

Reading Galatians As Rhetorical Parody: Paul's Reinterpretation of Scriptural Demands
for Obedience to the Law and the Implications for Understanding Faithfulness and
Apostasy

by

Kathy Barrett Dawson

Graduate Program in Religion
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Richard B. Hays, Supervisor

Melvin K. H. Peters

Mark S. Goodacre

Zlatko Plese

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Graduate Program in Religion
in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2012

ABSTRACT

Reading Galatians As Rhetorical Parody: Paul's Reinterpretation of Scriptural Demands
for Obedience to the Law and the Implications for Understanding Faithfulness and
Apostasy

by

Kathy Barrett Dawson

Graduate Program in Religion
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Richard B. Hays, Supervisor

Melvin K. H. Peters

Mark S. Goodacre

Zlatko Plese

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Graduate Program in Religion
in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2012

Copyright by
Kathy Barrett Dawson
2012

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.

Dedication

This project is dedicated first to my husband, H. Lee Dawson, who was continuously loving, supporting, and helpful throughout the writing of this dissertation. It is also dedicated to my daughter, Hayley, who willingly assumed numerous responsibilities and was always a source of loving encouragement. It is also dedicated to my son, Byron, who never complained about having a mom in school and whose wit and humor encouraged us all. Additionally, this project is in memory of my parents, James Emmett Barrett Jr. and Helen M. Barrett, who instilled in each of their children a love of family, a love of learning, and a drive to succeed.

Contents

Abstract.....	iv
1. Introduction and a Definition of Rhetorical Parody	1
1.1 Quintilian, Hermogenes, and Ps.-Demetrius on Rhetorical Parody.....	7
1.2 Previous Investigations of the Concept of Ancient Parody	27
1.3 Encyclopedic Definitions of Rhetorical Parody	41
1.4 Lexical Definitions of Ancient Parody	51
1.5 A Working Definition of Ancient Rhetorical Parody.....	55
2. Historical Overview of Select Rhetorical Studies on Galatians	60
2.1 Paul’s Rhetoric in Galatians According to Patristic Writers	61
2.2. Recent Works Comparing Paul’s Letters with Greco-Roman Rhetoric	95
2.3 Concluding Comments.....	98
3. Examples of Rhetorical Parody in Galatians	99
3.1 Parody of Demands for Obedience to the Law in Gal 1:6-2:21	105
3.1.1 Paul’s Anathemas and the Parodic Reinterpretation of Apostasy (1:6-10) ...	105
3.1.1.1 The importance of a correct interpretation of μετατίθημι in understanding Paul’s parodic reversal of the scriptural meaning of apostasy.....	110
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	121
3.1.1.3 “Slave of Christ” as a parodic reinterpretation of the Deuteronomic curse of a return to slavery	131
3.1.1.4 Summary.....	136
3.1.2 A New Paradigm of Faithfulness via Parodic Reversal (1:11-2:21).....	140
3.1.2.1 Parodic reversal of the faithful paradigm presented in 2 Maccabees	142

3.1.2.2	The scriptural basis for requiring Gentile believers to observe Torah....	171
3.1.2.3	The Incident at Antioch in light of Scriptures regarding proselytes.....	183
3.1.2.3.1	Paul’s vocabulary and scriptural demands for exclusion.....	185
3.1.3	Understanding the Controversy at Antioch As the Exclusion of Gentiles From the Community Rather Than As a Withdrawal of Table Fellowship	188
3.1.3.1	A proposed explanation for a Pauline neologism	198
3.1.4	Galatians 2:15-21 as a Continuation of Paul’s Parodic Reinterpretation of the Maccabean Model of Faithfulness	210
3.1.4.1	Galatians 2:15-21 in relationship to Fourth Maccabees	232
3.1.5	Supporting Evidence for Our Reading of Gal 2:15-21 from Gal 3:6-14	236
3.1.6	Galatians 3:6-14 as a Parodic Reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19:1-20:29.....	247
3.1.6.1	Galatians 3:26-29 as support for including Gentiles in ἡμεῖς (3:13)	292
3.1.6.2	Additional examples of Paul’s parodic reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20.	306
3.2	Other Passages in Galatians That Are Clarified By Understanding Paul’s Rhetorical Parody.....	309
3.2.1	Paul’s Second Rebuke Section in Relation to Threatened Exclusion (3:1-5)	310
3.2.1.1	Other passages in Galatians that have been used to support translating βασκαλίνω as “bewitch”	317
3.2.1.1.1	Galatians 4:12-15	317
3.2.1.1.2	Galatians 5:19-21 within the context of Gal 5	322
3.2.2	Reading Gal 4:12-20 As Rhetorical Parody.....	343
3.2.3	A Suggested Translation of Gal 6:6 in Light of the Threat of Exclusion	348
4.	Conclusion	357
	Bibliography	366

Biography..... 398

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.¹ Although George A. Kennedy² 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.³ 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 Martyn⁴ 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. Dunn⁵ 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

¹ *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 14-15.

² *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 144-52.

³ E.g., Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); and Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, (WBC 41; Dallas: Word, 1990).

⁴ *Galatians* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 21-23.

⁵ *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC 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.

⁷ *Galatians: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 66-71, here 69.

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 (ἔργα) of the righteous bring about life, but the fruits (καρποί) of the ungodly [bring about] sins.” Paul, however, reverses the positive connotation of works (ἔργα) and the negative connotation of fruits/fruit when he describes the positive “fruit (καρπός) of the Spirit” in contrast to the ungodly “works (ἔργα) 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,¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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 ῥήτωρ. 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.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,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 *Institutio Oratoria* (*The*

¹³ According to Roland Gregory Austin (*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 *fiscus* (imperial treasury)."

Orator's Education).¹⁴ First, Quintilian defines *παρωδία*¹⁵ 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”¹⁸ (*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 *urbs*, i.e., *ridiculus* (*ridiculum dictum* in 6.3.6; *ridiculum* in 6.3.26; and *dicta ridicula* in 6.3.46) and *iocus* (*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 *iocus* as “being the opposite of ‘serious’” (*Inst.* 6.3.21 [Russell, LCL]). Here, it is important to note that *OLD* defines *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 *OLD* specifically references *Inst.* 6.3.6.¹⁹

For Quintilian, humor is possible in all types of speech and all topics of argumentation (*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” (σχήματα διανοίας 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 *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 *sue toti ut sunt*

¹⁸ *OLD*, “urbane,” 2105.

¹⁹ *OLD*, “ridiculus,” 1653.

(“one may quote whole lines”).²⁰ For the second, he states: *seu verbis ex parte mutatis* (“Alternately, the words may be altered in part”).²¹ For the third, Quintilian says: *seu ficti notis versibus similes* (“Again, lines can be invented resembling well-known ones”).²² Immediately after Quintilian describes the third method of making up lines that *imitate* and are *similar* to existing sayings, he states (6.3.97): *quae παρωδία dicitur* (“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 alteration²³ 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 προσωποποιία, which is also referred to by the Latin term *sermocinatio* (9.2.29-37). At the beginning of his description of προσωποποιία, Quintilian notes that προσωποποιία is a “bolder” (*audaciora*) way of making a statement compared to the “Emotive Figures” that he has just discussed.²⁴ In describing προσωποποιία, 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”).²⁵

In *Inst.* 9.2.33-35, Quintilian makes several important statements that relate the use of parody in προσωποποιΐα 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 προσωποποιΐα. In 9.2.34-35, he says:

Ut dicta autem quaedam, ita scripta quoque fingi solent quod facit 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 summa voluntate’, et adiectis deinceps alias ‘heres esto’: incipit esse quodam modo παραδῆ, quod nomen ductum a canticis ad aliorum similitudinem modulantes 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])

²⁵ *Inst.* 9.2.30.

In Quintilian's description of *παρωδή* 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 *παρωδή* rather than as *παρωδία*, he is basically presenting the same definition of the rhetorical device (*παρωδή*) as he presented for the refined witticism that he called *παρωδία*. Both *παρωδία* and *παρωδή* 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 *παρωδή*, 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 *παρωδή* is an orator's imitative wordplay on a *written* document that had been previously submitted by an opponent.²⁶ Therefore, Quintilian defines *παρωδή* 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 *παρωδή* indicates that

²⁶ Note Quintilian specifically describes *παρωδή* as being composed in imitation of the other side's *scripturae* ("document/writing").

the words that are parodied are drawn from a written source.²⁷ 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 *παρωδή*.

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.²⁸ 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 *παρωδία* in a passage in which he contrasts *κόλλησις* with *παρωδία* while discussing a topic entitled, *Περὶ χρήσεως ἐπῶν ἐν πεζῷ λόγῳ* (“On the Use of Verses in Prose”).²⁹

According to Hermogenes, there are two ways that verses are used in prose. The first is *κόλλησις*, which he defines as “when one quotes the complete verse skillfully in a

²⁷ Quintilian refers to *dictum* and *scriptum* (*Inst* 9.2.34) to describe the product formed by the orator and *versificatio* and *sermo* (*Inst* 9.2.35) to describe the product in which *παρωδή* is commonly observed, but he refers to *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 *Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος* (*Meth.*). It is generally acknowledged that *Meth.* is most likely a spurious work; however, it is also generally acknowledged that it was most likely composed around the same time as the genuine works of Hermogenes. For discussions of the association of the five-work corpus with Hermogenes of Tarsus and the probability that only *On Staseis* and *On Types of Style* are genuine, see George A. Kennedy, “Historical Survey of Rhetoric,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 3-41; Gertrud Lindberg, “Hermogenes of Tarsus,” *ANRW* 34.3:1979-2062; and Barbara P. Wallach, “Pseudo-Hermogenes and the Characterizing Oath,” *GRBS* 22 (1981):257-67. The Greek text used for *Meth.* is Hugo Rabe, ed., *Hermogenis Opera* (*Rhetores Graeci*; Leipzig: Teubner, 1913).

²⁹ *Meth.* 30.

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 Pleše, 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 *παρωδία* that Hermogenes stated.³² 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.³³ 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:

ὅστις δ' ὁμιλῶν ἤδεται κακοῖς ἀνὴρ,
οὐ πάποτ' ἠρωτήσα, γιγνώσκων ὅτι
τοιούτός ἐστιν οἷσπερ ἤδεται ξυνῶν.³⁴

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?”³⁵ Next, Demosthenes stated:

οὐκοῦν, Αἰσχίνη, καὶ κατὰ σοῦ τὰ ἰαμβεῖα ταῦθ' ἀρμόσει νῦν ἐμοί,
κἂν ἐγὼ λέγω πρὸς τούτους, ὀρθῶς καὶ προσηκόντως ἐρῶ,³⁶

And last, Demosthenes reworded Aeschines' previous quotation as:

ὅστις δ' ὁμιλῶν ἤδεται, καὶ ταῦτα πρεσβεύων, Φιλοκράτει,
οὐ πάποτ' ἠρωτήσα, γιγνώσκων ὅτι
ἀργύριον εἴληφ' οὗτος, ὥσπερ Φιλοκράτης ὁ ὁμολογῶν.³⁷

It is Demosthenes' altered quotation of Euripides' Phoenix that Hermogenes presents as his example for *παρωδία*. 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 *παρωδία* with the entire portion of *Demosthenes'* speech in mind, his definition of *παρωδία* would be very close to the above-mentioned example that Quintilian presented in illustration of *παρωδή*. 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 *παρωδή* is an imitation of an opponent's written document while Hermogenes' *παρωδία* 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 *entire* 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 *παρωδία* 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 *παρωδία* 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.*

³⁸ Hugo Rabe, ed., *Hermogenis Opera* (Rhetores Graeci; Leipzig: Teubner, 1913), 6:447.

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 ἅμα καὶ σκώπτειν ἀρχαίως 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 ἐπῶν 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 προσδοκίαν ("contrary to expectation"); and τὸ ἐναντίας ποιέσθαι 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 σκώπτειν ἀρχαίως “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 ἀρχαίως in the treatise; however, he does refer to οἱ παλαιοί 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 παρωδίαν 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.).⁴⁵ 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 σκώπτειν ἀρχαίως that rhetorical parody encompassed the risqué type of humor that was exhibited in such comedies?⁴⁶ 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 παρωδία 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 σκώπτειν ἀρχαίως, 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 παρωδία 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

⁴⁵ J. F. Lockwood and N. G. Wilson, "Aristophanes (2)," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth; 3d ed. rev; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 165.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of the vulgar nature of Greek comedies, esp. Old Greek Comedy, see, e.g., Kenneth J. Dover, "Comedy (Greek), old" in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth; 3d ed. rev; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 368-69.

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 ἀρχαίως 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.⁴⁷

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 ἑρμηνείας* (*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.⁴⁸ Just as Quintilian described the urbane manner in which an orator should use humor, Ps.-Demetrius similarly stresses the refined way in which a speaker⁴⁹ should make witty statements. In the process of analyzing the four styles that included the plain or unadorned (ἰσχνός), the grand (μεγαλοπρεπής), the elegant or polished (γλαφυρός), and the forceful (δεινότης), 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 (σκῶμμα) that

⁴⁷ *Inst.* 6.3.29-31

⁴⁸ 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.

⁴⁹ *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.

characterized the comedies, which he deemed “not far from γελωτοποιία,”⁵⁰ a term which is an accurate designation for buffoonery. He contrasts the comedic type of cheap scoffing with talking cleverly (ἀστεῖζομαι) and making witty/clever (ἀστεῖος) statements that added forcefulness (δείνωσις) and intensity (ἔμφασις) 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 (σκῶμμα), 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, ἀστεῖος, with the Latin *urbanus* that was used by Quintilian. Since ἀστεῖος 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 σκῶμμα 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 ἀστεῖος 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 παρωδέω: “Charm also comes from parody of another writer’s line. . .”⁵² 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.⁵³

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),⁵⁴ his recommendation

⁵² *Eloc.* 150 (Innes, LCL).

⁵³ *Inst.* 6.3.97 (Russell, LCL).

⁵⁴ *Eloc.* 130 states: χρῆται δὲ Ὅμηρος καὶ πρὸς δεινώσειν ἐνίστε καὶ ἔμφασιν . . . 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),⁵⁵ he points out that if a statement uses wit or humor and, at the same time, amazes and secretly stings/bites (ὑποδάκνω),⁵⁶ it reveals the speaker's meaning most forcefully (δεινότατα).⁵⁷ Additionally, forcefulness can be created by the use of figures of thought,⁵⁸ 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 παρωδέω 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,⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ and F. J. Lelièvre,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 παρωδέω and its cognates.

Householder begins his article by noting that LSJ defines παρωδία 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.”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 παρωδός, παρωδή, παρωδία, and παρωδέω in ancient literature, Householder maintains that the basic meaning of the word group is

⁶⁰ “ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ,” *CP* 39 (1944): 1-9.

⁶¹ “The Basis of Ancient Parody,” *GR* 2/1 (1954): 66-81.

⁶² “ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ,” 1.

“singing in imitation, singing with a slight change.”⁶³ The earliest use of *παρωδία* 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 *παρωδός* and *παρωδία* in Athenaeus,⁶⁴ Householder concludes that the earliest meaning for *παρωδία* 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.”⁶⁵

Since this meaning for *παρωδία* 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 *παρωδία*. Householder insists, “There does not seem to be a grain of evidence that any ancient *παρωδία* were designed

⁶³ Ibid., 2. Householder’s definition makes sense on the basis that the noun was formed from a combination of *παρ*, with *ῶδή*. And *ῶδή* (“song”) was derived from a contraction of the Attic *ᾠοιδή* (“song”). Homer also used the verbal form *ᾠοιδιάω* (*Od.* 5.61, 10.227) and its variant form *ᾠείδω* (*Od.* 1.326, 8.266), which in some cases means “to sing,” but can also mean “to sing praise.” See LSJ, “ᾠοιδή,” “ᾠοιδιάω,” 172. Homer also uses *παρᾠείδω* (*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, “παρᾠείδω,” 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 *παρωδία* and *παρωδός* 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 *παρωδία* or to *παρωδός*. According to our findings, forms of *παρωδός* (“writer of parody”) occur in 1.5b; 2.62c; 4.134d; 4.183a; and 15.697f., and forms of *παρωδία* (“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.”⁶⁶ “Burlesque” could accurately be applied to the genre since it encompassed the ridiculing of subject matter, but Householder maintains that this particular use of *παρωδία* 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.”⁶⁷

After studying the typical ways in which *παρωδή* and *παρωδέω* were used, Householder concludes that this noun and verb referred to “close literary imitation.” Householder points to *Inst* 9.2.35 in which *παρωδή*, as part of Quintilian’s discussion of *προσωποποιία*, clearly indicates the imitation of “written documents (as opposed to spoken words).” This same use of *παρωδή* occurs in Philodemus of Gadara (*Hom.* 17.31). Similarly, an occurrence of *παρωδέω* 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 *παρωδή* and *παρωδέω* and the standard English definitions of parody and burlesque.⁶⁸ 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.”⁶⁹ This use is the one

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 4.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

mentioned above that appears in Quintilian's (*Inst.* 9.2.35) discussion of προσωποποιία 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 παρωδέω and its cognates were used as rhetorical terms or to describe a feature of educated conversation, the word group always referred to a

⁷⁰ Ibid., 5. See also William G. Rutherford, ed., *Scholia Aristophanica: Being Such Comments Adscript to the Text of Aristophanes as Have Been Preserved in the Codex Ravennas* (3 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1896).

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 *παρωδέω* 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 *θυμός*. 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 *παρωδία* (*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 *παρωδία* 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 *παρωδέω* 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.’”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’ *Meth.* 30, Demosthenes’ purpose in quoting the passage from Euripides, which Aeschines had previously 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.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.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.”⁷⁸ He defines parody as “essentially a play upon an original brought about

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ See the above discussions of Hermogenes, *Meth.* 34 and Quintilian on *παρωδία*.

⁷⁷ “ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ,” 8, esp. n.27.

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.”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.”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 *παρωδοῦντες*; 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.”⁸¹

For Lelièvre, the “main divergence” from the comedic use of the term occurs with the rhetoricians. Once again Hermogenes (*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.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

⁷⁹ Ibid., 79.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 71.

⁸¹ Ibid., 75.

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 *παρωδέω* 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.⁸⁵ 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 *παρωδή* (*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."⁸⁶ In the context of Quintilian's discussion, the changing of an opponent's written document not only employed imitation, but it also

⁸⁵ *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

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 *παρωδή*. 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 product⁸⁷ and her comparison of parody with other genres are very informative.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.”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

⁸⁷ Ibid., 31-34.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 9-10.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 33, 36.

between κατὰ παρωδίαν and παρὰ προσδοκίαν in his discussion of the methods in which an orator could speak *comically* (*Meth.* 34), Quintilian's description of παρωδή (*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 παρωδία 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.⁹¹

Literary and rhetorical forms of parody differ from *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.”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

⁹¹ Ibid., 83-86.

⁹² Ibid., 87.

the incongruity. The process results in a transformation of the meaning of the original text in its new context.⁹³

Another author who discusses parody in terms of the transformation of the original text is Gérard Genette.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.”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 *παρωδία* 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.”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.”⁹⁷ For Genette, burlesque travesty and

⁹³ Ibid., 88-89.

⁹⁴ *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (trans. C. Newman & C. Doubinsky; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 16-19.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 16.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 18, 143.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 25. It is also important here to note that when Genette translates Scaliger’s often-quoted definition of parody, he translates *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

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

the vulgar connotation of burlesque travesty to a later discussion dealing with seventeenth-century Italy. See *ibid.*, 14-15, 56.

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,⁹⁹ 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 προσωποποιΐα.¹⁰⁰ Lausberg defines *sermocinatio* as the formulation “of statements, conversations and soliloquies or unexpressed mental reflections of the persons concerned.”¹⁰¹ These “persons concerned” can either be invented or historical, and the formulated material is used to characterize them.¹⁰² According to Lausberg, *sermocinatio* or προσωποποιΐα is connected to the rhetorical quality of vividness and is “most emotive.”¹⁰³

After noting that the linguistic form of *sermocinatio* or προσωποποιΐα is typically direct speech and giving numerous examples of the three basic types of direct speech normally used,¹⁰⁴ Lausberg lists several “borderline cases” of *sermocinatio* or προσωποποιΐα that do not fit within the most common forms.¹⁰⁵ Included among such cases is the production of “writings, which, with the reciprocal counterfeiting of a piece

⁹⁹ See, e.g., R. Dean Anderson, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures, and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000); Galen O. Rowe, “Style,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 121-57; George A. Kennedy, “Classical Rhetoric,” in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* (ed. Thomas O. Sloane; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 92-115; and the discussion of rhetorical figures in idem, *New Testament*, 27-30. Additionally, the fourth volume of *KIPauly* (Munich: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1972) does not contain an entry for “parody.”

¹⁰⁰ *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (trans. M. Bliss, A. Jansen, and D. Orten; Leiden: Brill, 1998), §§ 824-26, esp. 824.6.

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 παρωδή as a type of προσωποποιία 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 παρωδή 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 παρωδή as a rhetorical term, but his use of *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, *Inst.* 9.2.35 defines παρωδή as: *nomen ductum a canticis ad aliorum similitudinem modulatus 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 (*A Latin Dictionary Founded on the Andrews’ Edition of Freund’s Latin Dictionary* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1879] 14) cite *Inst.* 8.6.35 and 9.2.35 in defining *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 *abusio* as “a harsh use of tropes, Gr. κατάχρησις” and the later ecclesiastical meaning that implies “abuse.” Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.2.5) is again cited to support the rhetorical meaning of *abusio*. In *Inst.* 8.2.5 and 8.6.34-35, Quintilian uses *abusio* as the equivalent of κατάχρησις 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. *OLD* (28) also defines *abusive* as “catachrestically” or “loosely.” From these definitions, παρωδή 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 *παρωδή* 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 (*παρωδή*) 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 *παρωδή* has a literary component. And he is correct in citing Quintilian's definition of *παρωδή* in support of this position. Lausberg has correctly observed Quintilian's statement that *παρωδή* 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, Merkmal ganz Textklassen" ("the

¹⁰⁸ See 1.1 above.

¹⁰⁹ Peter Stocker, "Parodie," in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* (ed. Gert Ueding et al.; Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003), 6:637-49.

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.”)¹¹⁰

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

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 6:639-40.

a discourse” for a particular situation encountered by an orator.¹¹¹ 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.¹¹² 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.¹¹³ 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*.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.¹¹⁵

As mentioned earlier,¹¹⁶ *KIPauly* does not include an entry for παρωδή, but the older work upon which it was based does discuss rhetorical parody under its listing for "Parodos." Although the combined entry for παρωδός and πάροδος under "Parodos" does seem inappropriate, Paul Maas presents an overview of παρωδός 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 παρωδία was used as a rhetorical term. Maas maintains that παρωδία is correctly understood as standing in contrast to κόλλησις, which he defines as an "unaltered quotation."¹¹⁷ In support of his

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

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.

¹¹⁶ See n.99 above.

¹¹⁷ PW (1949), "Parodos (παρωδός)," 18.4:1684-86.

understanding of rhetorical parody, Maas cites Hermogenes' reference to *παρωδία* in *Meth.* 30, which we have discussed above. Therefore, Maas's understanding of the contrast between *κόλλησις*, an unaltered quotation within a speech, and, *παρωδία*, a rhetorical term that described an altered quotation, is an accurate one 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.

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 *παρωδία* in *Meth.* 30: "Another unusual usage; the word means 'parody' as below in ch. 34."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 *παρωδία* as a contributing factor in his assessment of the unity of the treatise.¹¹⁹

However, the definition of *παρωδία* given in *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 *Meth.* In *Meth.* 30, Hermogenes explicitly stated that his

¹¹⁸ *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises From the Hermogenic Corpus* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 255, n.61.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 203.

topic for the section was Περὶ χρήσεως ἐπῶν ἐν πεζῷ λόγῳ. Considering that the definition of παρωδία 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 παρωδία 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 παρωδή and Hermogenes’ παρωδία.

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 eighteenth-century source, Ernesti’s *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae*, that defines parody in terms of its ancient varieties. Ernesti begins his definition of παρωδία 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.”¹²⁰

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 *παραγραμματισμός*, noting that, from Hermogenes, we learn that what is in a word can “far exceed the thing itself.”¹²¹ He then quotes Quintilian, stating: *Adiuvant urbanitatem et versus, ficti novis versibus similes, quae παρωδία* (“And verse contributes to urbanity/wit, lines can be made like well-known ones, which is called *παρωδία*.”)¹²² 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 *προσωποποιία* 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

¹²⁰ Johann Christian Gottlieb Ernesti, *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae* (Leipzig: Fritsch, 1795; repr., New York: Olms, 1983), 251. We have translated Ernesti’s Latin description of parody.

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).

παρωδία (*Meth.* 30) 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 παρωδία 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 παρωδία, we see that his inclusion of Quintilian's definition of παρωδία as a way that an orator could use laughter or wit to strengthen an argument is a further discussion of the same understanding of παρωδία 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 παρωδέω and its cognates in LSJ goes a long way in explaining

¹²³ "Parodie," 6:642.

the association of parody with burlesque.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, *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.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.¹²⁶ LSJ does include an entry for the adjective *παρωδός*,¹²⁷ which lists one passage in Euripides (*Iph. aul* 1147) that employs the word. It is defined as: “singing indirectly, obscurely hinting;” however, the entry equates *παρωδός* with *ἀλνιγμα* 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

¹²⁴ “*παρωδέω*,” 1344.

¹²⁵ LSJ cites Aristotle, *Poet.* 1448a.12-13, in which Aristotle notes that the first writer of parodies was Hegemon of Thasos, and Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 15.698b, in which Athenaeus discusses the many writers of parodies and explains that parody was employed in Old Comedy.

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 (*Poet.* 1449a).

¹²⁷ “*παρωδός*,” 1344.

αἴνιγμα.¹²⁸ The first is as LSJ defines it; however, the second definition is extremely close to Quintilian’s rhetorical definition of παρωδή. 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 παρωδικός as “burlesque.”¹²⁹ 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 παρωδός,¹³⁰ 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 παρώδησις, which states: “defined as ὅταν ὁ ῥήτωρ κῶλον ἀρχαῖον τίθησι καὶ χωρίον ἑαυτοῦ i.e., when the rhetor quotes a passage of classical literature and adds his own continuation.”¹³¹ 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 “αἴνιγμα,” 27.

¹²⁹ Although παρωδικός 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, “παρωδός,” 243.

