to understand Paul’s argument in Galatians without having to resort to Paul’s other letters, especially Romans, in order to comprehend what Paul was saying to the troubled Galatian believers. Considering that the Galatians certainly had no way of knowing what Paul would say in letters that had yet to be written, and most likely were written to address very different faith communities with different sets of issues, it seemed more exegetically sound to attempt to interpret Galatians without depending on Romans, or any other Pauline epistle, to clarify what Paul was saying to the Galatian churches. An examination of Galatians in terms of Greco-Roman rhetorical principles seemed to be a much better option in understanding what Paul had to say.
From a study of the principles of Greco-Roman rhetoric, we determined that ancient rhetorical parody was a device that a literate person in the first century C.E. would use in order to strengthen an argument and that ancient rhetorical parody involved imitating and altering an existing saying or text so that the parodic statement presented a new, and possibly shockingly different, meaning from that of the hypotext. Additionally, our investigation indicated that rhetorical parody transformed the hypotext into a paraphrase that could function in a variety of ways. The altered saying or text could be satirical, playful, serious, ironic, polemical, and/or humorous. As a result of our study, we determined that Paul could have used this rhetorical device without having had the benefit of all three levels of rhetorical education that existed in the first-century Hellenistic world. Since we know from Paul’s statement in Gal 6:11 that he was literate, we determined that he, like any other literate person in the ancient world, would have been capable of employing rhetorical parody in order to strengthen an argument. Therefore, the fourth issue with which I sought to deal was resolved.

Since no one really questions that a large part of the problem in Galatia was that the Missionaries were insisting that the law-free Gentiles be circumcised, a logical starting point for addressing the remaining subjects of investigation was a search of the scriptural demands for Torah obedience. Given Paul’s double anathema (1:8-9), passages in Deuteronomy that discussed blessings and curses were extremely relevant to our investigation. In reviewing the passages that we determined were parodied by Paul in an effort to reverse their original meaning, which demanded Torah obedience, we started with the passages identified by Morland as the basis for Paul’s double anathema. Since
we agreed with Morland’s proposal that Paul drew ἀναθήματα from Deut 13, a review of the context of Deut 13 revealed that a person who became an unrepentant apostate was to be ostracized from the community of the faithful in order to prevent the deceptive words of the apostate from influencing others in the community. From our investigation of the various meanings of μετατιθημί (1:6), we determined that Paul’s accusation that the Galatians were “apostatizing” was indeed an issue in the Galatian conflict and that Paul was most likely employing rhetorical parody in order to refute the Missionaries’ argument that the Galatians were unrepentant sinners because they were Torah-free.

Although numerous parts of this study consisted of a review of passages that required a Gentile proselyte who desired to be an active member of the covenant community to be subject to the requirements and penalties associated with the Mosaic law, especially the last chapters of Deuteronomy, we determined that Paul parodied numerous other passages of Scripture that praised the champions of the law and demanded the exclusion of unrepentant sinners. Considering that most commentators note that 2 Macc 7:24 employs the same verb in the context of praising those who refuse to “apostatize” from the “laws of the fathers,” we determined that Paul was parodically reversing the entire context of the martyr narratives of 2 Macc 6-7, not just the use of μετατιθημί in 2 Macc 7:24.

From this prospective it is not difficult to see, as we have argued above, that Paul was parodying both Deut 13 and 2 Macc 6-7 in the autobiographical portion of the letter in an effort to clear himself of the possible charge by the Missionaries that he himself was similar to the apostate of Deut 13:5 who deceptively led others away from the Law and,
thereby, put the community of believers in jeopardy of the curse of the law. As discussed above, on the basis of Deut 13:18, among other Scriptures, a faithful follower of God was to follow all the commandments. And based on Deut 28:41, 48, and 68, the punishment for rejecting the covenantal requirements was a return to slavery. We then proposed that Paul’s “slave of Christ” was a parodic reversal of the scriptural curse of slavery.