¹³¹ LSJSup, “παρώδησις,” 243.

different from the rhetorical definitions of parody mentioned above, LSJSup does include an acknowledgment that παρωδός was employed in rhetoric and that παρωδήσις 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 παρωδήσις does not describe anything that could be considered burlesque or risqué.

The entry for παρωδέω in *PGL* follows a similar line of thought.¹³² Two possible definitions are given, but neither is associated with humor or burlesque. First, παρωδέω 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 παρωδήσαντες. (“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-Asconius claims that Cicero is parodying (*de qua parodia Cicero dixit*) the poet in *Verr.* 1.10.29. Apparently, Lewis and Short agree with Pseudo-Asconius’s notation since they cite it in support of their definition.

¹³² “παρωδέω,” 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 γελωτοποιία 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 προσωποποιΐα, which is an emotive figure,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 προσωποποιΐα, designed to add intensity to an argument by way of exaggeration,

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,¹³⁴ 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

¹³⁴ E.g., see Mark D. Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002).

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 *παρωδή* is a more accurate description than *είρωνεία* 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.”¹³⁵ 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 *είρωνεία* 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*.¹³⁶ 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

¹ Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 24. In an earlier article ("The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 21 [1975]: 353-79), Betz analyzed Galatians via Greco-Roman rhetoric and epistolography and concluded that it should be viewed as an apologetic letter. Frequently citing the 1975 article, Bernard Hungerford Brinsmead (*Galatians – Dialogical Response to Opponents* [SBLDS 65; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982], 37-55) supports Betz's conclusion. However, the majority opinion now follows the proposal of George A. Kennedy (*New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984], 144-52) who sought to demonstrate that the narrative in Gal 1-2 and the exhortation in 5:1-6:10 provided ample evidence that the letter should be viewed as deliberative rhetoric. Notable exceptions to the current consensus are: Troy Martin ("Apostasy to Paganism: The Rhetorical Stasis of the Galatian Controversy," in *The Galatian Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation* [ed. Mark D. Nanos; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002], 73-94) who maintains that Galatians should be considered as a form of forensic rhetoric on the basis that the letter falls under the classification of a *controversia*, and James D. Hester ("Placing the Blame: The Presence of Epideictic in Galatians 1 and 2," in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* [ed. Duane F. Watson; JSNTSup 50; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1991], 281-307 and "Epideictic Rhetoric and Persona in Galatians 1 and 2," in *The Galatian Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation* [ed. Mark D. Nanos; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002], 181-96) who proposes that since Galatians is best characterized as a letter of reproach, a subcategory of a letter of blame, it falls within the genre of epideictic.

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.³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵ Although the most ancient forms of exegesis stressed the unity of Scripture, the best

1974, the above referenced article, and the 1979 commentary by stating, "Indeed, some held Betz's work as marking the beginning of a new era in New Testament scholarship."

³ See e.g., Janet Fairweather, "The Epistle to the Galatians and Classical Rhetoric," *TynBul* 45 (1994): 1-38, 213-43; Philip H. Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistle* (SNTSMS 101; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), esp. 167-203; Lauri Thurén, "John Chrysostom as a Modern Rhetorician," in *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics* (ed. James D. Hester and J. David Hester; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 218-40; and Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (Tübingen: Mohr, Siebeck, 2000), 241-45; 278-9.

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,⁶ 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 ἔθνη γὰρ ἀκούοντα ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ἡμῶν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς καλὰ καὶ μεγάλα θαυμάζει ("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."⁷ One of the most interesting assessments of Paul's rhetorical abilities and writing style is found in John Chrysostom's *On the Priesthood*.⁸ 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.⁹ 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).¹⁰ Chrysostom counters this objection by first

⁷ *Trumpet*, 30. Chrysostom (c. 347-407 C.E.) received a classical education and was a student of the orator Libanius. See idem, "Chrysostom, John," in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters* (ed. Donald K. McKim; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998), 28-34.

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 Παῦλος, φησὶν, οὐκ ἐσπούδασε ταύτην αὐτῷ κατορθωθῆναι τὴν ἀρετὴν, οὐδὲ ἐγκαλύπτεται ἐπὶ τῆ τοῦ λόγου πενία, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαρρηδὴν ὁμολογεῖ ἰδιώτην ἑαυτὸν εἶναι, καὶ ταῦτα Κορινθίους ἐπιστέλλων, τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ λέγειν θαυμαζόμενοις, καὶ μέγα ἐπὶ τοῦτο φρονοῦσι; ("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 ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει (“now even if [I am] inexpert in speech, certainly [I am] not in knowledge”) are not able ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσαι 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”).¹¹

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 καιρὸν ὁ λόγος ἀναμεινέτω, τέως δὲ ἐκεῖνό φημι· θῶμεν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἰδιώτην τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, ὅπερ αὐτοὶ βούλονται· τί οὖν τοῦτο πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς νῦν; Ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ εἶχεν ἰσχὺν πολλῷ τοῦ λόγου μείζονα καὶ πλείονα δυναμένην κατορθοῦν.¹²

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:

Ἄλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδα πῶς τὸν ἄνδρα προήχθην ὑβρίζειν. τὰ γὰρ κατορθώματα αὐτοῦ πάντα μὲν ὑπερβαίνει λόγον, τὸν δὲ ἡμέτερον τοσοῦτον, ὅσον καὶ ἡμᾶς οἱ λέγειν εἰδότες.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 ἡμᾶς and οἱ λέγειν εἰδότες. Taken at face value, Chrysostom's words would mean that he also was ἰδιώτης τῷ 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":

Ἐγὼ δὲ εἰ μὲν τὴν λειότητα Ἰσοκράτους ἀπήτουν, καὶ τὸν Δημοσθένους ὄγκον, καὶ τὴν Θουκυδίδου σεμνότητα, καὶ τὸ Πλάτωνος ὕψος, ἔδει φέρειν εἰς μέσον ταύτην τοῦ Παύλου τὴν μαρτυρίαν· νῦν δὲ ἐκεῖνα μὲν πάντα ἀφήμι καὶ τὸν περίεργον τῶν ἕξωθεν καλλωπισμόν, καὶ οὐδέν μοι φράσεως οὐδὲ ἀπαγγελίας μέλει. Ἄλλ' ἐξέστω καὶ τῇ λέξει πτωχεύειν, καὶ τὴν συνθήκην τῶν ὀνομάτων

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid., 1.3 (PG 48.643).

ἀπλῆν τινα εἶναι καὶ ἀφελῆ, μόνον μὴ τῇ γνώσει τις καὶ τῇ τῶν δογμάτων ἀκριβείᾳ ἰδιώτης ἔστω· μηδ', ἵνα τὴν οἰκείαν ἀργίαν ἐπικαλύψῃ, τὸν μακάριον ἐκεῖνον ἀφαιρείσθω τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τὸ τῶν ἐγκωμίων κεφάλαιον.¹⁵

Now if I were demanding the smoothness of Isocrates, and the sublimity of Demosthenes and the dignity of Thucydides and the height of Plato, it would be necessary to bear this witness of Paul among them.¹⁶ 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”).¹⁷ 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,”¹⁸ 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.”¹⁹ 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 λείον ἐκεῖνο καὶ εὐπρεπὲς ἔχων (“having that smoothness and majesty in the composition of expressions”).²⁰

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.²¹ 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.

¹⁸ George A. Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 64.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁰ *Isocr.*, 18. Dionysius of Halicarnassus was a Greek historian and teacher of rhetoric who moved to Rome ca.30 B.C.E. See Donald Andrew Frank Moore Russell, “Dionysius (7),” in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth; 3d ed. rev; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 478.

²¹ Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 68, 74.

Therefore, Chrysostom candidly acknowledges that Paul's abilities pale in comparison to the finest of Greek orators.²² 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 *ιδιώτης* 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.²³ 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 Ἰουδαίους ἐπιχειοῦντας ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ πόθεν ἠγωνίζετο καὶ συνεζήτει;²⁴

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

Having already established that Paul ἐνταῦθα . . . οὐδέπω τοῦ θαυματουργεῖν ἤρξατο, (“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 ἐνίκα τῷ λέγων; (“Was it not because in relation to force [he was] unique in speech?”).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

were ἀπὸ δημηγορίας μόνης (“from oration alone”).²⁵

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 φαίνηται πολλῶ κεχρημένος τῷ λόγῳ, πῶς ἔτι τολμήσουσιν ἰδιώτην εἰπεῖν τὸν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι καὶ δημηγορεῖν μάλιστα θαυμασθέντα παρὰ πᾶσι;²⁶

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 Λυκάονες αὐτὸν ὑπέλαβον εἶναι Ἑρμῆν; Τὸ μὲν γὰρ θεοὺς αὐτοὺς νομισθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων ἐγένετο, τὸ δὲ τοῦτον Ἑρμῆν, οὐκ ἔτι ἀπ’ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου.²⁷

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.²⁸

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 ἀποστόλων ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὁ μακάριος οὗτος; καὶ πόθεν ἀνὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς ἀπάντων ἐστὶ στόμασιν; πόθεν οὐ παρ' ἡμῖν μόνον, ἀλλὰ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἑλλησι μάλιστα πάντων θαυμάζεται; οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀρετῆς . . . ;²⁹

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?³⁰ It seems best to assume that ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ

Plutarch (*Max. princ.* 777B) states: ἐνδιάθετος λόγος (“immanent thought”) is ἡγεμόνος Ἑρμοῦ δῶρον (“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 ἕωλον (“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: Λητοῖ δ' ἀνθέστηκεν Ἑρμῆς, ἐπειδήπερ ὁ μὲν οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος ἐστὶ τῶν ἐνδον ἐρμηνεύς παθῶν (“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 τουτέστιν . . . ὁ ἔμφρων λόγος (“Hermes . . . that is intelligent speech”). Aristides asks in *Or.* 49: τί κωλύει καὶ ῥητορικὴν τῆς Ἑρμοῦ τιθέναι δωρεᾶς, ἣν γε τῷ ὄντι χρῆ θείαν καλεῖν καὶ τέχνης κρείττω; (“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 ἡγεμών (“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.³¹ 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 τοῦ λόγου φιλοσοφίαν (“the philosophy concerning oratory”).³² 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: Καίτοι τινὲς ἐπιτιμῶσι τῶν λόγων τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἰδιώτου ἔχουσι καὶ λίαν ἀπηκριβωμένοις (“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).³³ 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

³¹ See LSJ, “ἰδιώτης, III.1,” 819.

³² *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.

³³ Hyperides lived from 390 until 322 B.C.E. For information about the trial, see *Minor Attic Orators* (trans. J.O. Burt; LCL: Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 2.462-63.

the impeachment law does not apply to private citizens (οἱ ἰδιῶται).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 ἰδιώτης over the centuries. Alexander, the son of Numenius, who was a renowned rhetor during the time of Hadrian, stated: εἰ μὴ ἦν διανόημα τὸ μὲν κατὰ φύσιν, τὸ δὲ ἐσχηματισμένον, οὔτ' ἄν τῶν ἰδιωτῶν οἱ ῥήτορες διέφερον οὔτ' 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”).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 ἰδιώτης 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 ἰδιώτης 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,³⁶ could refer to οἱ λέγειν εἰδότες as having the advantage over his own rhetorical abilities. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that

³⁴ Hyperides contrasts ῥήτορες and ἰδιῶται 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, “ἰδιώτης,” 819.

³⁵ Alexander Numeniu, *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.

³⁶ *Sac.* 1.3 (PG 48.643).

a person who had obtained a rhetorical education,³⁷ but who was not currently a practicing orator, could be referred to as ἰδιώτης 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*.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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:

λέγω δὲ τοῦτο ὅτι ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει· ἐγὼ μὲν εἶμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, 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:

Ταῦτα δὲ μετεσχημάτισα εἰς 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 ἐσχηματισμένος λόγος 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.

⁴⁰ Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 3.1 (PG 61.23-24). See BADG, "μετασχηματίζω," 513; BDAG, "μετασχηματίζω," 641-42.

meaning.⁴¹ 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.⁴² Benjamin Fiore proposes that Paul knew and used this figure of speech in order to help alleviate the factionalism in the churches.⁴³ Whether or not Paul actually had knowledge of this rhetorical device, the fact that Chrysostom assumes that Paul knows of ἐσχηματισμένος λόγος, 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 ὃ 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.⁴⁴ And third, Chrysostom holds that Paul purposely placed his own name first in the list of the three because he arranged the names κατὰ ἀύξησιν (“according to amplification”).⁴⁵ Although the definition of ἀύξεις presented by Ps.-Longinus, implies that the term

⁴¹ The verb used by Ps.-Demetrius is the same as that employed by Alexander, Περὶ σχημάτων 11.31-12.1 quoted above.

⁴² See also Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.67-107.

⁴³ “Covert Allusion in 1 Cor 1-4,” *CBQ* 47 (1985):85-102.

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 αὔξησις to apply also to individuals who are named in order of increasing greatness. In support of Chrysostom's view, Ps.-Longinus does state: μυρίαί γὰρ ἰδέαι τῶν αὔξησεῶν (“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

⁴⁶ *Subl.* 11-12. Both authorship and date are a matter of question, but the work is most frequently dated in the first century C.E. See Donald Andrew Frank Moore Russell, “Longinus,” in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth; 3d ed. rev; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 884.

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.⁴⁸

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

Τοῦτο γὰρ αἴτιον τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι τοὺς ἀποστόλους σοφοὺς, οὐκ ἀσθενείᾳ τοῦ χαρίσματος, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ βλαβῆ τὸ κήρυγμα.⁴⁹

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 δὲ ἰδιῶται οἱ βεβαιοῦντες (“And unlearned men were the ones who established [the proclamation]”).⁵⁰ However, at this part in the homily, Chrysostom questions:

Καὶ εἰ οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου, τίνος ἕνεκεν τὸν Ἀπολλῶ λόγιον ὄντα ἔπεμψαν, φησί;⁵¹

⁴⁸ *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.”

⁴⁹ Chrysostom, *Hom .1 Cor.* 3.3 (PG 61.26).

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 3.3 (PG 61.26-27). In this context, the most likely meaning of ἰδιώτης is “unlearned” rather than “layperson.” See LSJ, “ἰδιώτης, 3.3,” 819.

⁵¹ *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?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.⁵³ Chrysostom is here quite adamant that God did not "cast out" the educated simply because they were learned or eloquent.⁵⁴

Chrysostom then ironically demands:

Σὺ δὲ ἐκεῖνό μοι δεῖξον, εἰ Πέτρος λόγιος ἦν καὶ Παῦλος. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις ἰδιῶται γὰρ ἦσαν, καὶ ἀγράμματοι.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 *On the Priesthood*, bestowed on Paul due to his rhetorical and epistolary skills, this statement is quite surprising.⁵⁶ Although ἰδιῶται 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, I.2 and II.1," 1056.

⁵³ Chrysostom, *Hom .I 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, *Hom .I Cor.* 3.4 (PG 61.27).

⁵⁶ Note specifically the quotations cited above from *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 ἰδιῶται. 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.⁵⁷

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.⁵⁸

Although the possibility does exist that Chrysostom meant to describe only the disciples who were with Jesus in Palestine as ἰδιῶται 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 *ιδιωται* and *ἀγράμματοι*. 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:

“Όταν οὖν Ἕλληνες κατηγορήσωσι τῶν μαθητῶν ὡς ιδιωτῶν, πλέον ἡμεῖς ἐκείνων κατηγορῶμεν αὐτῶν. Μηδὲ λεγέτω τις, ὅτι σοφὸς ἦν ὁ Παῦλος· ἀλλ’ ἐπαίροντες ἐπὶ σοφία τοὺς μεγάλους παρ’ ἐκείνοις καὶ ἐπὶ εὐγλωττία θαυμασθέντας, τοὺς παρ’ ἡμῖν ἅπαντας λέγωμεν ιδιωτάς γεγονέναι. Οὐ μικρῶς γὰρ αὐτοὺς καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο καταβαλοῦμεν τὸ μέρος· οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται λαμπρὰ τὰ νικητήρια.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.⁶⁰ Chrysostom concludes this part of his homily by stating: οὕτω τοίνυν αὐτοὺς καταβάλωμεν (“Indeed in this way we should overthrow them”).⁶¹

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.⁶² 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 ἰδιώτης 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.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ 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

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 ἄνδρα λόγιον ὄντα καὶ δυνατὸν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς (“a man of eloquence and powerful in the Scriptures”).⁶⁶ In contrasting Apollos to the false apostles, Chrysostom asks why Paul exhorts Apollos while he fights the false apostles. Ὅτι μετὰ τῆς παιδείσεως ἐκεῖνος καὶ τὴν τῶν δογμάτων ὀρθότητα διετηρεῖ· οὗτοι δὲ τοὺν ἀντίον (“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 (ιδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῇ γνώσει). Possibly this statement, in itself, is a rhetorical device in which the speaker downplays his own rhetorical abilities.⁶⁷ That Chrysostom may have understood Paul’s expression in this way is supported by his comment on the verse: ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ καταίρει τὸ πρᾶγμα τὸ τῆς ἕξω σοφίας (“but he destroys the matter

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”).⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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,⁷¹ 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.⁷²

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."⁷³ Before Chrysostom gets further than the προοίμιον, he demonstrates that Paul employs a common method

⁷¹ Kern, 181.

⁷² Chrysostom, *Hom. Gal.* (PG 61.611-82).

⁷³ *Ibid.*, (PG 61.611).

used to allay suspicion.⁷⁴ Citing v. 2, he points out that Paul does not normally say καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ 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.⁷⁵

Chrysostom also notes that 1:5 contains ἀμήν, 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.⁷⁶ By claiming this, Chrysostom is implying that Paul would have known that the ἀμήν 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.

⁷⁴ Quintilian discusses the importance of eliminating suspicion of the speaker in the exordium in *Inst.* 4.1.7-8.

⁷⁵ Chrysostom, *Hom. Gal.* (PG 61.616).

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:

οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα 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:

Ὅρα 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: ὄρα πῶς λύει σοφῶς τὴν 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

⁷⁸ See LSJ, “λύω II.4.d,” 1068 and “οἰκονομία 6,” PGL, 943.

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.⁸⁶ Interestingly, allegory and enigma are used by Paul in Gal 4:24 and 1 Cor 13:12, respectively.⁸⁷

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.⁸⁸ And, in fact, most of the stylistic features of rhetoric were carried out everyday by ordinary laypeople in the course of their daily lives.⁸⁹

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").⁹⁰ 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").⁹¹

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.⁹² 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*

⁸⁶ Ibid., 3.88.

⁸⁷ Augustine, *Doctrina Christiana* (trans. R.P.H. Green; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 170 n. 76.

⁸⁸ Augustine, *Doctr. chr.* 4.8.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 4.16.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 4.31.

⁹¹ Ibid., 4.35.

⁹² Ibid., 4.44.

obtrektoribus (“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).⁹³

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.⁹⁴ 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 gospel⁹⁵ 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

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 epistola summisso dicendi genera scripta sit nisi in extremis partibus* ("that entire letter is written in the

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”).¹⁰⁰ 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.¹⁰¹ 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 praeferatur 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.¹⁰³ To support this assertion, he reviews the standard ancient handbooks and surveys the statements made by early Christian writers regarding Paul's rhetorical abilities.¹⁰⁴

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.¹⁰⁵ 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.”¹⁰⁶ 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.¹⁰⁷

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.”¹⁰⁸

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 One¹ 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 Missionaries² were Torah-observant Jewish Christians who were insisting that Gentile converts must also observe the Torah.³ 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 ταρασσοντες) 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 ταρασσοντες 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 ταρασσοντες.

³ The consensus views Paul’s reference in Gal 1:7 to τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταρασσοντες ὑμᾶς καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον 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 μεταστρέψαι 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 εὐαγγελίζω 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 phrases⁷ 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.

⁹ Chaïm Perelman, *The Realm of Rhetoric* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982), 49.

understood, not as reality, but as “the means of reaching” the new reality.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).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.¹²

¹⁰ Chaïm Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 411-59, here 416, 433.

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 (*Galatians*, 7) cites 2:15-21; 3:2-5; 4:21; 5:2-12; and 6:12-17; Hays (*Galatians*, 185), in addition to noting the Missionaries’ emphasis on circumcision, cites 3:10, 12; 4:8-11; and 5:16-24; and Martyn (*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).

¹² See e.g. Betz, *Galatians*, 7; Martyn, *Galatians*, 117-26; N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 137-74; Hays, *Galatians*, 185-86; and Dunn, *Galatians*, 14-17.

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 θαυμάζω ("I am amazed") along with other parts of Paul's rebuke section (1:6-10).¹³ However, considering the

¹³ For a discussion of the ironic use of θαυμάζω 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 θαυμάζω as an expression of amazement and shock rather than as an indication of irony. Hays (*Galatians*, 204) notes Paul's ironic use of μεταίθημι 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 However, he goes on to state, "the combination of curse and blessing

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: Personnalité, 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 Epideictic 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.”¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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.¹⁷ 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 deuteronomic 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”¹⁸ 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.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 Deuteronomistic curse tradition (27:15-26; cf. Deut 13:16b) thus allowing for "curse and excommunication" to be substituted for the death penalty.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 ἀνάθεμα 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 ἀνάθεμα, 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 ἀνάθεμα and ἀναθεματίζω in 13:16 and a form of ἀνάθεμα 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, *Galatians*, 204; Dunn, *Galatians*, 39-40; and Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 53. A full discussion of Paul's use of μετατίθημι 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 Excommunication," *VT* 35 (1985): 13-38, esp. 18-25.

law.”²¹ Although “Paul draws on the dynamics of authoritative covenantal tradition to secure the truth of the Gospel of Christ”²² 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.²³

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”²⁴ 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 deuteronomic 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 μεταίθημι 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.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 θαυμάζω or an equivalent.²⁶ While Paul’s use of θαυμάζω is ironic, rather than parodic, his expression of astonishment and rebuke, which includes the important statement that the Galatians οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε (“are so quickly deserting”)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.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.”²⁹ Although Martyn notes that Paul uses

²⁵ See n.13 above.

²⁶ Dahl, “Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” 12-20. Also, see John Lee White, *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,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 91-97, esp. 94-95; and Terrence Y. Mullins, “Formulas in the New Testament Epistles,” *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 θαυμάζω as expressing ironic (and for Mullins even “sarcastic”, 385) amazement that the Galatians have abandoned Paul’s gospel.

²⁷ This is the translation in the NRSV and NIV.

²⁸ Justification for this statement will be presented below.

²⁹ *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 ὁ 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 ὁ Μεταθέμενος from the

³⁰ Ibid., 108. Martyn cites CD 1:13 (הַיֵּשׁוּבִים מִן הַדֶּרֶךְ: “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.³² 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 *μετέθετο* 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.³³ 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 περιστάσιν ὀφθαλμία· ἀλγήσας γὰρ ἐπίπονωσ ὤκησεν εἶπεῖν 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 ἀποστὰς δὲ τοῦ Ζήνωνος πρὸς τοὺς Κυρηναϊκοὺς ἀπέτραπη ("When he deserted Zeno, he turned to the Cyrenaics"). Diogenes Laertius lived during the first half of the third century C.E. (See Herbert Straine 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 Stoa 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 "*negō*," *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. . .”).³⁴ And Diogenes Laertius notes that some people refer to Dionysius by the nickname Σπίνθαρος (“Spark”), rather than as ὁ Μεταθέμενος.³⁵ 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.³⁶

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 καλούμενος ἔχαιρε . . . ἀποστάς τῶν τῆς στοᾶς λόγων καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑπίκουρον μεταπηδήσας (“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 ἀφίστημι, 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,³⁷ the possibility that the Galatians would have associated Paul’s μετατίθεσθε 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 Θαυμάζω and μετατίθεσθε 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.³⁸ 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.³⁹ Although Betz understands Paul’s μετατίθεσθε 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 μετατίθημι indicating that those to whom it was applied were traitors, Betz’s claim that Paul’s μετατίθημι is “political language” is not supported by the evidence since the syntax of the sentences that employ μετατίθημι with a political connotation follows a particular pattern that is different than Paul’s. Additionally, Betz’s insistence on viewing

³⁷ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.167; Cicero, *Acad. pr.* 2.71.

³⁸ Martyn, *Galatians*, 116-17; Betz, *Galatians*, 46-7.

³⁹ Martyn, *Galatians*, 108, 116.

Paul as the rhetorical defendant downplays the importance of Paul's statement that the Galatians are deserting "from the one who called" them.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 μετατίθημι to indicate *political* desertion mention the person or group from which the subject is deserting, but they do consistently use μετατίθημι with πρὸς to indicate the new group to which the subject aligns.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 μετατίθημι with different connotations.

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

⁴⁰ Betz, *Galatians*, 47. For the political connotation of μετατίθημι, see, e.g., Polybius (c.200 - c.118 B.C.E.), *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.), *Pyrrh.* 7.7; *Eum.* 5.4; *Marc.* 20.3. The following paragraphs will demonstrate that the sentence structure in ancient sources that employ μετατίθημι with a political connotation differs significantly from the sentence structure in ancient sources that employ μετατίθημι with a religious connotation.

⁴¹ Texts cited in previous note.

⁴² *Contra Martyn*, *Galatians*, 108. Examples connoting a nondescript change of opinion/habits include: Plato, *Resp.* 1.345C; Polybius, *Hist.* 36.17.10; Plutarch, *Cat. Min.* 49.3; *Dem.* 13.4; *Nic.* 14.1; *Prae. ger. rei. publ.* 813B; Appian, *Hist. rom.* 3.4.29; Justin, *I Apol.* 43.6.2; Maximus, *Or.* 36.3.15. Examples connoting a change for the worse include: Polybius, *Hist.* 9.26.1; Justin *Dial.* 47.5.5; Maximus, *Or.* 5.7.10. Examples connoting a correction from wrong thinking include: Herodotus, 7.18; Euripides, *Iph. aul.* 385; Polybius, *Hist.* 11.25.10; 37.9.6; Diodorus Sic. 15.54.4; Philo, *Praem.* 58; and Plutarch, *Quaest. rom.* 283E. Examples connoting repentance/religious conversion include: *Let. Aris.* 188.4 (with active participle); Josephus, *A. J.* 5.110, 200; 9.265; 20.38; Cornutus, *Nat. d.* 11. 7; Justin, *I Apol.* 45.6.4, 57.1.7; *2 Apol.* 12.8.1, 15.2.3; *Dial.* 107.2.9; *Mart. Pol.* 11.1.3; Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.8.3; Origen, *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,⁴³ and many of these texts mention the new opinion or religion into (usually εἰς or ἐπί) which the person is moving.⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵ 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: προσαγορεύουσι δὲ καὶ μείλιχον τὸν Δία, εὐμείλικτον ὄντα τοῖς ἐξ ἀδικίας μετατιθεμένοις (“And now they address a gentle god, who is easily appeased by the ones who convert/repent from wrongdoing”).⁴⁶ Additionally, Josephus, in narrating Jewish history to a Gentile audience, employs μετατιθέμενοι 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).⁴⁷

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 μεταθέμενοι 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.

⁴⁷ Cf. Josh 22:9-24; Judg 4:1; 5:6-9.

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 (εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον), 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 1:6-7.⁴⁸ 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 school⁴⁹ 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 P^{46vid}, 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)⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹ 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 μεταθέμενον 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 ἐκκλίνω 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 סוּר, which means “mislead,” “deceive,” or “incite.” See “סוּר,” 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 מוּס 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).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 ὁδοῦ ἧς ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος ὁ θεός 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).⁵³

Additionally, Morland notes:

The accusation *μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς* in 1:6 corresponds to the crime in Deut 13, which is one of *πλάνειν* [*sic* *πλανῆσαι*] *σε ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ* (13:5), *ζήτειν* [*sic* *ἐζήτησεν*] *ἀποστήσαι σε ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ* (13:10), and of *ἀφιστῆναι* [*sic* *ἀπέστησαν*] *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 ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον* in 1:6 corresponds to the apostasy in Deut 13, which is described as one of serving *θεοῖς ἑτέροις* (13:2, 6, 13).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

⁵² Josephus’ use of *μετατίθημι* is clearly connected to the Mosaic law since *A. J.* 5.108 refers to *νόμων πατριῶν* (“of the laws of the fathers”), 5.200 has *ἐκ τῆς περιφρόνησεως τῶν νόμων* (“from the contempt of the laws”), and 9.266 has *παρανομοῦσιν* (“they are acting contrary to the law”).

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.

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 *ἀφιστῆναι*, which should have been *ἀφιστάναι*, 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 ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ὅσας ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι 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)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,⁵⁹ how would a recognition of this rhetorical device affect the interpretation of 1:10a: Ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν; (“Am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God?”)?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,⁶¹ commentators note the difficulty of interpreting ἢ τὸν θεόν in relationship to Ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω.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

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 εὐάρεστος (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 εὐάρεστος 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.

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

⁶⁰ This is the translation presented in the RSV. We will propose a different translation below.

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 Foerster, “ἀρέσκω,” *TDNT* 1.455-57.

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 *πείθω* and *ἄρέσκειν*. 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 *πείθω*.

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 ἀρέσκειν connote: "Now am I *really* attempting to persuade humans or God? Or am I seeking to please humans?"⁷⁰ While Paul's πείθω and ἀρέσκειν should be understood with the negative connotations that were so frequently associated with the verbs,⁷¹ the switch from πείθω to ἀρέσκειν 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 ἀρέσκειν is denying that his law-free gospel is law-free because he is a people-pleaser.

Support for different translations of πείθω and ἀρέσκειν 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);”⁷² 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, εἴ τις ζηλωτῆς ἐστὶν τῶν πατρῴων ἐθῶν (“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.⁷³ 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 ἀρέσκω, 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 ἀρέσκω (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 εὐαρεστέω, rather than ἀρέσκω, BDAG (“εὐαρεστέω,” 403) mentions the morphological connection of the verbs. For Paul’s use of ἀρέσκω and εὐαρεστος, 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.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 *ἀνθρώπους 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 *θεῶ. . . πεφανερώμεθα* ("we are well known to God").⁷⁵ Thus, as Furnish notes, Paul is "responding to those who have accused him of trying to 'persuade people' in devious ways,"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

⁷⁴ See, e.g., Martyn's (*Galatians*, 137-40) discussion.

⁷⁵ Bultmann, "*πείθω*," *TDNT* 6.2-3; Martyn, *Galatians*, 138; George Lyons, *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.

⁷⁶ *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 306. See also Bultmann, "*πείθω*," *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 ἀνθρώπους is “a definition of rhetoric.”⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ 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, πείσαι 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*.⁷⁹

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.⁸⁰ 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.”⁸¹ Martyn’s determination that *γάρ* 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 *γάρ* in questions is to express indignation, and such an expression of indignant emotion logically connects v.10 to the preceding anathemas.

⁷⁹ See Bruce M. Metzger (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [2d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1994], 481) on the reading *ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας* vs. *ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις*.

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 ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἠρεσκον ("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.⁸⁴ And as Hays notes, Paul “put his zeal into action by using force against those whom he considered enemies of the Law.”⁸⁵

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).⁸⁶

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.”

⁸⁶The 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.⁸⁷ 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),⁸⁸ and at the end of this description v. 68 states:

καὶ ἀποστρέψει σε κύριος εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐν πλοίοις . . . καὶ πραθήσεσθε ἐκεῖ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὑμῶν εἰς παῖδας 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].⁸⁹

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

⁸⁸ Deut 28:15 states: καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν μὴ εἰσακούσης τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου φυλάσσειν καὶ ποιεῖν πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ὅσας ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον καὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πᾶσαι αἱ κατάραι αὐταὶ καὶ καταλήμψονται 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 ἐνετείλατό σοι (“as many as he commanded you”).

⁸⁹ Cf. Deut 32:6; Exod 15:16; and Ps 73:2 in which forms of κτώμαι 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 קָנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל 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 קָנָה (“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.⁹⁰ However, after a period of punishment for their rejection of the law, the people would again be restored as God's δούλοι (Deut 32:36; 2 Macc 7:6, 33).

If Paul is again employing rhetorical parody in his phrase Χριστοῦ δούλος, he is depicting the status of being a slave of Christ as a desirable and voluntary state⁹¹ 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 κτώμενος 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 πρᾶθήσεσθε (“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).

⁹⁰ 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 δούλος (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 δούλους καὶ δούλας 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.

⁹¹ 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 δούλος 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.⁹²

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.⁹³ 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.⁹⁴ Although Paul most likely saw himself as standing in the tradition of the Hebrew prophets, especially considering the prophetic

⁹² 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.”

⁹³ 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.

⁹⁴ In addition to the sources cited in the previous note, see, e.g., T. Holtz, “Zum Selbstverständnis des Apostels Paulus,” *TLZ* 91 (1966): 321-30; F.F. Bruce, “Further Thoughts on Paul’s Autobiography: Galatians 1:11-2:14,” in *Jesus und Paulus* (ed. E. E. Ellis & E. Gräber; Tübingen: Mohr, 1975), 21-9; William Baird, “Visions, Revelation, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Corinthians 12:1-5 and Galatians 1:11-17,” *JBL* 104 (1985): 651-62; N. Habel, “The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives,” *ZAW* 77 (1965): 297-323; Hays, *Galatians*, 215; and Dunn, *Galatians*, 62-3.

language in Gal 1:15-16,⁹⁵ the very infrequent use of δούλος κυρίου in the LXX versions of the verses in which the MT has עֶבֶד־יְהוָה may indicate that Paul’s Χριστοῦ δούλος should be understood as a double entendre.⁹⁶ Since δούλος 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: διότι οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ κύριος ὁ θεὸς πρᾶγμα ἐὰν μὴ ἀποκαλύψῃ παιδείαν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ τοὺς προφῆτας (“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 “עֶבֶד־יְהוָה; LXX δούλος κυρίου;” however, in actuality, only 4 of the verses cited (Josh 24:29; Judg 2:8; 2 Kg 18:13; Ps 35:1) employ δούλος for עֶבֶד. Importantly, Josh 24:29 and Judg 2:8 employ δούλος 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 δούλος 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 δούλῳ κυρίου Δαυιδ prior to describing the thought process of ὁ παράνομος τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν (“the one contrary to the law in order to sin”) in 35:2. Although Dodd (98 n. 41) does state: “On the interchangeability of δούλος 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 οἰκέτης κυρίου in LXX Deut 34:5 for MT עֶבֶד־יְהוָה מֹשֶׁה; Μωυσῆς παῖς κυρίου in LXX 2 Chr 1:3 for MT עֶבֶד־יְהוָה מֹשֶׁה; Μωυσῆ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ in LXX 2 Chr 24:6 for MT עֶבֶד־יְהוָה מֹשֶׁה; Μωυσῆ in Josh 1:1 for MT עֶבֶד־יְהוָה מֹשֶׁה. While the Greek word chosen could reflect the theological tendencies of the translator, δούλος κυρίου is used for עֶבֶד־יְהוָה 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 δούλος μου (e.g., 2 Kgs 21:8; Mal 3:24), δούλου σου (e.g., Neh 9:14) or δούλον αὐτοῦ (e.g., Ps 104:26), the only time that he is referred to with the exact phrase δούλος κυρίου is 2 Kg 18:13. As a title for Moses, δούλος 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: ἐπῆλθεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἡ κατάρα καὶ ὁ ὄρκος ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσέως δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι ἡμάρτομεν 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 δούλος κυρίου with Χριστοῦ δούλος, the contexts of the verses that use the *exact* phrase δούλος κυρίου become important for our discussion since parody requires a play on the hypotext’s words.

rather than as a title for a prophet,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).⁹⁸

3.1.1.4 Summary

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

⁹⁷ 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.

⁹⁸ For the use of εξαγοράζω in connection with the manumission of slaves, see F. Büchsel, "ἀγοράζω, εξαγοράζω," *TDNT* 1:124-28. Compare Paul's ἠγοράσθητε ("you were bought") in 1 Cor 6:20.

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 Deuteronomic 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.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,¹⁰² demands continued obedience to *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 μετατίθεσθε and χάριτι (v.6), double anathema (vv.8-9), and ἀρέσκειν and δοῦλος (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.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.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.¹⁰⁵ However, although Martyn views v.

¹⁰¹ If the primary emphasis of Χριστοῦ δοῦλος is to counter the Deuteronomic threat of future enslavement, this does not negate the possibility that Paul is also employing δοῦλος to indicate the concept of total obedience to Christ in his proclamation of the gospel.

¹⁰² Deut 32:6c questions: οὐκ αὐτὸς οὗτός σου πατήρ ἐκτήσατό σε καὶ ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔκτισέν σε; ("Did not he himself, your father, purchase you, and make you, and bring you into existence?").

¹⁰³ See again the paraphrase of 1:6-10 above.

¹⁰⁴ *Galatians*, 24, 106. As mentioned above, Martyn views vv. 6-9 as the theme of the letter; however, as Hays (*Galatians*, 207) notes, v. 10 does continue the rebuke section.

¹⁰⁵ 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. 11-12.¹⁰⁶ 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,¹⁰⁷ 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.¹⁰⁸

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 ἄνθρωπον (according to humanity), that he received¹¹⁰ his gospel παρὰ ἀνθρώπου (from a

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.

¹¹⁰ 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. Dellings, “παραλαμβάνω,” *TDNT* 4:11-14 for a discussion of the verb’s meanings in Hellenistic, Jewish, and New Testament documents. Especially relevant is Dellings’ discussion of *m. Abot* 1:1 (13) in which he notes the connection of παραλαμβάνω with לָקַח (received) and הָרַח (handed down). Christian documents in the post-Pauline period

human source), and that he was taught the gospel (αὐτὸ . . . ἐδιδάχθη) in some manner.¹¹¹ 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,”¹¹² the common interpretation,¹¹³ 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;¹¹⁴ 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 ἃ 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 “reveall[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”,¹¹⁵ thus, scholarship began to acknowledge that Paul’s stress on the divine origin of his gospel was not *solely* an attempt either to defend his apostleship or to assert his independence from the pillar apostles in Jerusalem.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.”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

¹¹⁵ B. R. Gaventa, “Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as Paradigm,” *NovT* 28 (1986): 309-26, here 313.

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,” *NTS* 21 [1975]: 353-79; “Galatians, Letter to the,” *IDBSup*: 352-53; and *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 *defend* his apostolate” (311).

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 313, 326.

some reference to 2 Macc 7:24 in discussing μετατίθημι (1:6),¹¹⁸ 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,¹¹⁹ 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: Ἰουδαϊσμός, ἀναστροφή, διώκω, ἡλικία/συνηλικιωτής, 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 (χαρίζομαι) 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).

¹¹⁹ Cf. Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.42-43.

order the teaching” (στοιχείωσις)¹²⁰ 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 αὐτοῦ νόμους (“on account of his laws”).¹²¹ 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 πατράσιν ἡμῶν διὰ Μωυσέως (“but I obey the commands of the law given to our fathers by Moses”).¹²² The reason the son gives for welcoming death rather than violating the law is threefold: (1) ἡμεῖς γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν 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 ἀενάου ζωῆς (“the ever-flowing life”) of the covenant of God (v.36); and (3) ἐν ἐμοὶ 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).

¹²⁰ LSJ, “στοιχείωσις,” 1647. See also J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, “διαρυθμίζω,” *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992), 1:108.

¹²¹ Paul addresses similar issues in Gal 3:2, 5, 14, 21c.

¹²² Cf. Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.232-34. Also, *A. J.* 2.91 states: “suffering comes to those standing against the θεοῦ προστάγμασι (“commands of God”).

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, *II 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 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.

Scott.¹²⁵ 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."¹²⁶ 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.¹²⁷ 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."¹²⁸

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 Geshick 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 ᾠδῆς διεσάφησεν Μωυσῆς (“just as Moses explained through the song that is witnessing against every person”). As Goldstein notes, διὰ τῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀντιμαρτυρούσης ᾠδῆς is taken from the description of Moses' song in Deut 31:21: καὶ ἀντικαταστήσεται ἡ ᾠδὴ αὕτη κατὰ πρόσωπον μαρτυροῦσα οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἐπιλησθῆ 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”).¹²⁹

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.”¹³⁰ Goldstein's

¹²⁹ Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 304.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 12-13.

interpretation of 2 Macc 7 therefore *affirms dtrGB*.

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 *dtrGB*,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:

ἀνέγραψε δὲ τὰς εὐλογίας καὶ τὰς κατάρους αὐτός, ὡς μηδέποτε ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν μάθησιν 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* (παρὰβάντες 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 Rather, Josephus has merely rewritten

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: ὑμῖν δὲ τί τῶν εὐλογηθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ νομοθέτου πέπρακται τί δὲ τῶν ὑπ' ἐκείνου κατηραμένων παραλέλειπται πόσῳ δ' ἐστὲ τῶν τάχιον ἀλόντων ἀσεβέστεροι ("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.

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 Ἰουδαϊσμός 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 4:26.¹³⁷ 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.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 Ἰουδαϊσμός 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.¹³⁹

The first step in this investigation is to understand the context in which Ἰουδαϊσμός 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 Ἰουδαϊσμός 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

¹³⁷ E.g., Betz, *Galatians*, 67 n. 105; Martyn, *Galatians*, 154; Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 78 n. 4; Hays, *Galatians*, 213; and Dunn, *Galatians*, 56-57. See also Shaye J.D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 69-106, esp. 90-93, 105-106.

¹³⁸ E.g., Hays, *Galatians*, 213; Martyn, *Galatians*, 29-37; Dunn, *Galatians*, 56-57.

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 (*Galatians*, 56-62) discusses numerous Pauline words in relationship to their use in 1-2 Macc, and Hays (*Galatians*, 213) discusses Ἰουδαϊσμός and ζηλωτής 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.

appearances from heaven,” “diligently performed brave deeds for the sake of Judaism” (Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ), “pursued (διώκειν) the barbarian multitudes,” “recovered the temple,” “freed” (ἐλευθερώσαι) the city, and “set up again the law that was about to be torn down” (καταλύεσθαι).¹⁴⁰ In 2 Macc 8:1, Judas and his companions “secretly entered” (παρεισπορευόμενοι ληθηθότως) the villages, summoned their countrymen, and accepted (προσλαμβάνόμενοι) those who had remained in Judaism (τοὺς μεμνηκότας 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 εἰσηνηγεμένος Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ) and “with all earnestness (μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενείας) he risked body and life on behalf of Judaism” (v.38).¹⁴¹

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” (ἠνάγκαζεν) all the people “to renounce Judaism” (ἐξόμνησθαι 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

¹⁴⁰ Paul also employs καταλύω in discussing the law in 2:18: εἰ γὰρ ἂν κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν 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).

¹⁴¹ The only occurrence of ἐκτένεια in the NT is in Luke’s account of Paul’s speech before Agrippa in which Paul declares that he “stands trial” (ἔστηκα 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 πορθέω (4:23, 11:4),¹⁴² 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.¹⁴³ 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* (τῷ πατρίῳ πολιτευόμενοι νόμῳ) 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* (πορθεῖς) them and connects the torture to Torah in v. 5 by asking if the cause of the persecution was because κατὰ τὸν ἐνάρετον αὐτοῦ ζῶμεν νόμον (“we live according to his virtuous law”). Therefore, 4 Macc employs πορθέω 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 διώκω to describe his former persecution of the church. Martyn (*Galatians*, 154 n. 185) notes that πορθέω is used strictly to refer to persecution carried out by Paul. Although Martyn is correct that Paul is always the subject of πορθέω 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.¹⁴⁴

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).¹⁴⁵ 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).¹⁴⁶ 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 θεῖον ἡμῶν νόμον μέχρι θανάτου (“our divine law to the point of death” in 6:21).

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

¹³Ἦκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν,
¹⁴καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.

¹³For 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.

¹⁴And 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 *hapax legomenon*

¹⁴⁴ 4 Macc 5:29 states: οὔτε τοὺς ἱεροὺς τῶν προγόνων περὶ τοῦ φυλάξαι τὸν νόμον ὄρκους οὐ παρήσω (“nor will I neglect the sacred oaths of the forefathers concerning keeping the law”).

¹⁴⁵ John M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 371-73.

¹⁴⁶ Paul L. Redditt, “The Concept of *Nomos* in Fourth Maccabees,” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 249-70, here 251.

in the undisputed letters of Paul, occurs in the account of the martyrdom of Eleazar (2 Macc 6:23),¹⁴⁷ and Dunn relates Paul’s ἐδίωκον 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,¹⁴⁸ 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 ἀνὴρ ἤδη προβεβηκῶς τὴν ἡλικίαν . . . ἠναγκάζετο φαγεῖν ὕειον 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:

ὁ δὲ λογισμὸν ἀστεῖον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ ἄξιον τῆς ἡλικίας . . . καὶ τῆς ἐκ παιδὸς καλλίστης ἀναστροφῆς μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς ἀγίας 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, *Diatr.* 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 συνηλιξ (“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.¹⁴⁹ 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.¹⁵⁰

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 (συνηλικιώτης).”¹⁵¹ Paul’s phrase περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων (“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.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.”¹⁵³

And as numerous commentators discuss,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 Macc 2:26, 54; 4 Macc 18:12);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 Macc 2:26-27; Josephus, *A. J.* 12.271); and Onias (2 Macc 4:2). Additionally, these zealous exemplars were to be imitated by those who wished to be faithful to God as evinced in: 1 Macc 2:27, 50; Josephus (*A. J.* 4.154-55) who describes the slaying of many transgressors by

¹⁵¹ Josephus (*A. J.* 4.152) describes Phinehas with similar words: τῶν νεωτέρων κρείττων καὶ . . . τοὺς ἡλικιώτας ὑπερέχων (“being better than the young men and . . . surpassing [his] contemporaries”).

¹⁵² *Galatians*, 68 and sources cited in n. 121. See also Dunn’s (*Galatians*, 60) discussion of Paul’s Pharisaic past.

¹⁵³ *Galatians*, 155.

¹⁵⁴ E.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 155; Hays, *Galatians*, 213-14; and Dunn, *Galatians*, 60-61.

¹⁵⁵ Ps 105:30 does not mention zeal, but states: καὶ ἔστη Φινεες καὶ ἐξιλάσατο καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραῦσις (“And Phinehas stood up and appeased and the destruction stopped”). MT Ps 106:30 employs יָבִיחַ (“intercede”) rather than יְשַׁלֵּם (“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);¹⁵⁶ and Philo (*Spec.* 2.253) who in discussing the inevitable punishment of a false witness notes: "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" (καταλύσει).¹⁵⁷ By employing Ἰουδαϊσμός, ἀναστροφή, διώκω, and a compound of ἡλικία, words associated with the "appearance" model of faithfulness, in conjunction with his declaration of his extreme zealotry 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 spreading¹⁵⁸ and, as Hays notes, in an effort to atone for the sin that had occurred within Israel.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁶ Josephus (*A. J.* 4.131-55) emphasizes the spread of apostasy in connection with Midianite wives and their gods (cf. Num 25:1-15) along with the fear that others would imitate the actions of Zimri, who vociferously announced his disregard for the law. Here, as in his discussion of Deut 27-28, Josephus includes a reference to Deut 13:6-11.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. *m. Sanh.* 9:6.

¹⁵⁸ 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.

¹⁵⁹ *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,¹⁶⁰ 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).¹⁶¹ In describing his trip to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus (2:1-10) and his encounter with Peter in Antioch (2:11-21),¹⁶² 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.”

¹⁶⁰ 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.

¹⁶¹ 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).

¹⁶² 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).¹⁶³ And Martyn is certainly correct to understand the repetition of “revelation” as emphasizing that Paul views his gospel as God’s activity,¹⁶⁴ especially considering that Paul immediately follows the statement with καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (“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 ἀνεθέμην 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 μή πως εἰς 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, “ἀνατίθημι,” 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 ἀναγκάζω (2:3, 14; 6:12), συνυποκρίνομαι (2:13) and, ὑπόκρισις (2:13) in order to reverse paradoxically the Maccabean situation in which Greeks were attempting to compel Jews to convert away from the distinctive customs of Judaism¹⁶⁸ 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 ὑποκριθῆναι (“to be a hypocrite” in 6:21; cf. 4 Macc 6:15, 17) by pretending to adopt Greek customs, especially since ὑποκριθῆναι (6:24) would not be a worthy example for others to follow and others “might be lead astray” (πλανηθῶσιν) because of his ὑπόκρισιν (“hypocrisy” in 6:25).

By employing ἀναγκάζω (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 ἀναγκάζω 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 ἀναγκάζω in reference to compelling Jews to sacrifice, and 1 Macc 2:15 employs the compound καταναγκάζω to refer to compelling Jews to commit apostasy. Although ἀναγκάζω 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 ἰουδαΐζειν (“to adopt Jewish customs”).¹⁶⁹ 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” (συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ), so that even Barnabas “was led astray by their hypocrisy” (συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει).¹⁷⁰ 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 ἔθνικῶς (“as a Gentile”) with living Ἰουδαϊκῶς (“as a Jew”) and then asks Peter, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν (“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 ἰουδαΐζειν, it stands to reason that Paul is speaking of adopting Jewish customs in general rather than employing ἰουδαΐζειν to refer to circumcision alone. This seems reasonable in comparison to Esth 8:17 that states: πολλοὶ τῶν ἔθνῶν περιετέμοντο καὶ ἰουδαΐζον διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων (“many of the Gentiles had themselves circumcised and were adopting Jewish customs because of fear of the Jews”). A similar combination of ἰουδαΐζειν and περιτομή is employed by Josephus (*B. J.* 2.454) when he explains that the Roman commander Melitius was allowed to live by stating: τοῦτον γὰρ ἰκετεύσαντα καὶ μέχρι περιτομῆς ἰουδαΐσειν 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.

¹⁷⁰ See BDAG, “συναπάγω 1,” 965 and “συναπάγω,” *PGL*, 1303.

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),¹⁷¹ Paul demonstrates what Gaventa terms the

¹⁷¹ See LSJ, “διαμένω,” 403, which stresses the continuing and permanent connotation of the compound verb, and BDAG, 233, which cites Gal 2:5b and translates διαμείνη πρός as “remain continually with.” However, πρός 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, πρός 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, πρός.” 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.”¹⁷² 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’ ἰδίαν* 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’ ἰδίαν*) 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’ ἰδίαν*) with *τοῖς 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 (*Ἕλληνας*), 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 2:4.¹⁷³ 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 (Ἰουδαίος, Ἰουδαϊκῶς, Ἰουδαίζειν)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 (Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ), “pursued (διώκειν) the barbarian multitudes,” “recovered the temple,” “freed” (ἐλευθερώσαι) the city, and “set up again the law that was about to be torn down” (καταλύεσθαι). 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 καταδουλώσουσιν (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 ληληθότως) the villages, summoned their countrymen, and accepted (προσλαμβανόμενοι) those who had remained in Judaism (τοὺς μεμνηκότας ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ) 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 ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν (“sneaked in to spy on our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, in order to enslave us”).¹⁷⁵ 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 ληληθότως (“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 ψευδαδέλφους as the reverse of the Torah-observant Maccabees whose intention was to free Jerusalem.¹⁷⁶

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.¹⁸⁰ 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

⁹καὶ φυλάξεσθε ποιεῖν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης ἵνα συνῆτε πάντα ὅσα ποιήσετε.

¹⁰Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐστήκατε σήμερον πάντες ἕναντι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ γερουσία ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ κριταὶ ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ γραμματοεισαγωγεῖς ὑμῶν πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραὴλ,

¹¹καὶ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς παρεμβολῆς ὑμῶν ἀπὸ ξυλοκόπου ὑμῶν καὶ ἕως ὑδροφόρου ὑμῶν,

¹²παρελθεῖν σε ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀραῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅσα κύριος ὁ θεός σου διατίθεται πρὸς σὲ σήμερον,

¹³ἵνα στήσῃ σε ἐαυτῷ εἰς λαόν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου θεός, ὃν τρόπον εἶπέν σοι, καὶ ὃν τρόπον ὥμοσεν τοῖς πατράσιν σου Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακωβ.

¹⁴καὶ οὐχ ὑμῖν μόνοις ἐγὼ διατίθεμαι τὴν διαθήκην ταύτην καὶ τὴν ἀρὰν ταύτην,

¹⁵ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ὧδε οὖσι μεθ' ἡμῶν σήμερον ἕναντι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ τοῖς μὴ οὖσιν μεθ' ἡμῶν ὧδε σήμερον.

⁹And you will continue to do all the words of this covenant in order that you may understand all the things that you do.

¹⁰You 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,

¹¹Your wives and your children and the proselyte who is in the midst of your camp from your woodcutter even to your water-drawer,

¹²You 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,

¹³In 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.