Additionally, we proposed that Paul’s description of his pre-call life in Judaism was also a parodic reversal of the Maccabean model of a faithful follower of God. While it may seem unusual to some that Paul would place emphasis on 2 Maccabees, we have demonstrated that the Maccabean narratives were definitely considered important by the first-century Jewish community. As we noted, whether or not 4 Maccabees pre-dates or post-dates Paul’s letters, the fact that 4 Maccabees was produced by a Jewish community roughly contemporaneous with Paul and was a reinterpretation of 2 Maccabees indicates that 2 Maccabees was considered important enough for a first-century Jewish community to reinterpret the material in order to serve a purpose for a community contemporary with nascent Christianity. Therefore, just as a first-century Jewish community reinterpreted the martyr narratives, we proposed that Paul reinterpreted these same narratives in order to parodically dissociate the belief that a follower of God must be Torah-observant in order to be considered faithful.

Next, we proposed that Paul employed rhetorical parody in order to depict Peter as the parodic opposite of the Maccabean hero, Eleazar. And we noted that, failing to find a better explanation from all the ones proposed by New Testament scholarship, the Incident at Antioch was most likely a problem revolving around the exclusion, from the
faithful community, of the law-free Gentile believers on the basis that they were unrepentant sinners. Also, we proposed that the prophetic conflict in Micah, especially Micah 2:7, might be the basis for Paul’s apparent creation of a new word, ὄρθοποδέω (Gal 2:14). Therefore, we determined that the reason for Peter’s withdrawal from the Gentiles in Antioch was that he had been convinced by the ones from James that the law-free Galatian believers were unrepentant sinners.

Additionally, we proffered that Paul’s enigmatic statement in 2:19a is best understood as his acknowledgement that he, himself, had suffered the curse of the law. We noted above that the Deuteronomic curse (Deut 28: 41, 48, 68) promised that slavery would be the just punishment for the covenant people’s continuing failure to follow all the commandments of the law, and we agreed with Morland’s proposal that the prescription of death for apostates (Exod 22:19; Deut 13:5, 10, 16a) changed over time thus allowing for “curse and excommunication” to be substituted for the death penalty. However, we also proposed that Paul’s statement in Gal 2:19a (ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον) was a parodic reinterpretation of the Mosaic demand that God’s covenant people must make a conscious choice between blessing/life and curse/death (Deut 30:19). Because, in light of his experience with Christ, Paul had rejected the law as a necessary requirement for a faithful follower of God and had sought to persuade others of his position, we proposed that Paul parodied Deut 30:15-20 in order to dissociate Torah obedience from life/blessing. Therefore, we interpreted Gal 2:19a as Paul’s acknowledgement that he “died through the” curse of the “law to the law,” and we
indicated that our reading of 2:19a explained Paul’s emphatic placement of ἔγρο in his declaration.

Beginning with Paul’s discussion of Abraham in Gal 3, we proposed that the covenant renewal ceremony in 2 Esd 19-20, a passage that had previously been employed in post-exilic controversies over the identity of the true “seed” of Abraham, was the background for Paul’s discussion of “faithfulness,” “seed,” “promise,” and “inheritance.” And we posited that the overriding issue in Gal 3-4 was Paul’s attempt to combat the confluence of the Abrahamic covenant with the Mosaic law, as depicted in 2 Esd 19-20. From our exegesis, we determined that the most logical reading of πίστεως Χριστοῦ in Galatians was that of the subjective genitive interpretation in which Paul is referring to the “faithfulness of Christ,” rather than to the “faith” of the believer “in Christ.”

Additionally, we proposed that Paul, in 3:13, was declaring that “Christ bought back” all believers, Jew and Gentile, from the curse of the law/slavery. Our interpretation was again based on Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20, which not only discussed the need for ethnic Jew and Gentile proselyte to submit willingly to the curse of the law in order to walk properly in the commandments of God, but also acknowledged that the Israelites failure to be faithful to the Mosaic law had resulted in their return to a state of slavery. We supported this proposal by interpreting Paul’s argument in 3:26-29 as one grounded in the Galatian situation, rather than as the inclusion of words that were drawn from a pre-existing baptismal formula. In our interpretation, baptism results in the believer’s existence inside/in Christ. Because of the faithfulness of Christ and the believer’s new existence “in Christ,” the believer, regardless of ethnicity, is released from
not only the threat of slavery/curse/death as just punishment for failing to be Torah-observant, but also the requirement for circumcision.