¹⁴And not with you only do I make this covenant and this curse,

¹⁵But 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:

¹⁹καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν ἀκούσῃ τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ἀρᾶς ταύτης καὶ ἐπιφημίσηται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ λέγων ὅσιά μοι γένοιτο ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἀποπλανήσει τῆς καρδίας μου πορεύσομαι ἵνα μὴ συναπολέσῃ ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς τὸν ἀναμάρτητον

²⁰οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ ὁ θεὸς εὐιλατεῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀλλ' ἢ τότε ἐκκαυθήσεται ὀργῇ κυρίου καὶ ὁ ζῆλος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ καὶ κολληθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ ἀραὶ τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης αἱ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου καὶ ἐξαλείψει κύριος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν

²¹καὶ διαστελεῖ αὐτὸν κύριος εἰς κακὰ ἐκ πάντων τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἀρᾶς τῆς διαθήκης τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου

¹⁹And 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,

²⁰God 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.

²¹And 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.¹⁸²

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.¹⁸³ Therefore, it would be logical for a Torah-observant Jewish Christian, who viewed Gentile Christians as proselytes within the Christ-believing segment of Judaism,¹⁸⁴ 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 Rengstorf (“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 (συναναμίγνυμι = “associating with” and συνεσθίω = “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* (2^d 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 her¹⁸⁵ 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 12:43-49¹⁸⁶ 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 (πάς ἀλλογενῆς οὐκ ἔδεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ - "No foreigner will eat from it"). In this context, ἀλλογενῆς means a "stranger" or "foreigner" that is not part of the community of Israel.¹⁸⁷ In v. 44, an οἰκέτης ("house servant") who had been purchased must be circumcised, but he could partake of the meal.

¹⁸⁵ Deut 29:18, which is not quoted above, specifically mentions man or woman (ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνή). Therefore, the same penalty for apostasy would apply to either a man or a woman.

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

¹⁸⁷ See LSJ, "ἀλλογενῆς," 69; and BDAG, "ἀλλογενῆς," 46. This noun is used many times in the LXX. Even though it appears that this noun refers to an Israelite in some passages, ἀλλογενῆς 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 ἀλλογενῆς 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 ἀλλογενῶν are considered to be inappropriate by Eleazar and his followers.

In v. 45, α 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:

⁴⁷ πᾶσα συναγωγή υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ποιήσει αὐτό.

⁴⁸ ἐὰν δέ τις προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ποιῆσαι τὸ πασχα κυρίῳ περιτεμεῖς αὐτοῦ πᾶν ἀρσενικόν, καὶ τότε προσελεύσεται ποιῆσαι αὐτό, καὶ ἔσται ὡσπερ καὶ ὁ αὐτόχθων τῆς γῆς· πᾶς ἀπερίτμητος οὐκ ἔδεται ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.

⁴⁹ νόμος εἷς ἔσται τῷ ἐγγχωρίῳ καὶ τῷ προσελθόντι προσηλύτῳ ἐν ὑμῖν.

⁴⁷ All the assembly of the sons of Israel will do (i.e., “celebrate”) it (i.e., “the Passover”).

⁴⁸ And 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.

⁴⁹ There will be one law for the native and for the proselyte who comes in among you.

Numbers 9:14¹⁸⁸ repeats almost the same requirement for the proselyte in relationship to eating the Passover meal and provides the same rationale for the requirement:

¹⁴ ἐὰν δὲ προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ἐν τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν, καὶ ποιήσει τὸ πασχα κυρίῳ, κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ πασχα καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνταξιν αὐτοῦ, οὕτως ποιήσει αὐτό· νόμος εἷς ἔσται ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ προσηλύτῳ καὶ τῷ αὐτόχθονι τῆς γῆς.

¹⁴ Now 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:

¹³καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐὰν καθαρὸς ᾖ καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ μακρᾷ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ ὑστερήσῃ ποιῆσαι τὸ πασχᾶ, ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἢ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς· ὅτι τὸ δῶρον κυρίῳ οὐ προσήνεγκεν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν αὐτοῦ, ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ λήμψεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος

¹³And a person whoever is ceremonially clean and is not far away on a journey and fails to observe the Passover, that individual will be ostracized¹⁸⁹ 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:

¹³πᾶς ὁ αὐτόχθων ποιήσει οὕτως τοιαῦτα προσεινέγκαι καρπώματα εἰς ὄσμην

¹⁸⁹ See BDAG, “ἐξολεθρεύω,” 315; Johannes Schneider (“ἐξολοθρεύω,” *TDNT* 5:170) notes the frequency of the verb as ἐξολεθρεύω in the LXX: “Ἐξολεθρεύω” is commonly used in the LXX in verses in which the MT has כרת. See “ἐξολεθρεύειν,” HRCs, 497-99 for a list of the occurrences of ἐξολεθρεύω in the LXX along with the various Hebrew verbs employed in the equivalent MT verses. See also BDB, “כרת,” 503-504. Elmer Smick (“כרת,” *TWOT* 1:456-57) notes the various connotations of the verb: while כרת literally means “to cut off,” 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 כרת means “exclusion from the community,” and LXX Exod 12:15 employs ἐξολεθρεύω. Acts 3:23 employs ἐξολεθρεύω 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 ἐξολεθρευθήσεται as “will be ostracized” in Num 9:13. Other LXX passages that employ ἐξολεθρεύω with the connotation of excommunication/ostracism will be discussed below.

εὐωδίας κυρίῳ¹⁹⁰

¹⁴ἂν δὲ προσήλυτος ἐν ὑμῖν προσγένηται ἐν τῇ γῆ ὑμῶν ἢ ὅς ἂν γένηται ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν ταῖς γενεαῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ποιήσει κάρπωμα ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας κυρίῳ ὄν τρόπον ποιεῖτε ὑμεῖς οὕτως ποιήσει ἡ συναγωγὴ κυρίῳ

¹⁵νόμος εἷς ἔσται ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς προσηλύτοις τοῖς προσκειμένοις ἐν ὑμῖν νόμος αἰώνιος εἰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν ὡς ὑμεῖς καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ἔσται ἔναντι κυρίου

¹⁶νόμος εἷς ἔσται καὶ δικαίωμα¹⁹¹ ἐν ἔσται ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ προσηλύτῳ τῷ προσκειμένῳ ἐν ὑμῖν

¹³Every native-born Israelite will do [behave] in this manner – to offer burnt offerings such as this for a sweet smelling offering to the Lord.

¹⁴And 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.

¹⁵There 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.

¹⁶There 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:

²⁷ἂν δὲ ψυχὴ μία ἀμάρτη ἀκουσίως, προσάξει αἶγα μίαν ἐνιαυσίαν περὶ ἀμαρτίας,

²⁸καὶ ἐξιλάσεται ὁ ἱερεὺς περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς ἀκουσιασθείσης καὶ ἀμαρτούσης ἀκουσίως ἔναντι κυρίου ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ.

²⁹τῷ ἐγχωρίῳ ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ προσηλύτῳ τῷ προσκειμένῳ ἐν αὐτοῖς, νόμος εἷς ἔσται αὐτοῖς, ὅς ἂν ποιήσῃ ἀκουσίως.

³⁰καὶ ψυχὴ, ἥτις ποιήσει ἐν χειρὶ ὑπερηφανίας ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτοχθόνων ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν

¹⁹⁰ Note that Paul uses the phrase ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ (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).

¹⁹¹ See G. Schrenk, “δικη, δίκαιος, κτλ.,” *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.

προσηλύτων, τὸν θεὸν οὗτος παροξύνει ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς,

³¹ὅτι τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου ἐφάυλισεν καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ διεσκέδασεν, ἐκτρίψει ἐκτριβήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη, ἡ ἁμαρτία αὐτῆς ἐν αὐτῇ.

²⁷And if one person should sin unintentionally, he will bring one female goat, one year old for a sin offering.

²⁸And the priest will appease for the person who sinned inadvertently and sinned unintentionally before the Lord to appease for him.

²⁹For 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.

³⁰And 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.

³¹Because 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:

²²δικαίωσις¹⁹² μία ἔσται τῷ προσηλύτῳ καὶ τῷ ἐγχωρίῳ ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.

²²There 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.¹⁹³ 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, “δικαίωσις,” 429. Although δικαίωσις 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 δικαίωσις 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.

¹⁹³ Cf. Lev 18:26-29, 20:2, 24:16.

that God defined the covenant with Abraham as “the commandment of circumcision.”¹⁹⁴ Genesis 17:10-27¹⁹⁵ 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 ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός 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 ὃς οὐ περιτμηθήσεται (“who will not be circumcised”): ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ 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 כרת/ἐξολεθρεύω 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; Ezk. 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 ἐξολεθρεύω is the most common Greek verb employed in the LXX when כרת appears in the MT,¹⁹⁷ Hasel's investigation of the meaning of כרת 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

¹⁹⁶ "כרת," *TDOT* 7:339-52, here 348 and sources cited in nn.98-103.

¹⁹⁷ Johannes Schneider ("ὄλεθρεύω, ὄλεθρος, ὄλεθρευτής, ἐξολεθρεύω," *TDNT* 5:167-71, esp. 170) notes that ἐξολεθρεύω "is used for 20 different Heb. terms, כרת 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.

¹⁹⁹ “Making and Breaking an Agreement Mediterranean Style: A New Reading of Galatians 2:1-14,” in *The Galatians Debate* (ed. Mark D. Nanos; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 261-81.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 273.

wine to be consumed met Jewish dietary requirements.²⁰¹ 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) φοβούμενος τοὺς 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.

²⁰¹ “Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11-14,” 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), 170-88.

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 ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστειλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν φοβούμενος 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:

⁹Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνοις,

¹⁰οὐ πάντως τοῖς πόρνοις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἢ τοῖς πλεονέκταις καὶ ἄρπαξιν ἢ εἰδωλολάτραις, ἐπεὶ ὠφείλετε ἄρα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελεθεῖν.

¹¹νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἢ πόρνος ἢ πλεονέκτης ἢ εἰδωλολάτρης ἢ λοιδορὸς ἢ μέθυσος ἢ ἄρπαξ, τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν.

¹²τί γάρ μοι τοὺς ἕξω κρίνειν; οὐχὶ τοὺς ἕσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε;

¹³τοὺς δὲ ἕξω ὁ θεὸς κρίνει. ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν.

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.

¹²For what have I to do with judging outsiders? Is it not the ones inside that you are to judge?

¹³Now 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.²⁰² Brian S. Rosner proposes “a link between 1 Cor 5 and Pentateuchal teaching on community exclusion.”²⁰³

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 ὄλεθρον (for destruction).²⁰⁴

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 ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (“remove the evil person from among you”) in 1 Cor 5:13 follows the LXX command ἐξαρῆς τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν 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 ἐξολεθρεύω is one of the verbs employed in the LXX when the MT employs כרת 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).

²⁰⁴ Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community* (Lund: CWP Gleerup, 1972), 143. Lampe, “Church Discipline and the Interpretation of the Epistles to the Corinthians,” in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox* (ed. W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, and R.R. Niebuhr; London: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 337-61, here 352. For other interpretations of παραδοῦναι τὸν

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.²⁰⁵ 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."²⁰⁶ 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

τοιούτου τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ 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."²⁰⁷

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 (ὑπέστειλεν) and separated (ἀφώριζεν) 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 παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον 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.

the Gentile Christians were viewed as intentional and unrepentant sinners.²⁰⁸ 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 ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν ("they desire to exclude you"). See BDAG, "ἐκκλείω," 303. Cf. Paul's use of ἐκκλείω 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” (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας) while Peter was “entrusted with the gospel for the circumcised” (τῆς περιτομῆς); and (2) most importantly, Peter had agreed in Jerusalem that ὁ ἐνεργήσας (“the one working”) through him was also ὁ ἐνεργήσας 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

²⁰⁹ Many commentators connect the phrase in 2:14 with 2:5: e.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 235; Hays, *Galatians*, 235; Dunn, *Galatians*, 127, etc.

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 ἀποστολήν 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,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," *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 (*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 (*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 (*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 (*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, ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι (“was compelled to be circumcised”). As Martyn notes, “the verb ‘to compel’ is a term of great significance in the Galatian setting.”²¹⁴ Although Paul uses ἀναγκάζω in 2:3 and in 6:12 in conjunction with περιτέμνω in order to refer explicitly to an attempt to compel Gentiles to be circumcised, the combination of ἀναγκάζεις and ἰουδαίξειν in 2:14 is usually interpreted as referring to Peter’s attempt to compel Gentiles to adopt Jewish dietary restrictions.²¹⁵ But is this limited interpretation of ἰουδαίξειν 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*, lxxiii-lxxxiii; 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.

²¹⁴ *Galatians*, 235.

²¹⁵ 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 ἰουδαΐζειν to relate *merely* to food laws because they place more emphasis on Paul's use of συνεσθίω (2:12) than on his reference to φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς (“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 ἰουδαΐζειν, 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.²¹⁶ 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 ἔθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν;

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.²¹⁷

Regardless of whether one attributes the problem at Antioch to food laws or to the issue of circumcision, the meaning of ἰουδαΐζειν 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 (*B. J.* 2.454, 463) to describe Gentiles who converted to Judaism out of mortal fear.²¹⁸ While Martyn's point fits the situations described in Esth 8:17 and *B.J.* 2.454, any hint of insincerity is precluded in *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 ἰουδαΐζοντας) were also considered suspect by the Syrians. Therefore, in *B. J.* 2.463 it is unlikely that Gentiles would have continued to

²¹⁷ This interpretation is equivalent to Longenecker's (*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.

²¹⁸ *Galatians*, 236. Cf. Betz, *Galatians*, 112. For a discussion of Esth 8:17 and *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 ἰουδαΐζειν “could embrace a range of degrees of assimilation to Jewish life-style, with circumcision as the climax, but without necessarily including circumcision.”²¹⁹ 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.²²⁰ 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, ἰουδαΐζον in Esth 8:17 should be understood as synonymous with “living as a Jew.”

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

In Paul’s view, ἰουδαΐζειν 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 ἰουδαΐζειν to mean forcing Gentile converts to keep the whole Torah is valid.

²²⁰ Περιετέμοντο is an Aorist Indicative, but ἰουδαΐζον is an Imperfect Indicative. Therefore, in Esth 8:17 περιετέμοντο describes the entrance into a state of being (Smyth, §1924) while ἰουδαΐζον 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.²²¹

Therefore, Betz's understanding of Gal 2:14 not only explains Paul's repetition of ἀναγκάζω and τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 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 ἰουδαῖζειν by Ignatius (*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 ἰουδαῖζειν in Gal 2:14 refers to adopting Jewish practices, specifically dietary restrictions.²²² Even though Ignatius is certainly contrasting “living according to Judaism” and “grace” (8.1) in his juxtaposition of practicing Judaism and Christianity (*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 εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι (“For if we live until now according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace” in 8.1) and ἄτοπὸν ἐστίν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ ἰουδαῖζειν (“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

²²¹ *Galatians*, 112.

²²² E.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 236 n.99; and Hays, *Galatians*, 235.

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 ἰουδαῖζειν 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 συναναμίγυσθαι) 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 ἰουδαῖζειν 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 ἰουδαῖζειν 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 συνήσθιεν 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 συνήσθιεν in 2:12, that Paul is employing ἰουδαΐζειν to refer to Jewish dietary requirements alone.

3.1.3.1 A proposed explanation for a Pauline neologism

If we understand Paul’s ἰουδαΐζειν to connote living in accordance with the Mosaic law as a whole, it is possible that Paul coined the verb ὀρθοποδέω²²³ 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”).²²⁴ 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,”²²⁵ 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 “ὀρθοποδέω,” *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.²²⁶ We have argued above that the Missionaries were portraying Paul as a *false prophet* similar to the false prophet described in Deut 13.²²⁷ 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 Galatians²²⁸ warrant further investigation into the possibility that Paul may have coined

²²⁶ Mic 3:11 depicts the leaders of the people, the priests, and the prophets as saying: οὐχὶ κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστίν; οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ 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.

²²⁷ See 3.1.2 above.

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 οἴκου Ἰακωβ (“the authorities of the house of Jacob”) as οἱ μισοῦντες τὰ καλὰ καὶ ζητοῦντες τὰ πονηρὰ (“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 ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς (“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 κατέφαγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου (“devour the flesh of my people”), and Mic 3:5 describes the false prophets who deceive (πλαυῖω) the people as τοὺς δάκνουσας ἐν τοῖς ὁδοῦσιν αὐτῶν (“those who bite with their teeth”). Paul warns the Galatians in 5:15: εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων 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

ὀρθοποδέω from Micah’s prophecy.

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 ἔθνη πολλά (“many nations/Gentiles”) will go so that the covenant people can show them “the way” ὅτι ἐκ Σιων ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλημ (“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 ὠδίνω μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῆ Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν (“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 οὐκ ὠδίνουσα (“she who does not suffer labor pains”) has many children, and Isa 54:3 promises τὸ σπέρμα σου ἔθνη κληρονομήσει (“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 οἱ ἡγούμενοι 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 2:6-11.²³¹ 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.²³² 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

ἀσεβῆς. Preisker cites Mic 3:9 as an example of this meaning. Additionally, Mic 7:2, in a lament over the ungodly condition of the covenant people, employs the compound verb κατορθόω: ἀπόλωλεν ἐύλαβῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ κατορθῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις οὐχ ὑπάρχει (“the godly have perished from the earth and among humans there is no one who proceeds correctly”). Although Preisker does not include ὀρθόω or its compounds in his entry for ὀρθός, see LSJ, “κατορθόω,” 929-30, esp. II in which κατορθόω is considered the opposite of ἀμαρτάνω. Cf. Ps 118:9, 128; Prov 2:7, 9; 14:11; Ezek 18:29. It is also possible that Mic 2:3 employs ὀρθός with the connotation of “correctly” in the phrase οὐ μὴ πορευθῆτε ὀρθοί (“you will never walk correctly”); however, in the context of the verse ὀρθός most likely means “upright” since the people are also told “you will not be able to raise your necks.”

²³¹ Although MT Mic 2:6-11 has numerous textual problems, which has resulted in numerous emendations, the LXX text is more certain. For discussions of the text-critical issues in the MT, see, e.g., Francis I. Andersen and Noel David Freedman, *Micah* (AB 24E; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 294-313; Ehud ben Zvi, *Micah* (FOTL 21B; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 56-65; and James Luther Mays, *Micah: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 60-85.

²³² Andersen and Freedman, *Micah*, 308.

preachers.”²³³

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 ἔμπροσθεν πάντων (“in front of all”).²³⁴ 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:

ὁ λέγων οἶκος Ιακωβ παρώργισεν πνεῦμα κυρίου· εἰ ταῦτα τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ ἔστιν; οὐχ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ εἰσιν 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?²³⁵

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 theologically 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”²³⁶ 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,²³⁷ 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,²³⁸ 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).²³⁹ 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 ἔστησεν ψεῦδος ("a spirit has established a lie").²⁴⁰ 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.

²³⁸ See Friedrich Baumgärtel, "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός, IV.B.c.(b)" *TDNT* 6:363. Cf. Neh 9:30; Isa 48:16; Zech 1:6, 7:12; Ezek 11:5.

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 כעב in the Hiphil ("provoke to anger"). However, MT Mic 2:7 has קצר ("shorten") rather than כעב. 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,²⁴¹ 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.²⁴² Although Stoic thought identifies *pneuma* with God,²⁴³ Wis 1, in an effort to maintain the Jewish understanding

²⁴¹ See, e.g., in addition to Prov 8, Prov 9:10, Sir 1:1-10, 16-20, 26-27; 6:32-37; 15:1-20; 24:1-34 (esp. vv.22-23, 25); Bar 3:9-4:4.

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,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).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"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 (διορθόω) 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.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 ορθόω to express the Holy Spirit's direction in a righteous person's life, but also contends that the Holy Spirit

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.

²⁴⁵ Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 205. Cf. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 196-99.

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).

²⁴⁷ For a study of the distinct similarities between Wis and the NT, see C. Larcher, *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, *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 (ἀποικίζω) 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 πολιτεία ("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

²⁴⁸ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 198-99. For an overview of Philo's understanding of Wisdom/Spirit, see James A. Davis, *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1:18-3:20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1984), 49-81.

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.²⁴⁹ As *m. Abot* 3:2 states, “[when] two sit together and do exchange words of Torah, then the שְׂכִינָה (“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.”²⁵⁰ Therefore, while the covenant community obeyed Torah as the proper response to God’s grace in electing Israel and giving the law,²⁵¹ 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.’”²⁵²

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.²⁵³ 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 rectification²⁵⁴ in Christ apart from the law (3:1-5).²⁵⁵ 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 δικαιώω 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.²⁵⁶ 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.²⁵⁷

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,²⁵⁸ 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 (*subiungō*) 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).²⁵⁹ 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.²⁶⁰ 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 ἂν

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 ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν 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 Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ,” 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 ἐπανορθόω with οἰκοδομέω in order to describe the action that he refuses to do as “building up.” However, on closer inspection, Paul’s οἰκοδομέω may be part of a stronger parodic reversal of the Maccabean verse than it first appears.

The verb ἐπανορθόω 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 πατριὸν 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” (καταλύσει). See also n.157 above.

²⁶³ LSJ, “ἐπανορθόω,” 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 ἐπανορθόω when ἐπανορθόω means “restore.” This seems especially likely not only since οἰκοδομέω can mean “restore”²⁶⁴ as well as “build/build up,” but also because οἰκοδομέω, in contrast to ἐπανορθόω, 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.²⁶⁵

The above interpretation of 2:18 is quite different from the consensus²⁶⁶ that Paul is referring to Torah as a wall of separation between Israel and the Gentiles as it is described in *Let. Aris.* 139;²⁶⁷ 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 ἐπανορθόω 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 “ἐπανορθόω,” *PGL*, 509.

²⁶⁶ Cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 256; Dunn, *Galatians*, 142; Hays, *Galatians*, 242.

²⁶⁷ The relevant phrase in *Let. Aris.* 139 is: περιέφραξεν ἡμᾶς ἀδιακόποις χάραξι καὶ σιδηροῖς τείχεσιν (“he fenced us all around with unbreakable palisades and iron walls”). Dunn (*Galatians*, 142) also suggests Isa 5:5; however ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ καθελῶ 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 καθελῶ is the future active indicative of καθαιρέω, not καταλύω. See LSJ, “καθαίρω,” 849. Additionally, Martyn (*Galatians*, 256) compares Gal 2:18 to Eph 2:14, which states: Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήμη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ 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 ἑμαυτὸν 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!”²⁶⁸ However, as Hays notes,²⁶⁹ 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.²⁷⁰

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).²⁷¹

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).²⁷² When Paul, in 2:19a-b, states ἐγὼ 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: ἕτοιμοι γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν ἔσμεν ἢ παραβαίνειν τοὺς 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 ζῆν ἀπολύεις ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἀποθανόντας ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ νόμων εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν

ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῶ ζήσω (“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 ζωὴ 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: τοιγαροῦν ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης ὁ πλάσας ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν καὶ πάντων ἐξευρών γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν πάλιν ἀποδίδωσιν μετ’ ἐλέους ὡς νῦν ὑπερορᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς 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 κομίσωμαί σε (“Welcome death in order that in mercy I may receive you back with your brothers”) And 7:37 states: ἐγὼ δὲ 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: ἀποθνήσκω διὰ τὸν νόμον (“I die for the sake of the law”).

(πνεῦμα) and life (ζωή).²⁷³ Paul, on the other hand, announces: ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῶ ζήσω 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: ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῆ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. Οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν 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: τῆ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. 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 ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ 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 Deuteronomic 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).²⁷⁸ 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.”²⁷⁹ 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.²⁸⁰ 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.²⁸¹ 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 ἀπέθηναι 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: διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν Τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον δέδωκα πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν· καὶ ἔκλεξαι τὴν ζωὴν, ἵνα ζῆς σὺ 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: Ἴδου δέδωκα πρὸ προσώπου σου σήμερον τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον, τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ κακόν ("Behold I place before you today life and death, good and evil").

with Paul's previous statements regarding apostasy²⁸² 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 ἐγὼ in 2:19a.²⁸³ 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,"²⁸⁴ such an interpretation not only ignores the emphatic ἐγὼ, 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.²⁸⁵ In 2:19, Paul *first*

²⁸² See 3.1.1 above for a discussion of the connotations that μεταίθημι in the middle voice conveyed in ancient texts.

²⁸³ Smyth, §1190; BDF, §472. The addition and emphatic placement of ἐγὼ in 2:19 stands in stark contrast to the lack of the personal pronoun in 2:18 and the emphatic position of ζῶ, rather than ἐγὼ, in 2:20. This is so regardless of whether one views ἐγὼ 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 ἐγὼ 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 ἐγὼ 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 γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ 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 συνεσταύρωμαι. 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.²⁸⁶ 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.

²⁸⁶ 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 συνεσταύρωμαι 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.20,²⁸⁷ 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 Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι is part of v.20, and the NRSV, which translates the phrase with v.19.

back from lawlessness,²⁸⁸ 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.²⁸⁹ 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 ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (“*in faithfulness*²⁹⁰ 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.²⁹¹ 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 (πίστις) to God and the decisive manifestation of God’s faithfulness to his covenant promise to Abraham.” Although the literature on the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate is too immense to include an exhaustive bibliography here, any list of works that support the subjective genitive interpretation of Paul’s πίστις 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 PISTEŌS: A Key to the Meaning of PISTIS CHRISTOU," 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, "Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective," *NovT* 42 (2000) : 1-23; idem, "Πίστις 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 martyrological 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-xxx) 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.²⁹² 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.²⁹³ 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* (ἐξαγοράζω) 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, “ἐξαγοράζω,” 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 εὐρεθῶ 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 (“ἐπί 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 ἐπί 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,²⁹⁴ 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?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,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 ἀπέθανον to the perfect συνεσταύρωμαι. 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

²⁹⁵ “EK PISTEŌS,” 360.

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.”

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.²⁹⁷ Therefore, in describing the new creation (6:15) produced by this apocalyptic invasion, Paul employs the perfect of σταυρώω in 6:14:

Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καὶ γὰρ 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 συσταυρώω (2:19) and σταυρώω (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.²⁹⁸

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 παθήμασιν 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 σταυρώω, 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 of²⁹⁹ works of the law, except³⁰⁰ through the

Paul's ἐσταύρωσαν 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 ἐσταύρωσαν 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 ἐσταύρωσαν 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 (*Obedying*, 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 ἀπέθανον in 2:19a to indicate his spiritual death, as a completed action, to the law through the curse of the law.

²⁹⁹ BDAG, "ἐκ 3.i," 297.

³⁰⁰ See BDAG, "ἐάν 1.c.b," 267-68; Thayer, "ἐάν 1.3.c," 162; and BDF, §376. We do not agree with translating ἐάν μή as the simple adversative "but," which is employed by the RSV, NRSV, NASV, and NIV. Nor do we agree with Martyn (*Galatians*, 251) that ἐάν μή "in the present context signifies absolute opposition to that which precedes," thus resulting in the translation "but rather." As Andrew Das ("Another Look at ἐάν μή in Galatians 2:16," *JBL* 119 [2000]: 529-39, here 530) demonstrates: "Paul always uses ἐάν μή 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 *propositio*. (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 ἐάν μή in Galatians 2:16," *JBL* 116 [1997]: 515-20) in which the exception applies to οὐ δικαιούται ἄνθρωπος alone, rather than to the entire phrase οὐ δικαιούται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου; 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 ἐάν μή 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 ἐάν μή 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: Paul is qualifying his statement that no person is rectified on the basis of works 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 [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται 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).³⁰¹ 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 ἀποθνήσκουσιν ὥσπερ οὐδὲ οἱ πατριάρχαι ἡμῶν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ 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 ἡ ἑπταμήτωρ ἕνα ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν παρακαλοῦσα ἀποθανεῖν ἔπεισεν μᾶλλον ἢ παραβῆναι τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔτι δὲ καὶ ταῦτα εἰδότες ὅτι οἱ διὰ τὸν θεὸν ἀποθνήσκοντες ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ ὥσπερ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ 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,³⁰⁵ in 4 Macc 5:29 Eleazar declares that he will not neglect the “sacred oaths of the forefathers concerning the keeping of the law.”³⁰⁶ 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.³⁰⁷

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 18:3,³⁰⁸ the martyrs are praised for being “counted worthy of a divine portion” (θείας μερίδος κατηξιώθησαν), 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 σχοίνισμα 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: ὦ τῶν Αβραμιαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῖται 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 ἀποκτενῶ 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 ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω from Deut 32:39 with αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν from Deut 32:47 along with καὶ ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν from Deut 30:20.³⁰⁹ When we note that Deut 30:19 states τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον δέδωκα πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν ἕκλεξαι τὴν ζωὴν ἵνα ζῆς σὺ 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 ἧς ὤμοσεν κύριος τοῖς πατράσιν σου Ἀβρααμ καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰακωβ 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

³⁰⁹ Deut 32:47 states: ὅτι οὐχὶ λόγος κενὸς οὗτος ὑμῖν ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ λόγου τούτου μακροημερεύσετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς διαβαίνετε τὸν Ἰορδάνην ἐκεῖ κληρονομήσαι αὐτήν (“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 ζωὴ 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.³¹⁰ 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.³¹¹ 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/blessing³¹² 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 Abraham³¹³ 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 αὐτοῦ ὅσας ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον ἵνα ζῆτε (“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,³¹⁴ 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;”³¹⁵ 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,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.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 *probatio*.³¹⁸ However, several commentators translate καθώς as “just as” or “things were the same with,”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. Williams³²⁰ and Witherington,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 ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας· τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ δι’ ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεός (“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”).

³¹⁶ Since 3:6-14 offers direct support for our interpretation of 2:15-21, we are discussing it prior to 3:1-5.

³¹⁷ NA²⁷ presents Gal 3:6-7 as: Καθώς Ἀβραάμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην· γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ. 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.

³¹⁸ *Galatians*, 137-40. Although Dunn (*Galatians*, 160) translates καθώς as “just as,” he considers the conjunction “more or less an abbreviation for the fuller formula, ‘as it is written.’”

³¹⁹ Cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 296; Hays, *Galatians*, 255; Witherington, *Grace*, 217-18; and Sam K. Williams, “Justification of the Spirit in Galatians,” *JSNT* 29 (1987): 91-100, esp. 92-94. Longenecker (*Galatians*, 112), however, opts for “the absolute use” of καθώς, which in his opinion renders καθώς Ἀβραάμ as “take Abraham as the example.”

³²⁰ “Justification,” 93.

³²¹ *Grace*, 217-18.

separate sentences in agreement with the RSV. In their very similar arguments, Williams and Witherington note that Paul does not employ καθώς as an abbreviation for καθώς γέγραπται elsewhere in his letters; therefore, they rightly reject Betz's³²² 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 ἄρα 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.³²³

However, most discussions of the proper translation of καθώς, 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 καθώς frequently connotes comparison and is translated as "just as" or "according as,"³²⁴ 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 δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομήν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; ἄρα 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, ἄρα 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 ἔτι 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, "καθώς 1," 493. LSJ (857) notes that καθώς 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.”³²⁵ Therefore, if καθώς is viewed as causal, 3:6 should be understood as the protasis with the ἄρα clause in 3:7 as the apodosis. And if καθώς 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.³²⁶ 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.³²⁷

Second, although Williams makes much of the fact that ἄρα “is the *second* word

³²⁵ See BDAG, “καθώς 3,” 494; Thayer (“καθώς 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 ἄρα phrase should not be considered the apodosis of v. 6,³²⁸ the second placement of ἄρα is not unusual at all since ἄρα 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 ἄρα can also be used as the equivalent of ὥστε in conjunction with a finite verb.³³⁰ Therefore, since ἄρα can connote result in the same manner as ὥστε, 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 τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν,
⁷ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι ἀπεκδεχομένους τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·

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 ἄρα 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 ἄρα in the first position of the apodosis when the protasis begins with εἰ, 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 ἄρα in the classical, postpositive position at times (cf. εὐρίσκω ἄρα in Rom 7:21); however, at other times and in conjunction with οὖν, he places ἄρα in the first position. Cf. Smyth, §2800.

³³⁰ Thayer, “ἄρα 2,” 71; and BDAG, “ἄρα 2,” 127.

³³¹ For the causal interpretation of καθώς in 1 Cor 1:6, see Christophe Senft, *La Première Épître 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 Thiselton (*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, ὥστε clearly denotes a result that follows from the fact that “the witness of Christ was confirmed” in the Corinthians. Since ὥστε means “so that” when it is followed by the accusative and an infinitive in a dependent clause,³³² 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.³³³ However, since ἄρα can be the equivalent of ὥστε and ἄρα is employed in the apodosis, which, of course, is the independent clause in Gal 3:6-7, ἄρα should be translated as “therefore.”³³⁴ A paraphrase of Gal 3:6-7 would then read: “Since Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as rectification; *recognize*,³³⁵ *therefore*, that the ones [living their lives] on the basis of

³³² BDAG, “ὥστε 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, “ὥστε 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 ὥστε in an independent clause that follows the causal fact. 1 Thess 4:18 states: “Ὡστε παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις (“Therefore, comfort one another with these words”).

³³⁴ Given that ἄρα can be the equivalent of ὥστε, the importance of 1 Cor 1:6-7 for our argument is not Paul’s syntax following ὥστε, but his causal employment of καθώς followed by a result clause containing ὥστε.

³³⁵ Martyn (*Galatians*, 299), Longenecker (*Galatians*, 114), and Witherington (*Grace*, 226) claim that γινώσκετε is an indicative based on their understanding that γινώσκετε ἄρα 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 ὥστε following a causal statement. In Gal 3:7, however, the imperative γινώσκετε precedes the postpositive ἄρα.

faithfulness *these*³³⁶ are the *sons*³³⁷ 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.”³³⁸ However, since we understand γινώσκετε 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.”³³⁹ 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 descendants would be numerous, and Gen 15:18, which included the covenant to inherit the land, in light of Gen 17,³⁴⁰ 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

³³⁶ Hays (*Galatians*, 255) correctly notes that Paul emphasizes οἱτοί (“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.

³³⁷ Note also the emphatic placement of υἱοί in οἱτοί υἱοί εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ, which is the preferred reading based on, among others, P⁴⁶, **N**, and B over the textual variant οἱτοί εἰσιν υἱοί Ἀβραάμ. Paul repeats the emphatic placement of υἱοί in ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οἱτοί υἱοί θεοῦ εἰσιν (“For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God”) in Rom 8:14.

³³⁸ *Galatians*, 298-99.

³³⁹ *Contra* Witherington, *Grace*, 226-27.

³⁴⁰ See, e.g., Hays, *Galatians*, 255; Dunn, *Galatians*, 16; de Boer, *Galatians*, 187.

since Abraham was faithful when the Lord tested him.³⁴¹ 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 οἱ ἐκ πίστεως.

Although Martyn³⁴² 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).³⁴³ 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:

⁴καὶ εὐθὺς φωνὴ θεοῦ ἐγένετο πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγων Οὐ κληρονομήσει σε οὗτος, ἀλλ' ὃς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ, οὗτος κληρονομήσει σε.

⁵ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔξω καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀνάβλεψον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀρίθμησον τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνήσῃ ἔξαριθμῆσαι αὐτούς. καὶ εἶπεν Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου.

⁴And 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.

⁵And he led him outside and said to him: "Indeed, look up into heaven and count

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 οὔτοι, 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 3:8³⁴⁵ 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 ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός σου (“who is not of your seed”) as part of the covenant that must be kept faithfully (17:12).³⁴⁶ In quoting Gen 12:3, Paul substitutes πάντα τὰ ἔθνη for πᾶσαι αἰ

³⁴⁴ In Gal 3:16, Paul will return to the subject of the single heir, expressed in Gen 15:4 by ὃς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ οὗτος κληρονομήσει 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: προϊδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός, προεηγγελίαστο τῷ Ἀβραάμ ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται 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.”

φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.³⁴⁷ 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.”³⁴⁸ 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)”³⁴⁹ does not adequately explain the relationship between 3:9³⁵⁰ 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 καταράσομαι· καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι 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 υἱοὶ of Abraham in Gal 3:7, but Gen 18:18 additionally promises that Abraham will become a ἔθνος 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 theologically, 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: ὥστε 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."³⁵¹

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.³⁵²

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, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta 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 'Καίγε 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 Καίγε 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 עֲשֵׂי by either forms of σῶζω 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 σῶζω for עֲשֵׂי 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,³⁵³ 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 Deuteronomic 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

³⁵³ See e.g., Rolf Rendtorff, "Nehemiah 9: An Important Witness of Theological Reflection," in *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (ed., Mordechai Cogan et al; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 111-17. Also, Mark J. Boda (*Praying the Tradition: The Origin and Use of Tradition in Nehemiah 9* [BZAW 277; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999], 101-14), after studying the Abraham tradition in Neh 9, concludes (here, 114): "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." Similarly, Michael W. Duggan (*The Covenant Renewal in Ezra-Nehemiah: Neh 7:72-10:40* [SBLDS 164; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001], 202) states: "The account of the covenant with Abraham (9:7-8) takes the form of a meditation on Gen 15:6-21 (and 17:5), which is supplemented primarily by Deuteronomistic elements." Judith H. Newman (*Praying By the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* [SBLEJL 14; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999], 55-116 and "Nehemiah 9 and the Scripturalization of Prayer in the Second Temple Period," in *The Function of Scripture in the Early Jewish and Christian Tradition* [ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 154; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998], 112-23) and Maurice Gilbert ("La place de la Loi dans la prière de Néhémie 9," in *De la Tôrah au Messie* [ed. Maurice Carrez, Joseph Doré, and Pierre Grelot; Paris: Desclée, 1981], 307-16) understand Neh 9 as a reinterpretation of not only the Pentateuch, but also prophetic literature. For an investigation of Neh 10 as an exegetical reinterpretation of pentateuchal laws, see David J.A. Clines, "Nehemiah 10 As an Example of Early Jewish Biblical Exegesis," *JSOT* (1981): 111-17.

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.³⁵⁴ 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.³⁵⁵

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 οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ (“the sons of Israel”),³⁵⁶ 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 בחר ‘to elect’ is used in reference to Abraham.” Rendtorff’s observation regarding בחר is also true for ἐκλέγω in the LXX. 2 Esd 19:7, which states that God chose (ἐξελέξω) Abraham, is the only time in the LXX that ἐκλέγω is used in reference to Abraham. In MT Deut, בחר 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, ἐκλέγω appears in place of בחר.

³⁵⁵ Frederick C. Holmgren, *Israel Alive Again: A Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (ITC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 136-38; *ibid.*, “Faithful Abraham and the ’āmānā Covenant Nehemiah 9,6-10,1,” *ZAW* 104 (1992): 249-254; Mark A. Throntveit, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (IBC; Louisville: John Knox, 1992), 108; and Richard J. Bautch, “An Appraisal of Abraham’s Role in Postexilic Covenants,” *CBQ* 71 (2009): 42-63.

³⁵⁶ Although 2 Esd 19:1 employs οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ 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 בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל (“sons of Israel”) while 9:2 has זֶרַע 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 ἐξελέξω (“you elected”) Abraham, which is followed in 19:8 by εὗρες τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ πιστὴν ἐνώπιόν σου (“you found his heart faithful before you”) and διέθου 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”). 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 ὀπίσω 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

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,”³⁵⁸ 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: ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ (“Therefore the ones [conducting their lives] on the basis of faithfulness are blessed with the faithful Abraham”). Gal 3: 10 states: “Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. (“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 19:7-8.³⁵⁹ As Rendtorff observes, the covenant renewal ceremony is unique in that Moses “is not given as much prominence as Abraham.”³⁶⁰ 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?”³⁶¹

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” (זרע אברהם, 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:

²⁸καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι τοῦ λαοῦ,³⁶³ οἱ ἱερεῖς, οἱ Λευῖται, οἱ πυλωροί, οἱ ἄδοντες, οἱ ναθινίμ καὶ πᾶς ὁ προσπορευόμενος ἀπὸ λαῶν τῆς γῆς πρὸς νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, γυναῖκες αὐτῶν, υἱοὶ αὐτῶν, θυγατέρες αὐτῶν, πᾶς ὁ εἰδὼς καὶ συνίων,
²⁹ἐνίσχυον ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν κατηράσαντο αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰσήλθοσαν ἐν ἄρᾳ καὶ ἐν ὄρκῳ τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ἐν νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὃς ἐδόθη ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ, φυλάσσεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου καὶ κρίματα αὐτοῦ

²⁸And 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,

²⁹they were prevailing³⁶⁴ 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.

³⁶³Numerous 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.

³⁶⁴LSJ, "ἐνίσχύω," 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 10:29³⁶⁵ to refer to Israelites who *separated themselves from non-Israelites* as part of the covenant renewal process,³⁶⁶ others interpret the Hebrew phrase as describing *the assimilation of Gentiles who were willing to adopt Torah into the covenant people of God.*³⁶⁷ 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 בָּדַל,³⁶⁸ 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

³⁶⁵The relevant phrase in the MT is: וְכָל-הַנִּבְדָּל מֵעַמֵּי הָאֲרָצוֹת אֶל-חֹרֶת (“And all who separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to Torah”).

³⁶⁶E.g., H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco: Word, 1985), 322; F. Charles Fensham, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1982), 238; Holmgren, *Israel Alive*, 138; and Matthew Thiessen, “The Function of a Conjunction: Inclusivist or Exclusivist Strategies in Ezra 6.19-21 and Nehemiah 10:29-30,” *JSOT* 34 (2009): 63-79, esp. 78-79

³⁶⁷E.g., Duggan, *Covenant Renewal*, 246; Sara Japhet, “People and Land in the Restoration Period,” in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Essays on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 96-116, esp. 115; and P.H.W. Lau, “Gentile Incorporation into Israel in Ezra-Nehemiah,” *Bib* 90 (2009): 356-73, esp. 370-72.

³⁶⁸See BDAG, “προσπορεύομαι,” 884; LSJ, “προσπορεύομαι,” 1524; and BDB, “בָּדַל,” 95.

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 בָּדַל. Therefore, the presence of προσπορεύομαι, 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 μεθαρμόσασθαι³⁷⁰ (“those that thought [it] worthy to adopt piety”). And most importantly, Philo not only specifically states that the second category consisted of προσήλυτους (“proselytes”), but also he leaves no doubt regarding his understanding of the etymology of the word προσήλυτος 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 μεθορμίσασθαι. He states (here 126 n.2): “MSS. μεθαρμόσασθαι, a word less suitable here and often confused in MSS. with μεθορμίσασθαι.” However, we quote the passage in agreement with MSS. since LSJ (“μεθαρμόζω,” 1089) defines μεθαρμόζω in the middle voice as “to adopt” and presents examples in which μεθαρμόζω is employed in the middle voice to describe adopting new customs and/or lifestyles. In our view, μεθαρμόζω fits the context of Philo’s discussion as well as or better than μεθορμίζω, which LSJ (“μεθορμίζω,” 1091) defines in the middle voice as: “seek refuge from” or “sail from one place to another.”

τούτους δὲ καλεῖ προσηλύτους ἀπὸ τοῦ προσεληλυθέναι καινῇ καὶ φιλοθέῳ πολιτείᾳ (“these he [i.e. Moses] calls proselytes because³⁷¹ they have come to the new and pious commonwealth [i.e. the covenant community]”). 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,³⁷² *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 ἀπό, 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” (ζηλωταὶ 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, ὅσοι in Gal 3:10³⁷³ 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.³⁷⁴ 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,”³⁷⁵ his interpretation that ὅσοι . . . ἐξ ἔργων νόμου can be understood to include Jews “only if the reader supplies such a reference in the ambiguous expression”³⁷⁶ 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 Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν

³⁷³ See n.358 above for the text of Gal 3:10.

³⁷⁴ For recent interpretations of 3:10 based on the understanding that human beings cannot satisfactorily keep the law, see, e.g., Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: the “Lutheran” Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 374-8, esp. 375 n.66; A. Andrew Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001), 145-69; and Bruce W. Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham’s God: The Transformation of Christian Identity in Galatians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998) 134-42. In addition, Barry Matlock (“Helping Paul’s Argument Work,” 154-79) argues for an ‘unfulfillability’ [Matlock’s term] reading of Gal 3:10-14 by enumerating what he considers to be weaknesses in other positions and, most unconvincingly, arguing that Phil 3:6 should not be employed against an ‘unfulfillability’ reading of Gal 3:10-14 since Phil 3:6 is how Paul thought in “the *past*, not telling us straightforwardly how he now thinks” (ibid., 155-56, italics original). For slightly older interpretations that stress the human inability to keep *all* the law, see, e.g., Hans Hübner, *Law in Paul’s Thought* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1984), 18-19 and Thomas R. Schreiner, “Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible: A Re-Examination of Galatians 3:10,” *JETS* 27 (1984): 151-60. For a rejoinder to Hübner’s position (as expressed in “Gal 3,10 und die Herkunft des Paulus,” *KD* 19 [1973]: 215-31), see Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 137-38, esp. n.61.

³⁷⁵ “‘Under A Curse’: A Fresh Reading of Galatians 3.10-14,” *NTS* 36 (1990): 481-511, here 500.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 498.

εἰσὶν describes anyone who desires to live under the conditional threat of the curse of the law.³⁷⁷ 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,”³⁷⁸ 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.

³⁷⁷ Cf. Gal 4:21, which states: Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; (“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.

³⁷⁸ *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 αὐτούς is drawn from the quotation of Lev 18:5³⁸⁰ 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: Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, ὅστις οὐκ ἔμμενεί ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτούς· καὶ ἑροῦσιν πᾶς ὁ λαός Γένειτο (“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 γεγραμμένοις 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 ὅστις 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 Deuteronomic quotations in Gal 3:10 to fit his argument in the letter, his retention of the Deuteronomic ἔμμενεί, 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 ἐπιμένω with its use in the context of remaining faithful to oaths. See LSJ, “ἐπιμένω 2,” 542 and sources cited there. BDAG (“ἐπιμένω 2,” 322) notes the presence of ἐπιμένω in legal formulae employing the dative of a participle in order to explain Paul's substitution of γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ for λόγοις. But, in citing Josephus (*A. J.* 19.247) as employing ἔμμενείν 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, ἔμμενεί 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 ἐπιμένω, 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 ἐπιμένω 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 αὐτούς 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 18:5,³⁸¹ 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 ἐπεμαρτύρω αὐτοῖς ἐπιστρέψαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν νόμον σου, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν, ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς σου καὶ ἐν τοῖς κρίμασί σου ἡμάρτοσαν, ἃ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔδωκαν νῶτον ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ τράχηλον αὐτῶν ἐσκήρυναν 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 προστάγματα μου καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματά μου καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά ἃ 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 αὐτὰ 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 doing³⁸² a person will live in them I am the Lord your God.

Gal 3:12: ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' 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 ὁ for ἄ and the omission of ἄνθρωπος 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.”³⁸³ When discussing the inclusion of αὐτὰ 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 10:5.³⁸⁴ However, while the position of αὐτὰ 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 ἄνθρωπος 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 ἄνθρωπος 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 ἄνθρωπος 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 ἄνθρωπος as quoted by Paul in Rom 10:5), as Sprinkle claims at one point in his argument, why would Philo omit ἄνθρωπος? 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 αὐτὰ was ‘corrected’ at some point toward the Hebrew by the addition of an equivalent for the Hebrew עָשָׂה, and that Paul then drew his citation from a manuscript that reflected this later tradition.”

position of αὐτά, in the witnesses for Lev 18:5 that do include it,³⁸⁵ the placement of αὐτά 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 αὐτά in Gal 3:12,³⁸⁶ he does not comment on the difference in the placement of αὐτά 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 καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά. Importantly, the neuter αὐτά 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 αὐτά 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.³⁸⁷ 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 αὐτά in Lev 18:5 that Stanley discusses all deal with the phrase καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά that immediately follows καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματά μου. According to Wevers (*Leviticus*, 203) only one manuscript, 767, employs αὐτά 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 ἃ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς 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, 1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906). Sprinkle (*Law and Life*, 135) misplaces αὐτά in Lev 18:5 in his comparison of Lev, Gal, and Philo. Lev 18:5 is thus incorrectly quoted as ἃ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος, ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. Therefore, Sprinkle does not actually address the agreement in the placement of αὐτά 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 οἱ ἐκ πίστεως in connection with “the faithful Abraham” (3:6, 9) and his contrast of οἱ ἐκ πίστεως over against those who are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου 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:

³⁶ἰδοὺ ἐσμεν σήμερον δοῦλοι, καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἣν ἔδωκας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν φαγεῖν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς,

³⁷τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν, οἷς ἔδωκας ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ἐξουσιάζουσιν καὶ ἐν κτήρεσιν ἡμῶν ὡς ἀρεστὸν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐν θλίψει μεγάλη ἐσμέν.

³⁸καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις ἡμεῖς διατιθέμεθα πίστιν καὶ γράφομεν, καὶ ἐπισφραγίζουσιν πάντες ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν, Λευῖται ἡμῶν ἱερεῖς ἡμῶν.

³⁶See 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.

³⁸And because of all these things we decree³⁸⁹ *faithfulness* and we record a written document³⁹⁰ 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 אֱמֻנָה within the phrase אֲנַחְנוּ בְרִיתִים אֱמֻנָה (MT Neh 10:1), which corresponds to ἡμεῖς διατιθέμεθα πίστιν (2 Esd 19:38).³⁹¹ Considering that אֱמֻנָה is used in conjunction with בְּרִית, the noun can be viewed as synonymous with בְּרִית (“covenant”). In this case, the phrase would mean, “we are making an agreement/covenant.”³⁹² However, Duggan and Holmgren interpret אֱמֻנָה more in the sense of an adjective and, drawing the connotation of covenant from בְּרִית, render the phrase as: “We are making a firm agreement/covenant.”³⁹³ BDB cites and translates the phrase אֲנַחְנוּ בְרִיתִים אֱמֻנָה as

³⁸⁹ Forms of διατίθημι 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 διαθήκη. See, e.g., Gen 9:7, 15:18, 21:27, 32, 26:28, 31:44; Exod 24:8; Deut 4:23, 5:2,3, 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, ἡμεῖς διατιθέμεθα πίστιν is best translated as “we decree faithfulness” or “we covenant faithfulness” since πίστιν is obviously the direct object of διατίθημι 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 אֱמֻנָה, 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 πίστις 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 אֱמִנָה, 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 9:8a³⁹⁵ are theologically connected since the verses employ not only a derivation of the root אָמַן, but also a form of the verb בָּרַת.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” (תורה, 9:14b; cf.

³⁹⁴ “אֱמִנָה,” 53.

³⁹⁵ The relevant portions of Neh 9:8 are: וּמִצָּאתָ אֶת־לִבּוֹ נֶאֱמַן לְפָנֶיךָ וְקִרְוֹת עָמוֹ הִבְרִית לְחַת אֶת־אֲרָץ . . . לְחַת לְיִרְעוֹ . . . לְחַת לְיִרְעוֹ (“And you found his heart faithful before you and made with him the covenant to give the land . . . to give to his seed.”). As discussed above, the relevant portions of the Greek text of 2 Esd 19:8 state: εὗρες τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ πιστὴν ἐνώπιόν σου (“you found his heart faithful before you”) and διέθου 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”).

³⁹⁶ Duggan, *Covenant Renewal*, 241; Holmgren, *Israel Alive*, 136-37; and *ibid.*, “Faithful Abraham,” 250.

8:1, 14; 10:30) through Moses. Thus, the community's agreement emerges as the confluence of these traditions. The "firm agreement" (אמנה, 10:1) of the community implies their imitation of Abraham's "faithfulness" (נאמן, 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).³⁹⁷

Second, he states:

The people's establishing the agreement "in writing" (כתבים, 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 (כ[ת]חוב, 8:14, 15, 10:35, 37). The appropriate response to the written text of the Torah is the written agreement by the people.³⁹⁸

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 Levites had just declared that the Persians rule over "our livestock" (בהמתנו, 9:37b), now the people announce their decision to bring the firstborn "of our livestock" (בהמתינו, 10:37) to the temple.³⁹⁹

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 לְלֶכֶת בְּתוֹרַת הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר נָתַןָה בְיַד מֹשֶׁה עֶבֶד־הָאֱלֹהִים ("to

³⁹⁷ *Covenant Renewal*, 287.

³⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 242. Similarly, in noting the different "conceptual background" in Ezra-Neh in comparison with Chron, Dennis J. McCarthy, ("Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah," *CBQ* 44 [1982]: 25-44, here 35) states: "There is an emphasis on written law. This is not alien to Chronicles, but the change of emphasis is notable. The Chronicler honored "the book of the law," but it is at the very heart of Ezra-Nehemiah."

³⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 289.

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: ἐντολάς καὶ προστάγματα καὶ νόμον ἐνετείλω αὐτοῖς ἐν χειρὶ Μωυση 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: צוֹתָ לָהֶם בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה עַבְדְּךָ וּמִצְוֹת וְחֻקִּים וְתוֹרָה (“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 διαταγὰς 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 ἐδόθη ἐν χειρὶ Μωυση 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 (הַמַּלְאָכִים אֲשֶׁר בְּרַגְלֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם/αἱ στρατιαὶ 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,⁴⁰² the covenant renewal ceremony is part of the process by which those who covenant/decreed 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 19-20,⁴⁰³ 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 ἀπόφασις 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 ὅσοι . . . ἐξ ἔργων 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 ἀὐτά (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 γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, which he draws from Deut 28:58 (and/or Deut 30:10), for λόγοις 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 Deuteronomic 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 Deuteronomic passages within his reinterpretation of 2 Esd 19-20 is logical.

into the oath⁴⁰⁵ 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.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).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 *πιστιν*. 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*.”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.”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

⁴⁰⁵ For the importance of Paul’s retention of *ἐμμένω* in his conflation of Deuteronomic passages in Gal 3:10 and the connection of *ἐμμένω* with oaths, see n.380 above.

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. Hays (*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.”

⁴⁰⁷ See 3.1.2.2 above.

⁴⁰⁸ “Who’s Cursed – And Why? (Galatians 3:10-14),” *JBL* 117 (1998): 79-92, here 86-87 (emphasis original).

⁴⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 87.

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 πάσας 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 νόμος in 6:13a. Gal 6:13a states: οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσοουσιν (“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 ὁ γὰρ 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 πάσας 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 ἐπιστήσαι πρὸς πάντας τοὺς λόγους 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 πάσας τὰς ἐντολάς.

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.⁴¹⁴

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 Scripture⁴¹⁵ 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;⁴¹⁶ 2) that the stipulations of the Mosaic law

⁴¹⁴ *Galatians*, 309.

⁴¹⁵ Martyn (*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. Hays, *Galatians*, 259-60.

⁴¹⁶ As discussed above, in agreement with Martyn (*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 (*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

should not be subsumed into God's covenant with Abraham,⁴¹⁷ and 3) 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.⁴¹⁸ 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),⁴¹⁹ 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.

⁴¹⁷If 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 προστίθημι. Since Paul states in 3:15 that he is speaking on a human level regarding a covenant made between human beings, his employment of προστίθημι 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, "προστίθημι," 1527.

⁴¹⁸This, 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.

⁴¹⁹NA²⁷ presents Gal 3:11 as: ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον, ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. 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 δῆλον, 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 δῆλον with the following ὅτι as if a comma preceded δῆλον. Whether ἐκ πίστεως modifies the substantive ὁ δίκαιος or should be read adverbially, thus modifying ζήσεται, 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., "Ὁ 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 19-20.⁴²⁰ 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,⁴²¹ 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," *ST* 32: 33-43. Despite strong protests against the RSV translation, numerous commentators interpret ἐκ πίστεως as modifying ὁ δίκαιος. See, e.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 312-14 and, most recently, de Boer, *Galatians*, 202-6. Additionally, Hays ("The Righteous One' as Eschatological Deliverer: A Case Study in Paul's Apocalyptic Hermeneutics," in *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 ὁ δίκαιος 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 δῆλον also indicating that his readers would have been familiar with the messianic emphasis in the citation (here, 210-11). In agreement with Martyn (*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 ὁ δίκαιος as referring to the person who is rectified on the basis of Christ's faithfulness. Cf. de Boer, *Galatians*, 205.

⁴²⁰ 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 covenanting faithfulness to the law (19:38) and entering into the curse in order to conduct their lives according to the Mosaic law (20:29).

⁴²¹ *Galatians*, 330-31.

act⁴²² that results in God counting a person as rectified,⁴²³ and 2) since it is God alone who grants life, the law per se does not have the ability to make anything alive.⁴²⁴ In terms of rectification, David Flusser,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, würde jeder vernünftige Jude Paulus

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.

⁴²³ We are not ignoring that in Gal 2:21, which was discussed above, Paul clearly states: εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἅρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν. 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: εἰδότες [δέ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.

⁴²⁴ Note the specific statement addressed to God in 2 Esd 19:6: καὶ σὺ ζωοποιεῖς 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 ζωοποιέω 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: ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν [τοῦ θεοῦ]; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὅντως ἐκ νόμου 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 ζωοποιῆσαι in Gal 3:21 refers to resurrection. Wakefield (*Where to Live*, 170 n. 122) states: "In Gal 3:21, ζωοποιέω 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 ζωοποιέω 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).

⁴²⁵ "Durch das Gesetz dem Gesetz gestorben" Gal 2, 19," *Judaica* 43 (1987): 30-46.

zustimmen: das Befolgen der jüdischen Gebote ist nicht eine soteriologische Entität, oder, einfacher gesagt: einem Juden würde es höchst kurios vorkommen, wenn ihm z.B. ein Rabbi sagen würde: "Durch die Werke des Gesetzes wirst du erlöst."⁴²⁶

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."⁴²⁷

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.*⁴²⁸ 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 Gentile⁴²⁹ 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 ἡμᾶς 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:

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 ἀπειθοῦντα (“disbelieving/disobedient”). And in describing God’s law, commandments, and judgments, the verse quotes Lev 18:5 as ἃ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος 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.”⁴³³ 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,⁴³⁴ 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.⁴³⁵ If, in agreement with Martyn and de Boer among others,⁴³⁶ 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 ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται, 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^c, 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 בְּאַמֻּנְתּוֹ יִחְיֶה (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 1.⁴³⁷ Additionally, Andersen states: "Hab 1:2-4 does not complain about the Chaldeans, but about the lawlessness in Judah."⁴³⁸ After stressing the "ungodliness" that the prophet has observed (1:3), Hab 1:4 states:

διὰ τοῦτο διεσκέδασται νόμος, καὶ οὐ διεξάγεται εἰς τέλος κρίμα, ὅτι ὁ ἀσεβῆς καταδυναστεύει τὸν δίκαιον· ἕνεκεν τούτου ἐξελεύσεται τὸ κρίμα διεστραμμένον.

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 διασκεδάζω 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" (διεσκεδάσειν) the commandments (Num 15:31), and any male who refused to be circumcised was to be ostracized from the

⁴³⁷ *Habakkuk*, 207.

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*, 223.

community because he “rejected” (δισεκέδασεν) the covenant (Gen 17:14).⁴³⁹

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,⁴⁴⁰ 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 φυλάσσω 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 δισεκέδάζω 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 (ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ποιεῖν πάσας τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ὥστε δισεκέδασαι 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 δισεκέδάζω twice in declaring that the people will reject the covenant (vv. 16, 20). Additionally, Ps 118:126b states: δισεκέδασαν 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 δισεκέδάζω 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."⁴⁴¹ Therefore, the connection between Abraham and the Galatians should not be understood as a *faithful act*

⁴⁴¹ Dunn (*Galatians*, 187) is certainly correct not only in stressing that χαρίζομαι 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 Christ⁴⁴² 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,⁴⁴³ 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."

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: ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως ("now the law is not in accordance with faithfulness").⁴⁴⁴ 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

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.

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.⁴⁴⁵

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.⁴⁴⁶ Since ἐξαγοράζω literally means "buy back" and was frequently employed commercially to depict purchasing a person back from slavery,⁴⁴⁷ 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 ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρρας τοῦ νόμου ("Christ bought us back from the curse of the law"), he is declaring that Christ bought back those who reject Torah-

⁴⁴⁵ Of the various scholarly works discussing Paul's scriptural quotations in Gal 3:10-14 that were mentioned above in n.362, Wakefield's (*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.

⁴⁴⁶ The Greek text is presented above.

⁴⁴⁷ See BDAG, "ἐξαγοράζω," 343. Although many commentators note the commercial connotation of ἐξαγοράζω that relates to the emancipation of slaves (e.g., Betz, *Galatians*, 150; Martyn, *Galatians*, 317; de Boer, *Galatians*, 210; Hays, *Galatians*, 260; and Witherington, *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 ἐξαγοράζω should be viewed as synonymous with δικαιώω fails 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.

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,⁴⁵⁰ 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.⁴⁵¹ 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.⁴⁵² Additionally, we know from Gal 4:17 that the threat of exclusion was a reality for some within the Galatian churches.⁴⁵³

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: An Exegetical Investigation of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus (WUNT 2.48; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992), 156; and David Brondos, “The Cross and the Curse: Galatians 3:13 and Paul’s Doctrine of Redemption,” *JSNT* (2001): 3-32, here 23 n.72.

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: ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς 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 ἡμᾶς (3:13)

An interpretation of ἡμᾶς 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 ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδώσαθε.

²⁸ οὐκ ἔστι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔστι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

²⁹ εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ 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 into⁴⁵⁵ Christ.

²⁸ Neither Jew nor Greek is inside⁴⁵⁶ [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 ἀγάπης in 5:13, which refers back to δι’ ἀγάπης 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 ἐλθούσης . . . 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 ἐνεδώσαθε as “you entered into,” rather than the typical “you put on” (RSV) or “you have clothed yourselves with” (NRSV), compliments Paul’s employment of ἔνεμι in 3:28. On ἔνεμι, see the following note.

⁴⁵⁶ See BDAG, “ἔνεμι, 1,” 334; “ἔνι,” 336; and esp. LSJ, “ἔνεμι, 1, 2,” 562. These lexical entries show that ἔνεμι 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 ἔνι is the contracted form of ἔνεστι, his translation, which views ἔνεμι 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).

²⁹And 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 *paidagōgos*.”⁴⁵⁷ While it is generally recognized that the emphatic placement of πάντες (“all”)⁴⁵⁸ 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 3:6-18.⁴⁵⁹ 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: ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. 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 Williams⁴⁶⁰ claims that ἐνδύω 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 ἐνδύω in 3:27b in relationship to ἔνεμι in 3:28. However, translating ἐνεδύσασθε 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 εἰς Χριστὸν before ἐβαπτίσθητε (v.27a) along with the emphatic placement of Χριστὸν before ἐνεδύσασθε (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 ἐνεδύσασθε 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,⁴⁶² views Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσαθε as an allusion to the baptism practices of early Christians, who were baptized naked and then re clothed, he is correct in connecting the significance of being baptized into Christ with the mysterious union of being “in Christ.”⁴⁶³ Translating ἐνεδύσαθε 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 *in/inside Christ* of *all* believers allows *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 ἐνδύω with the connotation of “entering into,” especially considering that the majority of the canonical passages that employ forms of ἐνδύω are most properly translated with the connotation of “putting on.”⁴⁶⁴ However, there are

to slave/free person or male/female, I disagree with his view that *all three pairs* of opposites are *fully explained* in light of the covenant of circumcision as presented in Gen 17. L. Ann Jervis (*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.

⁴⁶² *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (2d ed.; New Haven: Yale, 2003), 151.

⁴⁶³ *Galatians*, 272.

⁴⁶⁴ E.g., ἐνδύω 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 Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασία.

⁵⁴ ὅταν δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται ἀθανασία, τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος· κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος.

⁵³For this perishable [body] must enter into incorruptibility and this mortal [body] must enter into immortality.

⁵⁴Now 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 ἐνδύω 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.⁴⁶⁶ 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,⁴⁶⁷ 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,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

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 *καινή κτίσις* ("new creation") in Gal 6:15 is certainly correct.⁴⁷² However, since Paul's singular explicit reference to *καινή κτίσις* 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 *ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ* (3:27c) in conjunction with *καινή κτίσις* (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 ἐστίν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καινή κτίσις. Hays (*Galatians*, 344) suggests a translation that accurately expresses Paul's syntax: "For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything, but - *new creation!*" (emphasis original).

ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ as, in some way, related to the issue of circumcision.⁴⁷⁴ Therefore, there is no reason to maintain that Paul borrows ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ from a pre-existing baptismal formula. Rather, in our view, Paul changes his pattern of expression for the third pair of opposites in order to allude parodically to the creation of male and female in Gen 1:27.⁴⁷⁵ Additionally, since Paul is clearly not proposing the abolition of gender distinctions in the general society, Witherington is correct in associating 3:28c with “the social implications of the Galatians adopting a nomistic lifestyle.”⁴⁷⁶

Although in our interpretation Paul’s negation of the third pair of opposites is a vital part of his argument against the Missionaries’ insistence, which was probably based on Gen 17, that the Galatians must be circumcised, we do not agree with Martin that the verbal correspondence between Paul’s ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ and the creation story “is insufficient to establish a link between Gen 1:27 and Gal 3:28c.”⁴⁷⁷ On the contrary, the best explanation, besides an appeal to a pre-existing baptismal formula,⁴⁷⁸ for Paul’s use of the neuter forms of the adjectives for “male” and female” would be a direct quotation

⁴⁷⁴ 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.”

⁴⁷⁵ The relevant phrase in Gen 1:27 is: ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (“[God] made them male and female”).

⁴⁷⁶ *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.”

⁴⁷⁷ “Covenant of Circumcision,” 119.

⁴⁷⁸ 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 androgyne of Adam. Cf. Betz, *Galatians*, 195-200.

of a Scripture that uses the neuter forms.⁴⁷⁹ Since, according to Wevers’s critical edition,⁴⁸⁰ Gen 17 does not employ the neuter form of ἄρσῃν nor any form of θῆλυς, 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,⁴⁸¹ we propose that Paul again employs rhetorical parody in his quotation of ἄρσειν καὶ θῆλυ from Gen 1:27 in order to dissociate the covenant of circumcision as expressed in Gen 17 from the believer’s existence *in/inside* Christ.

While Paul has denied the existence of the first two pairs of opposites *inside Christ* in order to argue against the confluence of the Mosaic law with the Abrahamic covenant and to insist that *all* are “sons of God” because they are *inside* Christ and, therefore, are the *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 *covenant between God and Abraham*, but also as an *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: 9-14⁴⁸² states:

⁹καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Ἀβραάμ· Σὺ δὲ τὴν διαθήκην μου διατηρήσεις, σὺ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σέ· εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν.

¹⁰καὶ αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διατηρήσεις, ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ

⁴⁷⁹ See Smyth, §291a; and Betz, *Galatians*, 195.

⁴⁸⁰ *Genesis*, 176-82.

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.”

⁴⁸² The Greek text is from Wevers, *Genesis*, 178-79.

μέσον τοῦ σπέρματός σου μετὰ σὲ εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν· περιτμηθήσεται ὑμῶν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν,

¹¹καὶ περιτμηθήσεσθε τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας ὑμῶν, καὶ ἔσται ἐν σημείῳ διαθήκης ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν.

¹²καὶ παιδίον ὀκτῶ ἡμερῶν περιτμηθήσεται ὑμῖν πᾶν ἀρσενικὸν εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν, ὁ οἰκογενῆς τῆς οἰκίας σου καὶ ὁ ἀργυρώνητος ἀπὸ παντὸς υἱοῦ ἀλλοτρίου, ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός σου.

¹³περιτομῇ περιτμηθήσεται ὁ οἰκογενῆς τῆς οἰκίας σου καὶ ὁ ἀργυρώνητος, καὶ ἔσται ἡ διαθήκη μου ἐπὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον.

¹⁴καὶ ἀπερίτμητος ἄρσεν, ὃς οὐ περιτμηθήσεται τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ, ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς, ὅτι τὴν διαθήκην μου διεσκέδασεν.

⁹And God said to Abraham, “And you will carefully observe my covenant, you and your seed after you for their generations.

¹⁰And 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,

¹¹And you will be circumcised [in] the flesh of your uncircumcision, and it will be for a sign of the covenant between me and you.

¹²And 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.

¹³The 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.

¹⁴And 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 Deuteronomic 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 15:6.⁴⁸³ 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 θήλυ from Gen 1:27 in order to negate that ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ 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 πάντες, the change to the masculine gender is also important for Paul's argument.⁴⁸⁴

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 καινὴ κτίσις *inside* Christ, thus negating gender distinctions *inside* Christ.⁴⁸⁶

Returning to the inclusion of the Gentiles in Paul’s ἡμεῖς, not only does an all-inclusive interpretation of ἡμεῖς 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 ἡμεῖς 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 19.⁴⁸⁷

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 Ἀβραάμ ἐρρέθησαν 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 19:8.⁴⁸⁸ 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, ἣν εἶπας τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκληρονόμησαν αὐτήν (“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

⁴⁸⁷ 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: νόμον, ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς, κληρονομίαν συναγωγᾶς Ἰακωβ (“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.

⁴⁸⁸ The Greek text is presented in 3.1.6 above.

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 (ἐρρέθησαν in reference to the promises that were spoken by God in Gal 3:16 and ἦν εἶπας 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*.

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 ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται (‘‘O foolish Galatians’’) in 3:1 as the letter’s second rebuke and as typical of diatribe,⁴⁹⁰ and most commentators translate τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν as ‘‘who has bewitched you.’’⁴⁹¹ However, this translation may not be the best considering the various connotations of βασκαίνω and its cognates common in Greek literature from the fourth century B.C.E. through the fourth century C.E.⁴⁹² Forms of βασκαίνω were indeed frequently employed with the connotation of ‘‘casting a spell’’ or ‘‘bewitching’’ and this connotation was frequently associated with ‘‘the evil eye.’’⁴⁹³ Nevertheless, βασκαίνω along with numerous cognates⁴⁹⁴ 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 βασκαίνω 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’’ (ὥς μὴ βασκανθῶ); 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 βασκαίνω. See LSJ, ‘‘καταβασκαίνω,’’ 884. Dio Chrysostom (c. 40/50-110 C.E.) mentions ‘‘warding off/defending oneself against’’ (ἀμυνόμενος) ‘‘those who cast an evil eye on you and me’’ (τοὺς ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑμῖν βασκαίνοντας) in *Pol.* 2.4. Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 9.394b-c) describes male birds spitting on newly hatched young ‘‘so they might not be bewitched’’ (ὥς μὴ βασκανθῶσι). Also, see *T. Sol.* 18:39: βασκαίνω πάντα ἄνθρωπον (‘‘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.’’

“slandering/maligning/disparaging”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 βασκαίνει (“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. Apam.* 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 Κέστοι 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: Οὐ βασκαίνω δὲ τὴν θεραπείαν καὶ τοῖς ἵππων δευτέροις κτήνεσιν (“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; *Ios* 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; *Praec. ger. rei. 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.* 1.1.57-70; 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 “βασκαίνω 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 βασκαίνω means “bewitch,” the object can occur in either the dative or the accusative.

wealth in which a person ignores the needs of others.⁴⁹⁸ Sirach 14:8 has ὁ βασκαίνων ὀφθαλμῶ (“the person envying with the eye”) and is followed by an unflattering description of the characteristics inherent in πλεονέκτου ὀφθαλμὸς (“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 ὀφθαλμῶ as in the LXX.⁴⁹⁹ Although it is sometimes claimed that Paul’s reference to “eyes” in the phrase οἷς κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς 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,”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.⁵⁰¹ An orator understood that a vivid

⁴⁹⁸ Additionally, Sir 14:3 employs βάσκανος with the connotation of “envious.”

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,” *CurTM* 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.

⁵⁰⁰ This assumption is central to Elliott’s (“Evil Eye,” 268-69) argument.

⁵⁰¹ Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3.11.1-2) refers to the concept as πρὸ ὀμμάτων 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 ὑμᾶς 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 *ἐν λόγοις 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 *προγράψω* “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 “begrudge 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 πίστις in 3:2, 5 as “faithfulness” since it seems likely that Paul is employing πίστις 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 (λάβωμεν) 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;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 ἄνθρωπον. καταργεῖ με δὲ ὁ πολυπαθῆς ὀφθαλμὸς ἐγχαραττόμενος (“I bewitch every person. But the much suffering eye, being inscribed, renders me powerless”).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 λεγομένων καὶ βάσκανον ἔχειν ὀφθαλμόν (“Concerning the ones who are said to cast a spell and to have an evil eye”).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 ὀψεως

⁵⁰⁵ See n.493 above.

⁵⁰⁶ *T. Sol.* is known for its emphasis on demonology, magic, and medicine. See the introduction and Greek text compiled 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 ὀρωμένους διαδίδωσιν; (“and how does [the casting of spells] give harm through seeing to the ones being seen?”).⁵⁰⁸ 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 οἷς κατ’ ὀφθαλμούς. 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 5:20.⁵⁰⁹

3.2.1.1.1 Galatians 4:12-15

Although commentators cite Paul’s use of ἐκπτύω (“spit out,” “spit at in disgust,”) ⁵¹⁰ in describing his first meeting with the Galatians (4:12-15) as an allusion to warding off “the evil eye,” ⁵¹¹ a comparison of ἐκπτύω 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, “ἐκπτύω,” 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 ἐκπτύω. L&N (“ἐκπτύω,” 1:451) and Thayer (*Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997], 199) define ἐκπτύω 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 ἐκπτύω 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 ἐκπτύω can mean “distain,” but he leans toward the

of spitting in order to ward off the evil eye indicates otherwise.⁵¹² Although BADG notes that ἐκπτύω means “to spit to ward off evil spirits,” the sources referenced in support of this meaning actually use πτύω (“spit”), not ἐκπτύω.⁵¹³

Additionally, Schlier, after asserting that the apotropaic use of ἐκπτύω “is here our only concern,”⁵¹⁴ proceeds to support this connotation of the verb by citing sources that actually employ forms of ἐπιφθύζω, πτύω, and καταπτύω. Although ἐπιφθύζω does mean “spit at so as to avert a spell of witchcraft” and the sources referenced by LSJ to support this definition (Theocritus, *Id.* 2.62, 7.127)⁵¹⁵ are those cited by Schlier under ἐκπτύω, the meaning of ἐπιφθύζω should not be used to define ἐκπτύω. Similarly, even though Schlier cites sources that employ πτύω, which we have already mentioned as evidence that πτύω did connote spitting to ward off evil, there is no evidence that ἐκπτύω or καταπτύω carried this connotation. In fact, the only definition for καταπτύω listed in LSJ is: “*spit upon or*

connotation of spitting in order to ward off evil. Hays (*Galatians*, 294) notes that both connotations of ἐκπτύω are equally possible.

⁵¹² Gal 4:14 states: καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (“and you did not disdain nor reject your trial in my flesh, but you received me as angel of God, as Christ Jesus”).

⁵¹³ “ἐκπτύω,” 244. The references listed erroneously as employing ἐκπτύω are: Theocritus, *Id.* 6.39, which states: τρὶς εἰς ἐμὸν ἔπτυσσα κόλπον (“I spat three times on my chest.”); *ibid.*, 20.11, which states: τρὶς εἰς ἐόν ἔπτυσσε κόλπον (“she spat three times on her chest.”); Theophrastus, *Char.* 16.15, which, in describing a superstitious man, states: μαινόμενον δὲ ἰδὼν ἢ ἐπίλημpton φρίξας εἰς κόλπον πτύσαι. (“And when he sees a madman or an epileptic, after shuddering, he might spit on [his] chest.”); Lucian, *Nav.* 15.20, which states: καὶ ἐς τὸν κόλπον οὐ πτύεις (“and you do not spit on the chest.”); *idem*, *Merc. cond.* 6.13, which states: οὐκ εἰς τὸν κόλπον πτύσας πρότερον (“not having spit on the chest earlier”).

⁵¹⁴ “ἐκπτύω,” *TDNT* 2:448.

⁵¹⁵ LSJ, “ἐπιφθύζω,” 671.

at, especially as a mark of abhorrence or contempt.”⁵¹⁶ Since *PGL* also indicates that *καταπτύω* continued to mean “spit upon” or “reject”⁵¹⁷ 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.⁵¹⁸ 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.⁵¹⁹ 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*⁵²⁰ 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* [2^d 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 bearing 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 *βασκαίνω*. 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 *βασκαίνω*.

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.”⁵²¹ 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.⁵²² Additionally, neither the early commentators on the Greek text⁵²³ 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” (ἐγκέφαλον 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” (ἐκπτύω) and “turned away from” (ἀποστρέφω) 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: οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ διεπτύσατε (“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 (διεπτύσατε) me because of the things I suffered and the persecutions (διωγμούς); for he calls these things [i.e., his suffering and

Latin text⁵²⁴ 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.

persecutions] weakness (ἀσθένειαν) and trial (πειρασμόν).” Therefore, Chrysostom understands 4:14 as Paul’s praise for the Galatians who neither rejected nor spat upon Paul in contempt because he suffered and was persecuted and who did not allow his persecution to scandalize their belief in his message. Additionally, Chrysostom states that not only did Paul praise them for not rejecting or spitting upon him in contempt, but also he refers to the kindness that the Galatians showed to him. He does not, therefore, interpret 4:14 as Paul’s praise for the Galatians who did not spit on him to ward off evil. Hays (*Galatians*, 294) also proposes that Paul could be referring to a physical condition that resulted from being flogged; however, Chrysostom understands the flogging to have occurred *during* Paul’s preaching to the Galatians rather than as a punishment that Paul suffered prior to arriving in Galatia.

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 sprevisit, neque respuistis: sed sicut angelum Dei excepistis 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 a angel of God, as Christ Jesus”). *Spernō* means “to separate” or “to despise/reject with scorn” (*OLD*, 1803). The compound verb *respuō* (*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 *respuō* connoted spitting in order to ward off evil. However, *spuō* (*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, *spuō* is equivalent to πτύω, but, just as with the compounds ἐκπτύω, καταπτύω and διαπτύω, *respuō* 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 *respuō* 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” (*contumelias*), “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 sprevisit, neque abiecit* (“You did not despise nor reject your trial/temptation in my flesh”). *Abiciō* (*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 sprevisit neque respuistis*. He interprets the temptation of the Galatians as a test to see if they would “desert (*deserō*) him [i.e. Paul] out of fear or embrace him out of love.” And he interprets *neque respuistis* 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 Quarundam 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."⁵²⁵ 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)⁵²⁶ 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,⁵²⁷ 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 σαρκὸς 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 νόμον (“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 ἐπιθυμία σαρκός (“desire of the flesh”) in 5:16 is equivalent to the Hebrew **יצר בשׁר** (“inclination of the flesh”) in 1QH 10.23 by tracing the development of the concept of **יצר הרע** (“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 ἡγεμών ἐστὶν 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 *yesev* was a “technical term” by Paul’s lifetime “and that Paul knew of it is most clearly demonstrated by Gal 5:16.”⁵³⁰

Finally, Martyn argues that the “impulsive desire of the flesh” is a “cosmic power arrayed against God.”⁵³¹ “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.”⁵³² 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),⁵³³ 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.⁵³⁴

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

⁵³⁰ “The Evil Inclination in the Letters of Paul,” *IBS* 8 (1986): 8-21, here 8.