Furthermore, we proffered that Paul’s discussion of “two covenants” (Gal 4:24) was a parodic reinterpretation of the confluence of the covenants in 2 Esd 19-20. Additionally, we proposed that Paul’s juxtaposition of freedom vs. slavery, along with his surprising allegory in which those who were Torah-observant were equated with the children of the slave woman, was again a parodic reversal of the acknowledgment in the covenant renewal ceremony of 2 Esdras that the people’s failure to remain faithful to the law resulted in their return to slavery. And, importantly, we proposed that Paul’s quotation of Lev 18:5 in Gal 3:11 was a parodic reversal of the meaning of the quotation of the verse in 2 Esd 19:29. We concluded that Paul’s quotation of Lev 18:5 indicates that the believer lives on the basis of the faithfulness of Christ.

Additionally, we proposed that Paul’s exhortation to the Galatians to be as he was (Gal 4:12a) was again a parodic reversal, this time of Num 15:15c. Finally, we also proposed that Paul’s imperative in Gal 6:6 that the Galatians should “Let the one being taught the word share in all good things with the one teaching” had nothing to do with a call for the believers to support those who taught them in the faith. Rather, in light of our suggested translation, it had everything to do with Paul’s demand that all believers in Christ be included, not excluded, from the community of faith. Therefore, we demonstrated that reading Galatians as rhetorical parody not only clarifies many of Paul’s puzzling statements in the letter, but also indicates that Paul’s exhortations in Gal 5-6 were not unconnected to Paul’s arguments in portions of the letter that are usually
considered to be theological. Rather, the entirety of the letter was designed to argue against the exclusion of the Gentiles, whom the Missionaries claimed were unrepentant sinners, from the community of the faithful. We also suggested that Paul’s letter might have been aimed at convincing the Missionaries, as well as the Gentile converts, of the truth of his law-free gospel.

We see several areas of study that might grow out of the interpretation of Galatians that we have offered. First, we would hope that our reading of the πίστις Χριστοῦ phrases in Galatians might further the debate, especially since in our opinion our interpretation has addressed James D. G. Dunn’s most recently offered objection to a subjective genitive interpretation. Second, we would like to explore the ways in which our proposed reading of Galatians might affect the discussion of “Paul and the law.” Third, we would like to pursue further our parodic reading as it relates to additional statements in the final portion of Paul’s letter. And, lastly, we would like to explore the implications that our understanding of Galatians might have for questions concerning the possible development of Paul’s theological thought, and its overall consistency.

In conclusion, reading Galatians as Paul’s rhetorical parody of scriptural demands for Torah obedience clarifies many of the puzzling and highly debated statements in the letter. Since ancient rhetorical parody was a common device that any literate person in the first-century Hellenistic world could have employed in the course of normal dinner conversation, Paul would have been capable of using rhetorical parody even if he had never studied the standard rhetorical handbooks, which formed a part of the highest level of education in the first-century Greco-Roman world. Therefore, there is no need to
interpret Galatians through the extensive details of the ancient rhetorical handbooks. Rather, Galatians should be interpreted as a letter, which exhibited some of the standard components of first-century letter writing. Recognizing Paul’s use of rhetorical parody not only helps us understand many of the puzzling statements in the letter, but also it allows us to interpret Galatians on the basis of Paul’s statements solely within this one correspondence without having to appeal to Paul’s other letters for clarity. Interpreting Galatians in light of ancient rhetorical parody indicates that the Jewish-Christian Missionaries that infiltrated the Galatian churches, rather than the Galatian believers, were most likely the primary audience for much of Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of scriptural demands for obedience to the law. Our investigation of Paul’s rhetorical parody of the Maccabean narratives and the covenant renewal ceremony in 2 Esd 19-20 makes a distinctive contribution to the study of Galatians since it helps us understand that Paul is presenting a new understanding of the characteristics of a faithful follower of God. In the new reality, the faithfulness of Jesus Christ and the believer’s existence in Christ replace the necessity of Torah obedience for a faithful follower of God. Additionally, we see that the exhortations in the final portion of the letter directly relate to what is commonly referred to as the theological portion of the letter.
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