⁵³¹ *Galatians*, 493.

⁵³² *Idem*, “Apocalyptic Antinomies,” in *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 111-23, here 121 (*italics original*).

⁵³³ Cf. Hays, *Galatians*, 325-26.

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,⁵³⁵ especially if we read v. 17 as a parodic reversal of the description of the Song of Moses presented in Deut 31:21.⁵³⁶ Deut 31:21 states:

καὶ ἀντικαταστήσεται ἡ ὁδὸς αὕτη κατὰ πρόσωπον μαρτυροῦσα οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἐπιλησθῆ ἀπὸ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ στόματος τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν ὅσα ποιοῦσιν ὧδε σήμερον πρὸ τοῦ εἰσαγαγεῖν με αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἣν ὥμοσα 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 31:21⁵³⁷ reads:

כִּי יִדְעֵתִי אֶת־יִצְרוֹ אֲשֶׁר הוּא עֹשֶׂה הַיּוֹם בְּטָרֵם אֲבִיאֲנִי אֶל־הָאָרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי

For I know his inclination (*yesser*), 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 *yesser* was a technical term and that Paul demonstrates his knowledge of the *yesser* 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 *epithymeō 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 אֶת־יִצְרוֹ. And Wevers (*Deuteronomium*, 341) does not include any textual variant in his critical apparatus for τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν.

associated τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν in v. 21 with the *yesser* concept.⁵³⁸ 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 31:21⁵³⁹ 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 הִלַּךְ with its metaphorical meaning of walking in God’s laws.⁵⁴⁰ But it is just as important that Paul ends the verse by employing the subjunctive of τελέω (“carry out,” “bring to

⁵³⁸ Regarding MT Deut 31:21, Gerhard von Rad (*Deuteronomy* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966], 190) states: “The interesting concept of *yesser* (v. 21) which can be rendered by ‘tendency,’ ‘disposition,’ ‘nature’ is already approaching here closely to the late-Jewish *theologoumenon* of the ‘evil impulse.’”

⁵³⁹ Referencing the *law* here, rather than the *Song of Moses*, does not necessitate agreement with von Rad’s (ibid.) proposal that ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτῆ 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.

⁵⁴⁰ 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.

perfection”)⁵⁴¹ as part of his emphatic negation. Given that Paul employs περιπατέω with the metaphorical meaning that הִלַּךְ 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 ἐπιτελείσθε; (“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 ἐπιτελείσθε as passive, the RSV and NRSV take ἐπιτελείσθε to be in the middle voice. My translation assumes that ἐπιτελείσθε is in the middle voice.

from the noun *epithymia* [in v.16] to the verb *epithymeō* [v.17].” However, Paul’s use of ἐπιθυμῶ 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 31:21⁵⁴⁵ while retaining the preposition κατὰ from κατὰ πρόσωπον in Deut 31:21, which he uses in 5:17ab in conjunction with ἐπιθυμῶ. 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.”⁵⁴⁶

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” (παροξυνοῦσίν) God; and “they will reject” (διασκεδάσουσιν) “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 ἀντικαθίστημι and “to be set over against,” “to be opposite or opposed” as possible meanings of ἀντίκειμαι (“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,⁵⁴⁷ 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.⁵⁴⁸ But Paul's vocabulary in 5:3a is interesting: μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ("Now I in turn bear witness to every man receiving circumcision"). Although Dunn specifically mentions that Paul employs "formal legal terminology" by using μαρτύρομαι,⁵⁴⁹ I have not encountered any commentator who discusses the possibility that Paul employs πάλιν in 5:3 as "a marker of contrast" even though this is a normal connotation of the adverb⁵⁵⁰ and some scholars maintain that Paul employs πάλιν with this connotation in 2 Cor 10:7.⁵⁵¹ If we interpret πάλιν 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, "πάλιν, 4," 606-7, which renders πάλιν as "on the other hand" or "in turn." Cf. BDAG, "πάλιν, 4" 752-53; and LSJ, "πάλιν II & III," 1292.

⁵⁵¹ In addition to BAGD, "πάλιν, 4," 607 and BDAG, "πάλιν, 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 ποιεῖν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου ("to do all the words of this law")⁵⁵² In this case, Paul's testimony that any man being circumcised ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι ("is under obligation to do the whole law")⁵⁵³ is an allusion to the Deuteronomic requirement that all the people, including proselytes, must "do all the words of this law."⁵⁵⁴

Additionally, if Paul is parodically countering the Missionaries' insistence that the Galatians must "do all the words of this law," the attributive position of πᾶς in Gal 5:14

⁵⁵² Martyn (*Galatians*, 469) and Dunn (*Galatians*, 265) understand πάλιν 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 "the whole law" to relate to "the plural law," as in Deut 27:28, he does not understand πάλιν as Paul's expression of contrast. Dunn notes Paul's "play on words" between vv.2 and 3. Although vv.2 and 3 employ a form of περιτέμνω and v.3 employs ὀφειλέτης ("debtor") while v.2 has ὠφελέω ("to be of benefit"), translating πάλιν as "again" with reference to v. 2 does not necessitate Paul's immediate reference in v.3 to the "whole" law. But understanding πάλιν 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 "whole" law.

⁵⁵³ As mentioned above, according to Smyth (§1175), ὅλος in the predicate position denotes an entity "as a whole" or in its entirety. Therefore, Paul's phrase ὅλον τὸν νόμον is referring to the law in its entirety.

⁵⁵⁴ Hays (*Galatians*, 313), noting the connection between 3:10 and "the whole law" in 5:3, understands Paul's reference to "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 γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ for λόγους. Since Paul conflates Deuteronomic 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 Deuteronomic verses that demand obedience to "all the words of the law" in Gal 5:3, 14. In addition to Deut 27:26, which states ἐν πάσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτούς, and Deut 31:12, which states καὶ ἀκούσονται ποιεῖν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου ("and they will understand to do all the words of this law"), Deut 32:46 records the words of Moses as: καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς προσέχετε τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους οὓς ἐγὼ διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον ἃ ἐντελεῖσθε τοῖς υἱοῖς ὑμῶν φυλάσσειν 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 "life."

may also be clarified.⁵⁵⁵ Since πᾶς in the predicate position means “all”⁵⁵⁶ while πᾶς in the attributive position “denotes the whole regarded as the sum of all its parts,”⁵⁵⁷ Paul could be employing πᾶς 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 πᾶς and λόγος.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 ποιέω, which is in agreement with the Deuteronomic phrase.⁵⁵⁹ Since Paul immediately refers in 5:4 to ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε (“you being rectified in the law”), ποιέω in 5:3 is an additional allusion to the Mosaic

⁵⁵⁵ Gal 5:14 states: ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν (“For the entire law has been fulfilled in one word, in which: “You will love your neighbor as yourself”).

⁵⁵⁶ Smyth, §1174b.

⁵⁵⁷ Ibid., §1174a. Therefore, πᾶς in the attributive position is equivalent to ὅλος in the predicate position. See n. 326 above.

⁵⁵⁸ Although Hays (*Galatians*, 323-24) and Martyn (*Galatians*, 491, 506) note that the attributive πᾶς expresses totality and that Paul employs λόγος rather than ἐντολή, neither views Paul’s references to πᾶς and λόγος as parodic reinterpretations of the Deuteronomic phrase. Martyn explains the use of λόγος 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.

⁵⁵⁹ Martyn (*Galatians*, 470) notes the importance of the verb ποιέω 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 (ποιέω) all the words of this law.”

However, in 5:14 Paul declares that “the entire law (πᾶς) has been fulfilled/brought to completion (πεπλήρωται) 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 28-32,⁵⁶⁰ we see that Paul is not in any way discussing the ability or inability of humans to keep the law perfectly.⁵⁶¹ 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 πᾶς 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 ὁ πᾶς νόμος in 5:14 does not mean the same as ὅλον τὸν 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 πεπλήρωται is supported by Paul’s reference to Christ’s self-sacrificing act in 5:1:⁵⁶³ Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν· στήκετε οὖν καὶ μὴ ἄλλιν 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 πεπλήρωται as “has been brought to completion/fulfillment” by Christ, see e.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 488-89; Hays, *Galatians*, 322-23; Barclay, *Obeying*, 139.

⁵⁶³ Martyn (*Galatians*, 489) also relates 5:14 to 5:1.

the Song of Moses will witness against as those who “will reject” (διασκεδάσουσιν) 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 5.⁵⁶⁴ 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.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.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

⁵⁶⁴ See LSJ, “διασκεδάζω, 5,” 411.

⁵⁶⁵ *Galatians*, 140. Cf. Hays, *Galatians*, 315. Gal 5:9-10 state: μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε· ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα, ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ. (“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.”)

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 ταρασσῶν 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 ἢ ἁμαρτία 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, ὅστις ἐάν ᾗ (“his sin is on him, whoever he is”)?

Based on Paul’s question in Gal 2:17 (ἄρα 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 σὰρξ for ἁμαρτία.⁵⁷⁰ If Barclay is correct, Paul’s ὁ δὲ παράσσω ὑμᾶς 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.

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”⁵⁷⁵ (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:

ἔργα δικαίων ζωὴν ποιεῖ καρποὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν 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, *Obedying*, 208; Dunn, *Galatians*, 304-6; Martyn, *Galatians*, 532-33.

⁵⁷³ While LXX Gen 8:21 states the synonymous phrase as ἐγκείται ἡ διάνοια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐκ νεότητος (“the intention of a human insists thoroughly on evil things from youth”), MT 8:21 reads יֵצֵר לֵב הָאָדָם רַע מִנְעֻרָיו (“the *yesser* (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.⁵⁷⁷ 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 ἁμαρτία in Gal 5, choosing instead to address the issue facing the Galatians by substituting the term σάρξ. If Barclay is correct regarding ἁμαρτία, it is very likely that Paul would also avoid ἀσεβής⁵⁷⁸ 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 ἀσεβής and ἁμαρτωλός are synonymous. See BDAG, “ἀσεβής, 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.⁵⁷⁹ 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 10:16⁵⁸⁰ while changing καρποί to the singular καρπός, thus emphasizing the unity that is a product of a community that is walking in the Spirit.⁵⁸¹

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 καρποί 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

⁵⁷⁹ Martyn, *Galatians*, 496; Hays, *Galatians*, 237-38; Barclay, *Obeying*, 231; and Matera, *Galatians*, 205-12.

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: πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν 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 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ 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 $\phi\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (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 accomplishes⁵⁸³ 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 $\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ as “accomplish,” which seems to be the best option given that the Missionaries most likely espoused the constraining aspect of the law. See BDAG, “ $\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ 2,” 484. Paul employs $\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ 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.⁵⁸⁴ 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,⁵⁸⁵ along of course with the obvious sin of idolatry,⁵⁸⁶ 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.

Pharaoh 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 ταῦτα (“all the ones doing these things”) are an abomination to the Lord and κύριος ἐξολεθρεύσει αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ σοῦ (“the Lord will ostracize them from you”).⁵⁸⁷

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,⁵⁸⁸ 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,”⁵⁸⁹ and Dunn correctly observes that the first five items “would evoke warm assent in any Jewish or God-fearing audience.”⁵⁹⁰ 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 ἐξολεθρεύω, 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.”⁵⁹¹

Therefore, returning to our discussion of the most likely connotation of βασκαίνω in 3:1, there is absolutely nothing in the context of Paul’s letter that would support the translation of βασκαίνω as “bewitch.” If the common translation of βασκαίνω 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.⁵⁹² However, if we translate τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν 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 4:12-20.⁵⁹³ However,

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 Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι καὶ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς? 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 *implicit* manner in which Gaventa proposes,⁵⁹⁴ another possibility is more likely in light of our previous discussion of Num 15:13-16.⁵⁹⁵ Paul’s enigmatic statement in Gal 4:12a is not puzzling at all if we understand it as a parody of Num 15:15c.

Gal 4:12a: Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι καὶ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν
 Be as I am, brothers, because I am also as you are, I beg you.

Num 15:15: νόμος εἷς ἔσται ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς προσηλύτοις τοῖς προσκειμένοις ἐν ὑμῖν νόμος αἰώνιος εἰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν ὡς ὑμεῖς καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ἔσται ἕναντι 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.

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

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 *implicit* example for the Galatians does not preclude the additional function of Paul’s *explicit* comments as the parodic reversal of numerous scriptural demands for obedience to the law.

⁵⁹⁵ See 3.1.2.2 above.

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,⁵⁹⁶ 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:

μακάριος σύ Ισραηλ τίς ὅμοιός σοι λαὸς σωζόμενος ὑπὸ κυρίου ὑπερασπιεῖ ὁ βοηθός σου καὶ ἡ μάχαιρα καύχημά σου καὶ ψεύσονται σε οἱ ἐχθροί σου καὶ σὺ ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν ἐπιβήση.

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 ἐξ ἔργων 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 οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' 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 13:5,⁶⁰⁰ 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

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 ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκαυεν 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 advice⁶⁰¹ 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:

Κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς.
"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.⁶⁰² 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.’”⁶⁰³ 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 ἀγαθοῖς (‘in all good things’).”⁶⁰⁴ Longenecker appears to cite the grammatical construction as conclusive evidence that: (1) Paul uses κοινωνέω 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 κοινωνέω 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.⁶⁰⁵ LSJ and BDAG also explain that the connotation of participation can be expressed with the use of prepositions following a form of κοινωνέω.⁶⁰⁶ 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

⁶⁰³ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 278-9.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁰⁵ LSJ, “κοινωνέω,” 1, 969.

⁶⁰⁶ LSJ, “κοινωνέω,” 4, 969. BDAG (“κοινωνέω” 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.

κοινωνέω 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 ἀποστραφήση τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστε, πόσω 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 κοινωνέω, 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 κοινωνέω to connote the meaning of participation; and (2) the thing that is participated in (i.e., πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς) is governed by the preposition ἐν and, therefore, is expressed in the dative.

Since, in the grammatical construction of 6:6, κοινωνέω 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 κοινωνέω 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 ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες (“contributing to the needs of the saints, practicing hospitality”). Although he uses κοινωνέω 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 κοινωνέω, but it is determined by the context of the sentence (i.e., ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων). 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,⁶⁰⁸ Paul does not use the verb *κοινωνέω* in this sentence to specify financial support. Rather, in 15:27, *κοινωνέω* is used to indicate that the Gentiles have participated “in the spiritual things” (τοῖς πνευματικοῖς) of Christianity. In this verse, Paul uses the phrase *ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς* (“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 *κοινωνέω* 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, *κοινωνέω* means much more than just financial support. Philippians 4:15 states: *Οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππησίοι, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι.* The full sense of *κοινωνέω* 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 *ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως*

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid., 876.

expresses the notion of friendship and participatory partnership.⁶⁰⁹ Therefore, in each of these three Pauline uses of κοινωνέω, 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."⁶¹⁰ 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."⁶¹¹ 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 ὀφείλω rather than a form of κοινωνέω (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 Missionaries 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 ἀνάθεμα 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 μετατίθημι (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 μετατίθημι in 2 Macc 7:24.

From this perspective 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, ὀρθοποδέω (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 ἐγώ 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 πίστις 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.

Bibliography

- Africanus, Sextus Julius. *Les Cestes de Julius Africanus*. Edited by Jean-René Vieillefond. Paris: Didier, 1970.
- Andersen, Francis I. *Habakkuk*. Anchor Bible 25. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Andersen, Francis I. and Noel David Freedman. *Micah*. Anchor Bible 24E. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Anderson, R. Dean. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Rev. ed. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 18. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- _____. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected the Methods of Argumentation, Figures, and Tropes From Anaximenes to Quintilian*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. 1885-1887. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Apostolic Fathers*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912.
- Apostolic Fathers*. Translated by Bart D. Ehrman. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Aristides*. Translated by C. A. Behr. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard University Press, 1973-1980.
- Aristides, Publius Aelius. *The Complete Works*. Translated by Charles A. Behr. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Aristotle. Translated by H. P. Cooke, H. Tredennick, et al. 23 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938-2011.
- Arnold, James P. "Jewish Christianity in Galatians: A Study of the Teachers and Their Gospel." Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 1991.
- Athenaeus. *The Deipnosophists*. Translated by Charles Burton Gulick. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928-39.
- Augustine. *Doctrina Christiana*. Translated by R. P. H. Green. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Aune, David E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity 8. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- _____. Review of Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*. *Religious Studies Review* 7 (1981): 323-28.
- Austin, Roland Gregory. "Quintilian." Page 1290 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. 3d rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Bachmann, Michael. *Antijudaismus im Galaterbrief?: Exegetische Studien zu einem polemischen Schreiben und zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

- . “Zur Argumentation von Galater 3.10–12.” *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 524-44.
- Bahr, Gordon J. “Paul and Letter Writing in the Fifth [sic] Century.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28 (1966): 465-77.
- . “The Subscriptions in Pauline Letters.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 27-41.
- Baird, William. “Visions, Revelation, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Corinthians 12:1-5 and Galatians 1:11-17.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 651-62.
- Bammel, E. “Gottes ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (Gal. III. 15-17) und das jüdische Rechtsdenken.” *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959-1960): 313-19.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- . “Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31 (1987): 73-93.
- . “Neither Jew Nor Greek: Multiculturalism and the New Perspective on Paul.” Pages 197-214 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Britt. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- . “Paul Among Diaspora Jews: Anomaly or Apostate?” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 60 (1995): 89-120.
- Barr, James. *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of Two Testaments*. London: SCM, 1966.
- . *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barrett, C. K. “The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians.” Pages 154-70 in *Essays on Paul*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.
- . *Freedom & Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.
- . “Paul and the ‘Pillar’ Apostles.” Pages 1-19 in *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan*. Edited by J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- . “Paulus als Missionar und Theologe.” Pages 1-15 in *Paulus und das antike Judentum: Tübingen-Durham Symposium im Gedanken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schatters (19. Mai 1938)*. Edited by M. Hengel and U. Heckel. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, First Series, 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.
- . *Acts I, 1-14*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Barth, Markus. “The Kerygma of Galatians.” *Interpretation* 21 (1967): 131-46.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick William Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

- Bautch, Richard J. "An Appraisal of Abraham's Role in Postexilic Covenants." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2009): 42-63.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Bell, Richard H. *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, Second Series, 63. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Belleville, Linda L. "'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in 3:21-4:11." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (1986): 53-78.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. *Micah*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 21B. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Berkowitz, L. and K. A. Squitier. *Thesaurus linguae graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works*. 3d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Berényi, Gabriella. "Gal 2,20: A Pre-Pauline or a Pauline Text?" *Biblica* 64 (1984):490-537.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- _____. "Galatians, Letter to the," Pages 352-53 in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- _____. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974-75): 353-79.
- _____. "In Defense of the Spirit: Paul's Letter to the Galatians as a Document of Early Christian Apologetics." Pages 99-114 in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by E. Schüssler Fiorenza. Studies in Judaism and Early Christianity 2. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976.
- _____. "Paraenesis and the Concept of God According to Oratio XII (Olympikos) of Dio of Prusa." Pages 217-36 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Edited by James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedesen. New York: De Gruyter, 2004.
- _____. "Spirit, Freedom, and Law: Paul's Message to the Galatian Churches." *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 39 (1974): 145-60.
- Betz, Hans Dieter, ed. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation Including the Demotic Spells*. Translated by Janet H. Johnson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Bird, Michael F. and Preston M. Sprinkle, eds. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical and Theological Studies*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Black, David A. "Weakness Language in Galatians." *Grace Theological Journal* 4 (1983): 15-36.
- Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

- Bligh, John. *Galatians: A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle*. Householder Commentaries 1. London: St. Paul, 1969.
- _____. *Galatians in Greek*. Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966.
- Boda, Mark J. *Praying the Tradition: The Origin and Use of Tradition in Nehemiah 9*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 277. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N.A. *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- _____. *Revelation and Mystery in Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1990.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. *Galatians: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2011.
- _____. "The New Preachers in Galatia: Their Identity, Message, Aims, and Impact," Pages 39-60 in *Jesus, Paul, and Early Christianity: Studies in Honor of Henk Jan de Jonge*. Edited by Rieuwerd Buitenwerf et al. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- _____. "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology." Pages 169-90 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 24. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.
- _____. Review of Mark D. Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-century Context*. *Biblical Interpretation* 12 (2004): 421-24.
- Boers, Hendrikus. "We Who Are by Inheritance Jews, Not from Gentile Sinners." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 273-81.
- _____. *The Justification of the Gentiles; Paul's Letters to the Galatians and Romans*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Bonnard, Pierre. *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates*. 2d. ed. Rev. and enl. Commentaire du nouveau Testament 9. Neuchâtel: Delachux et Niestlé, 1972.
- Bonneau, Normand. "The Logic of Paul's Argument on the Curse of the Law in Galatians 3:10-14." *Novum Testamentum* 39 (1997): 60-80.
- Bonner, Campbell. *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.
- Bonner, Stanley E. *Education in Ancient Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Borgen, Peder. "Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men." Pages 37-46 in *Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men and Other Essays on Christian Origins*. Trondheim, Norway: Tapir, 1983.
- _____. "Observations on the Theme 'Paul and Philo': Paul's Preaching of Circumcision in Galatia (Gal 5:11) and Debates on Circumcision in Philo." Pages 85-102 in *Die paulinische Literatur und Theologie*. Edited by S. Pedersen. Teologiske Studier 7. Århus: Aros, 1980.

- Boring, M.E. et al., eds. *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- Børresen, Kari Elisabeth. "God's Image, Man's Image? Patristic Interpretation of Gen 1,27 and 1 Cor 11,7." Pages 187-209 in *The Image of God: Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. Edited by Kari Elisabeth Børresen. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Borse, Udo. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg: Pustet, 1984.
- Botha, P. J. J. "Letter Writing and Oral Communication in Antiquity: Suggested Implications for the Interpretation of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *Scriptura* 42 (1992): 17-34.
- Böttger, Paul C. "Paulus and Petrus in Antiochen: Zum Verständnis von Galater 2:11-21." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 77-100.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Braswell, Joseph P. "'The Blessing of Abraham' Versus 'The Curse of the Law': Another Look at Gal 3:10-13." *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991): 73-91.
- Braude, W. G. *Jewish Proselytizing in the First Two Centuries of the Common Era*. Providence: Boston University Press, 1940.
- Brawley, Robert L. "Contextuality, Intertextuality, and the Hendiadic Relationship of Promise and Law in Galatians." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 93 (2002): 99-119.
- Bring, Ragnar. *Commentary on Galatians*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1961.
- Brinsmead, Bernard Hungerford. *Galatians – Dialogical Response to Opponents*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 65. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Brondos, David. "The Cross and the Curse: Galatians 3.13 and Paul's Doctrine of Redemption." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 81 (2001): 3-32.
- Brooke, Alan E. and Norman McLean. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906.
- Brown, F., S. Driver, and C. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Brown, Raymond E. "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 74-79.
- Bruce, F. F. "'Called to Freedom': A Study in Galatians." Pages 61-72 in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Vol. 1 of *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1984.

- _____. "The Curse of the Law." Pages 27-36 in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*. Edited by M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- _____. "Further Thoughts on Paul's Autobiography: Galatians 1:11-2:14." Pages 21-9 in *Jesus und Paulus*. Edited by E. E. Ellis & E. Gräber. Tübingen: Mohr, 1975.
- _____. "Galatian Problems, 3: The 'Other' Gospel." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 53 (1970-71): 253-71.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die Kynischstoische Diatribe*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- _____. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951-1955.
- _____. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985.
- Burton, Ernest de Witt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921. Repr., New York: Continuum, 2004.
- _____. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900. Repr., Eugene, Or: Wipf & Stock, 2003.
- Bussman, Claus. *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionliteratur*. Bern: Lang, 1975.
- Butts, James R. "The Progymnasmata of Theon: A New Text with Translation and Commentary." Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1986.
- Byrne, Brendan. 'Sons of God' – 'Seed of Abraham': *A Study of the Idea of Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background*. Analecta biblica 83. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.
- Callan, Terrance, Jr. "The Law and the Mediator: Ga. 3:19b-20." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1976.
- Calvert-Koyzis, Nancy. *Paul, Monotheism and the People of God: The Significance of Abraham Traditions for Early Judaism and Christianity*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 273. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians*. Translated by William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *The Quest for Paul's Gospel: A Suggested Strategy*. New York: T & T Clark, 2005.

- _____. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- _____. "Romans 1:17 -- A Crux Interpretum for the Πιστις Χριστου Debate." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 265-85.
- Campbell, William S. *Paul's Gospel in an Intercultural Context: Jew and Gentile in the Letter to the Romans*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Cary, Christopher. "Rhetorical Means of Persuasion." Pages 26-45 in *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Edited by Ian Worthington. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. "Allegories of Hagar: Reading Galatians 4.21-31 with Postmodern Feminist Eyes." Pages 228-50 in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Edgar V. McKnight and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon. Valley Forge.: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Cavallin, H. C. C. "'The Righteous Shall Live by Faith': A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation." *Studia theologica* 32 (1978): 33-43.
- Cicero. Translated by G. L. Hendrickson, H. M. Hubbell et al. 28 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912-1972.
- _____. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by H. Caplan. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Classen, C. Joachim. "St. Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric." Pages 265-91 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Classen, Carl Joachim. *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Clines, David J. A. "Nehemiah 10 As an Example of Early Jewish Biblical Exegesis." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* (1981): 111-17.
- Cohen, David. "Classical Rhetoric and Modern Theories of Discourse." Pages in 69-84 in *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Edited by Ian Worthington. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Cohn-Sherbok, D. "Paul and Rabbinic Exegesis." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982): 130-37.
- Cook, David. "The Prescript as Programme in Galatians." *Journal of Theological Studies* 43 (1992): 511-19.
- Cole, R. Alan. *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: An Introduction and Commentary*. 2d ed. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

- Cole, Thomas. *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1991.
- Collins, C. John. "Galatians 3:16: What Kind of Exegete Was Paul?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 54 (2003): 75-86.
- Collins, John J. "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century." Pages 163-86 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, Others in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and E. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- _____. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Cornutus. *Theologiae Graecae*. Edited by C. Lang. Leipzig Teubner, 1881.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. "Arguing Like a Mere Human Being: Galatians 3:15-18 in Rhetorical Perspective." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988) 436-49.
- _____. *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- _____. "The Law Has Given Sarah No Children (Gal. 4:21-30)." *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987): 219-35.
- Cousar, Charles B. *Galatians*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- _____. *A Theology of the Cross: The Death of Jesus in the Pauline Letters*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Cranford, Michael. "The Possibility of Perfect Obedience: Paul and the Implied Premise in Galatians 3:10 and 5:3." *Novum Testamentum* 36 (1994): 242-58.
- Crownfield, Frederic R. "The Singular Problem of the Dual Galatians." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 64 (1945): 491-500.
- Cummins, Stephen A. *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "Paul's Letter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content, and Structure." Unpublished paper presented to Society of Biblical Literature Paul Seminar 1973, 1-105.
- _____. *Studies in Paul*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
- Dane, Joseph A. *Parody: Critical Concepts Versus Literary Practices, Aristophanes to Sterne*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.
- Das, A. Andrew. "Another Look at ἐν μὴ in Galatians 2:16." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119 (2000): 529-39.
- _____. *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 2. London: Athlone, 1956.

- Dautzenberg, Gerhard. “‘Da ist nicht männlich und weiblich’: Zur Interpretation von Gal 3,28.” *Kairos* n.s. 24 (1982): 181-206.
- Davies, W.D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. London: SPCK, 1948. Repr., Mifflintown: Sigler, 1998.
- _____. Review of H.D. Betz. *Galatians*. *Religious Studies Review* 7 (1981): 314-18.
- _____. *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or Age to Come*. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.
- Davis, Anne. “Allegorically Speaking in Galatians 4:21-5:1.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 14 (2004): 161-74.
- Davis, James A. *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1:18-3:20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1984.
- Demetrius. *On Style*. Translated by Dorren C. Innes. In Aristotle vol. 23, *The Poetics*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Demosthenes. *Orations*. Translated by J. H. Vince et al. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930-1949.
- Di Mattei, Steven. “Paul’s Allegory of the Two Covenants (Gal 4.21-31) in Light of First-Century Hellenistic Rhetoric and Jewish Hermeneutics.” *New Testament Studies* 52 (2006): 102-22.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm, ed. *Aristides*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1829. Repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964.
- Dio Chrysostom*. Translated by J. W. Cohoon and H. L. Crosby. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932-1951.
- Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925-1942.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Critical Essays*. Translated by S. Usher. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Divjak, Johannes, ed. *Augustinus, Sanctus Aurelius, Opera, Sect. IV, Par I: Expositio Quarundam Propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos; Epistolae ad Galatas Expositionis Liber Unus; Epistolae ad Romanos Inchoata Expositio*. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum 84. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1971.
- Dodd, Brian J. “Christ’s Slave, People Pleasers and Galatians 1:10.” *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 90-104.
- Dodd, C. H. “ENNOMOS CHRISTOU.” Pages 96-110 in *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan*. Edited by J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- Donaldson, Terence L. “‘The Curse of the Law’ and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Gal 3:13-14.” *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 94-112.

- _____. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- _____. "Zealot and Convert: The Origin of Paul's Christ Torah Antithesis." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 655-82.
- Doty, William G. *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
- Dover, Kenneth J. "Comedy (Greek), old." Pages 368-69 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. 3d ed. rev. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Duggan, Michael W. *The Covenant Renewal in Ezra-Nehemiah (Neh 7:72b-10:40): An Exegetical, Literary, and Theological Study*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 164. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Dumbrell, William J. "Abraham and the Abrahamic Covenant in Galatians 3:1-14." Pages 19-32 in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission: In Honor of Peter T. O'Brien*. Edited by Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Dunn, James D. G. "4QMMT and Galatians." *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 147-53.
- _____. *Christian Liberty: A New Testament Perspective*. Carlisle, U.K.: Paternoster, 1993.
- _____. "Echoes of Intra-Jewish Polemic in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 459-77.
- _____. "EK PISTEŌS: A Key to the Meaning of PISTIS CHRISTOU." Pages 351-66 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*. Edited by J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- _____. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975.
- _____. *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. London: SPCK, 1990.
- _____. "'The Law of Faith,' 'the Law of the Spirit' and 'the Law of Christ.'" Pages 62-82 in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- _____. "Once More, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ." Pages 61-81 in *Pauline Theology, Volume IV: Looking Back, Pressing On*. Edited by E.E. Johnson and D. M. Hay. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- _____. *The Parting of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1991.
- _____. *Romans*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary. 38A & B. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- _____. "The Theology of Galatians." Pages 125-46 in *Pauline Theology, Volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*. Edited by Jouette M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

- _____. *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3:10-14)." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 523-42. Repr., pages 215-41 in *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
- Du Toit, A. B. "Alienation and Re-Identification as Pragmatic Strategies in Galatians." *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992): 279-95.
- Eastman, Susan. "The Evil Eye and the Curse of the Law: Galatians 3.1 Revisited." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 83 (2001): 69-87.
- _____. *Recovering Paul's Mother Tongue: Language and Theology in Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Eastman, Susan G. "'Cast Out the Slave Woman and her Son': The Dynamics of Exclusion and Inclusion in Galatians 4.30." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (2006): 309-36.
- Eastman, Susan Groves. "Metaphor and Mimesis: Proclamation, Transformation, and the Staying Power of the Gospel in Galatians 4:12-5:1." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2003.
- Ebeling, G. *The Truth of the Gospel: An Exposition of Galatians*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Eckert, Jost. *Die urchristliche verkündigung im Streit zwischen Paulus und seinen Gegnern nach dem Galaterbrief*. Biblische Untersuchungen 6. Regensburg: Pustet, 1971.
- Eckstein, Hans-Joachim. *Verheissung und Gesetz: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2:15-4:7*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament 86. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996.
- Edwards, M. J. ed. *Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture 8. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1999.
- Elliott, John H. "Paul, Galatians, and the Evil Eye." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 17 (1990): 262-73.
- Elliott, Susan M. "Choose Your Mother, Choose Your Master: Galatians 4:21-5:1 in the Shadow of the Anatolian Mother of the Gods." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 661-83.
- Elliott, Susan Margaret. "The Rhetorical Strategy of Paul's Letter to the Galatians in Its Anatolian Cultic Context: Circumcision and the Castration of the Galli of the Mother of the Gods." Ph.D. diss., Loyola University, 1997.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, ed. *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- _____. ed. *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, "The Concept of Paraenesis." Pages 47-72 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Edited by James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen. New York: De Gruyter, 2004.

- Epictetus*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925-1928.
- Ernesti, Johann Christian Gottlieb. *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae*. Leipzig: Fritsch, 1795. Repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1983.
- Esler, Philip Francis. "Family Imagery and Christian Identity in Gal 5:13 to 6:10." Pages 121-49 in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family As Social Reality and Metaphor*. Edited by Halvor Moxnes. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- _____. *The First Christians and Their Social Worlds*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- _____. *Galatians*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1998.
- _____. "Group Boundaries and Intergroup Conflict in Galatians; A New Reading of Galatians 5:13-6:10." Pages 215-40 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Britt. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- _____. "Making and Breaking an Agreement Mediterranean Style: A New Reading of Galatians 2:1-14." Pages 261-81 in *The Galatians Debate*. Edited by Mark D. Nanos. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Esler, Philip Francis, ed. *Modeling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Evans, C. A. and J. A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Fairweather, Janet. "The Epistle to the Galatians and Classic Rhetoric." *Tyndale Bulletin* 45.1 (1994): 1-38, 213-43.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- _____. "Freedom and the Life of Obedience (Galatians 5:1-6:18)." *Review and Expositor* 91 (1994): 201-17.
- Feldman, L. H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Feldman, Louis H. "The Concept of Exile in Josephus." Pages 145-72 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott; Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Fensham, F. Charles. *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1982.
- Finlan, Stephen. *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Finn, Thomas M. *From Death to Rebirth: Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist, 1997.
- Fiore, Benjamin. "Covert Allusion in 1 Cor 1-4," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 85-102.

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Letter to the Galatians." Pages 236-46 in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- _____. "Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography" *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1974): 201-25.
- _____. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1961): 297-333.
- Fletcher, Douglas K. "The Singular Argument of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." Ph.D. diss., Princeton, 1982.
- Flusser, David "'Durch das Gesetz dem Gesetz gestorben' Gal 2, 19." *Judaica* 43 (1987): 30-46.
- Forbes, C. "Comparison, Self-Praise, and Irony." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 1-30.
- Forkman, Göran *The Limits of the Religious Community*. Lund: Gleerup, 1972.
- Fowl, Stephen. "Who Can Read Abraham's Story?: Allegory and Interpretive Power in Galatians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 55 (1994): 77-95
- Fredrikson, Paula. "Judaism and the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2." *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 533-64.
- Fridrichsen, Anton. *Exegetical Writings: A Selection*. Translated by Chrys C. Caragounis and Tord Fornberg. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. First Series 76. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Fung, Ronald Y. K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Funk, Robert W. "Word and Word in 1 Corinthians 2:6-16." Pages 275-305 in *Language, Hermeneutic, and the Word of God: The Problem of Language in the New Testament and Contemporary Theology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. Anchor Bible 32A. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- _____. "Paul the Theologian." Pages 19-34 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by R. T. Fortna and B.R. Gaventa. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.
- _____. *The Moral Teaching of Paul*. Rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1985.
- _____. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.
- Garlington, Don. "Role Reversal and Paul's Use of Scripture." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 65 (1997): 85-121.
- Gaston, Lloyd. "Angels and Gentiles in Early Judaism and Paul." *Studies in Religion* 11 (1982): 65-75.
- _____. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987. Repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2006.

- Gathercole, Simon J. "Torah, Life, and Salvation: Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and the New Testament." Pages 126-45 in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- _____. "Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as Paradigm." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 309-26.
- _____. "The Maternity of Paul: An Exegetical Study of Galatians 4:19." Pages 189-201 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.
- _____. "The Singularity of the Gospel: A Reading of Galatians." Pages 147-59 in *Pauline Theology, Volume I*. Edited by Jouette M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Genette, Gérard. *Pamlimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Gerleman, Gillis. *Studies in the Septuagint, II Chronicles*. Lund: Gleerup, 1946.
- Gilbert, Maurice. "La place de la Loi dans la prière de Néhémie 9." Pages 307-16 in *De la Tôrah au Messie*. Edited by Maurice Carrez, Joseph Doré, and Pierre Grelot. Paris: Desclée, 1981.
- Glad, Clarence E. "The Rhetoric of Moral Exhortation in Clement's Pedagogue." Pages 433-66 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Edited by James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedesen. New York: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Glare, P. G. W., ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.
- Goldstein, Jonathan. *II Maccabees*. Anchor Bible 41A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- Gombis, Timothy G. "The 'Transgressor' and the 'Curse of the Law': The Logic of Paul's Argument in Galatians 2-3." *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 81-93.
- Goodman, Martin. "Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century." Pages 53-78 in *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. Edited by Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Gordon, T. D. "The Problem at Galatia." *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 32-43.
- Gowan, Donald E. "The Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic." Pages 205-23 in *Scripture in History and Theology*. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977.
- Grabe, Petrus J. "Paul's Assertion of Obedience as a Function of Persuasion." *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992): 351-58.
- Grindheim, Sigurd. "Apostate Turned Prophet: Paul's Prophetic Self-Understanding and Prophetic Hermeneutic with Special Reference to Galatians 3.10-12." *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 545-65.
- Gromacki, Robert G. *Stand fast in Liberty: An Exposition of Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

- Habel, N. "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 77 (1965): 297-323.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 81. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Hagedorn, Dieter. *Zur Ideenlehre des Hermogenes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Hahn, Scott W. "Covenant, Oath, and the Aqedah: ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ in Galatians 3:15-18." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 67 (2005): 79-100.
- Hainz, Josef. "Koinônia bei Paulus." Pages 375-92 in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. Edited by L. Bormann et al. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Hall, R. G. "Arguing like an Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient Topos Outside the Greco-Roman Rhetorical Tradition." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 434-53.
- _____. "Historical Inference and Rhetorical Effect," Pages 308-20 in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of G. A. Kennedy*. Edited by D.F. Watson. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- _____. "The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians: A Reconsideration." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 277-87.
- Halliwell, Stephen. "Philosophy and Rhetoric." Pages 222-43 in *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Edited by Ian Worthington. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- _____. "Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character." Pages 32-59 in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Edited by Christopher Pelling. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. "Sacred Violence and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3:13): The Death of Christ as a Sacrificial Travesty." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 98- 118.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Text und Textgeschichte des 2. Esrabuches*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften 253. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
- Hansen, G. Walter. *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.
- _____. *Galatians*. The IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Harpocraton, Valerius. *Harpocraton et Moeris ex Recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri*. Berlin: Reimer, 1833.
- Harrill, J. Albert. "Paul and Slavery." Pages 575-607 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.
- Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, eds. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody, 1980.

- Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Harvey, A. E. "The Opposition to Paul." Pages 321-33 in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Edited by Mark D. Nanos. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007. Repr. from pages 319-32 in vol. 4 of *Studia evangelica*. Edited by F. L. Cross. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 102. Berlin: Akademie, 1968.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Hays, R. B. "Justification," Pages 1129-33 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Hays, Richard B. "Christology and Ethics in Galatians: The Law of Christ." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 268-90.
- _____. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- _____. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.
- _____. "The Letter to the Galatians." Pages 181-348 in *2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*. The New Interpreter's Bible 11. Nashville: Abingdon, 2000.
- _____. "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and Pauline Christology: What Is At Stake?" Pages 35-60 in *Pauline Theology, Volume IV: Looking Back, Pressing On*. Edited by E.E. Johnson and D. M. Hay. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- _____. "'The Righteous One' As Eschatological Deliverer: A Case Study in Paul's Apocalyptic Hermeneutics." Pages 191-215 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 24. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.
- _____. "The Role of Scripture in Paul's Ethics." Pages 30-47 in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Heath, Malcolm. *Hermogenes on Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- _____. "John Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians." *Biblical Interpretation* 12 (2004): 369-400.
- Hengel, Martin and C.K. Barrett. *Conflicts and Challenges in Early Christianity*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999.
- Henten, J. W. van. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- Hephaestion. *Enchiridion*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906.
- Heraclitus. *Homeric Problems*. Edited and Translated by Donald A. Russell and David Konstan. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Hermogenes. Opera*. Edited by H. Rabe. *Rhetores Graeci*. 6 vols. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1894.
- Hermogenes' On Types of Style*. Translated by Cecil W. Wooten. Chapel Hill: University of Chapel Hill Press, 1987.
- Hester, James D. "Epideictic Rhetoric in Galatians 1 and 2." Pages 181-96 in *The Galatian Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Edited by Mark D. Nanos. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- _____. *Paul's Concept of Inheritance: A Contribution to the Understanding of Heilsgeschichte*. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 14. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1968.
- _____. "Placing the Blame: The Presence of Epideictic in Galatians 1 and 2." Pages 281-307 in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Edited by Duane F. Watson. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 50. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1991.
- Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Hodge, Caroline Johnson. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Holladay, William L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Holmberg, Bengt. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Holmgren, Frederick C. "Faithful Abraham and the 'āmānā Covenant Nehemiah 9:6-10:1." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 104 (1992): 249-254.
- _____. *Israel Alive Again: A Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Holmstrand, Jonas. *Markers and Meaning in Paul: An Analysis of 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Galatians*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 28. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1997.
- Holtz, T. "Zum Selbstverständnis des Apostels Paulus," *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift* 91 (1966): 321-30.
- Holtz, Traugott. "The Question of the Content of Paul's Instructions." Pages 51-71 in *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*. Edited by Brian S. Rosner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Hong, In-Gyu. "The Law and Christian Ethics in Galatians 5-6." *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992): 113-30.

- _____. *The Law in Galatians*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 81. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- _____. "The Perspective of Paul in Galatians." *Scriptura* 36 (1991): 1-16.
- Horbury, William. "Extirpation and Excommunication." *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 13-38.
- Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Wandel im Geist: Zur pneumatologischen Begründung der Ethik bei Paulus." *Kerygma und Dogma* 38 (1992): 149-70.
- Householder, Fred W., Jr. "IIAPΩΔΙΑ." *Classical Philology* 39 (1944): 1-9.
- Howard, George. *Paul: Crisis in Galatia: A Study in Early Christian Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- _____. *Crisis in Galatia*. 2d ed. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hübner, Hans. "Der Galaterbrief und das Verhältnis von der antiker Rhetorik und Epistolographie." 109 *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1984): 241-50.
- _____. "Das ganze und das eine Gesetz, Zum Problemkreis Paulus und die Stoa." *Kerygma und Dogma* 21 (1975): 239-56.
- _____. "Gal 3,10 und die Herkunft des Paulus." *Kerygma und Dogma* 19 (1973): 215-31.
- _____. *Law in Paul's Thought: A Contribution to the Development of Pauline Theology*. Translated by James C. G. Grieg. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1984.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 5 (1979): 46-62.
- Hutchinson, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Isocrates*. Translated by George Norlin and La Rue van Hook. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928-1945.
- Janz, Timothy. "The Second Book of Ezra and the 'Καίγε Group.'" Pages 153-70 in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Cambridge 1995*. Edited by Bernard Taylor. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Japhet, Sara. "People and Land in the Restoration Period." Pages 96-116 in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Essays on the Restoration Period*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Jaquette, James L. *Discerning What Counts: The Function of the Adiphora Topos in Paul's Letters*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 146. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- _____. "Paul, Epictetus, and Others on Indifference to Status." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994): 68-80.

- Jebb, Richard. *The Attic Orators From Antiphon to Isaeus*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1893.
- Jegher-Bucher, Verena. *Der Galaterbrief auf dem Hintergrund antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik: Ein anderes Paulusbild*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 78. Zürich; Theologischer Verlag, 1991.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- Jervis, L. Ann. *Galatians*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 9. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Jewett, Robert. "The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation." *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 198-212.
- _____. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Jobs, Karen H. "Jerusalem, Our Mother: Metalepsis and Intertextuality in Galatians 4:21-31." *Westminster Theological Journal* 55 (1993): 299-320.
- Jobs Karen H. and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Paternoster/Baker, 2000.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1926-1965.
- Juel, Donald. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Jurgens, W. A. *The Priesthood: A Translation of the PERI HIEROSYNES of St. John Chrysostom*. New York: MacMillan, 1955.
- Kaibel, George, ed. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Berlin: Reimer, 1878.
- Kampen, John and Moshe J. Bernstein, eds. *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Symposium Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kennedy, George A. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- _____. "Classical Rhetoric." Pages 92-115 in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Edited by Thomas O. Sloane. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition From Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- _____. *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- _____. "Historical Survey of Rhetoric." Pages 3-41 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.- A.D. 400*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- _____. *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises From the Hermogenic Corpus*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

- _____. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- _____. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Kern, Philip. *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistle*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Kertelge, Karl. "Gesetz and Freiheit im Galaterbrief." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 382-94.
- _____. "Letter and Spirit in 2 Corinthians 3." Pages 117-30 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 89. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1996. Repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- _____. "*Rechtfertigung*" bei Paulus: Studien zur Struktur und zum Bedeutungsgehalt des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbegriffs. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, neue Folge 3. Munster: Aschendorff, 1967.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia C. *Paul and His Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 181. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Kieffer, Rene. *Foi et Justification a Antioch: Interpretation d'un Conflit*. Paris: Cerf, 1982.
- Kim, Seyoon. *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- King, Daniel Hayden. "Paul and the Tannaim: A Study in Galatians." *Westminster Theological Journal* 45 (1983): 340-70.
- Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. "Der Text von Hab 2 4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 76 (1985): 68-85.
- _____. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.
- Kraftchick, Steven John. "Ethos and Pathos Appeals in Galatians Five and Six: A Rhetorical Analysis." Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 1985.
- _____. "Why Do the Rhetoricians Rage?" Pages 55-79 in *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament*. Edited by Theodore Jennings. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Kramer, Werner R. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Studies in Biblical Theology 50. London: S.C.M., 1966.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Saint Paul, Epître aux Galates*. 2d ed. Paris: Gabalda, 1925.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "Church Discipline and the Interpretation of the Epistles to the Corinthians." Pages 337-61 in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*. Edited by W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, and R.R. Niebuhr. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

- _____. ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2007.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "The Line of Thought in Gal 2:14b-21." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977): 484-95.
- Larcher, C. *Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse*. Paris: Gabalda, 1969.
- Lategan, B.C. "The Argumentative Situation of Galatians." *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992): 257-77.
- Lategan, Bernard. "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." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 411-30.
- _____. "Level of Reader Instructions in the Text of Galatians." *Semeia* 48 (1989): 171-84.
- Lau, P. H. W. "Gentile Incorporation into Israel in Ezra-Nehemiah." *Biblica* 90 (2009): 356-73.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Translated by M. Bliss, A. Jansen, and D. Orten. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Lelièvre, F. J. "The Basis of Ancient Parody." *Greece and Rome*. Second Series 1 (1954): 66-81.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion*. New York: Harper Collins, 1985.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1879.
- Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *An die Galater*. 4th ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations*. 1865. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- Lindemann, A. "Die biblischen Toragebote und die paulinische Ethik." Pages 242-65 in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by W. Schrage. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Gesetz Erwägungen zur Auslegung und zur Textgeschichte von Römer 10:5." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 73 (1982): 231-50.
- Lindberg, Gertrud. "Hermogenes of Tarsus." Pages 1979-2062 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2, *Principat*, 34.3. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: De Gruyter, 1997.
- Lockwood, J. F. and N. G. Wilson. "Aristophanes (2)." Page 165 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. 3d ed. Rev. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Longenecker, Bruce W. "Πίστις in Romans 3:25: Neglected Evidence for the 'Faithfulness of Christ'?" *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 478-80.
- . "Sharing in Their Spiritual Blessings? The Stories of Israel in Galatians and Romans." Pages 58-84 in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Edited by Bruce W. Longenecker. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- . *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Translated by W. H. Fyfe. Revised by Donald Russell. In Aristotle vol. 23, *The Poetics*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Lull, David John. "'The Law was our Pedagogue': A Study in Galatians 3:19-25." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 481-98.
- . *The Spirit in Galatia: Paul's Interpretation of Pneuma As Divine Power*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 49. Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Lucian*. Translated by A. M. Harmon, K. Kilburn, and M. D. MacLeod. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913-1967.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Lührmann, Dieter. "Abendmahlsgemeinschaft? Gal 2:11ff." Pages 271-86 in *Kirche: Festschrift für Günther Bornkamm*. Edited by Dieter Lührmann and Georg Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr, 1980.
- . *Galatians: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by O.C. Dean, Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Lütgert, Wilhelm. *Gesetz und Geist: Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefes*. Beiträge zur Forderung christlicher Theologie 22/6. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1919.
- Luther, Martin. *A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: Based on Lectures at the University of Wittenberg in the Year 1531 and First Published in 1535*. Translated by P.W. Watson. London: James Clarke, 1953.
- . *Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. 40. II. Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1914.
- Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992.
- Lyons, George. *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 73. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Maccoby, Hyam. *Paul and Hellenism*. London: SCM, 1991.

- MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 20. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Mack, Burton. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Edited by Dan O. Via Jr. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. New Testament Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Malan, F. S. "The Strategy of Two Opposing Covenants: Galatians 4:21-5:1." *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992): 425-40.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- _____. *Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Library of Early Christianity 4. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- _____. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Malina, Bruce J. and Jerome H. Neyrey. *Portraits of Paul: An Archaeology of Ancient Personality*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996.
- Malina, Bruce J. and John J. Pilch. *Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Marcus, Joel. "The Circumcision and Uncircumcision in Rome." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 67-81.
- _____. "The Evil Inclination in the Letters of Paul." *Irish Biblical Studies* 8 (1986): 8-21.
- _____. "Modern and Ancient Jewish Apocalypticism." *Journal of Religion* 76 (1996): 1-27.
- Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956.
- Marshall, Peter. *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.
- Martin, Brice L. *Christ and the Law in Paul*. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Martin, Dale B. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Martin, Troy W. "Apostasy to Paganism: The Rhetorical Stasis of the Galatian Controversy." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 437-61. Repr., pages 73-94 in *The Galatian Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Edited by Mark D. Nanos. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- _____. "The Covenant of Circumcision (Genesis 17:9-14) and the Situational Antitheses in Galatians 3:38" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 111-25.
- _____. "Pagan and Judeo-Christian Time-Keeping Schemes in Gal 4:10 and Col 2:16." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 120-32.
- _____. "Whose Flesh? What Temptation? (Galatians 4.13-14)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 74 (1999): 65-91.

- Martyn, J. Louis. "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 410-24.
- _____. "Christ and the Elements of the Cosmos." Pages 125-40 in *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. Nashville; Abingdon, 1997.
- _____. "The Covenants of Hagar and Sarah." Pages 160-92 in *Faith and History: Essays in Honor of Paul W. Meyer*. Edited by John T. Carroll, Charles H. Cosgrove, and E. Elizabeth Johnson. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- _____. "The Crucial Event in the History of the Law (Gal 5:14)." Pages 48-61 in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish* Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- _____. "Events in Galatia. Modified Covenantal Nomism versus God's Invasion of the Cosmos in the Singular Gospel: A Response to J.D.G. Dunn and B. R. Gaventa." Pages 160-79 in *Pauline Theology, Vol. 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*. Edited by Jouette M. Bassler. Vol. 1 of *Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- _____. *Galatians*. The Anchor Bible 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- _____. "A Law-Observant Mission to Gentiles: The Background of Galatians." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 38 (1985); 307-24.
- _____. "The Textual Contradiction Between Habakkuk 2:4 and Leviticus 18:5." Pages 183-90 in *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Matera, F. J. "The Culmination of Paul's Argument to the Galatians: Gal. 5:1-6:17." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988): 79-91.
- _____. "The Death of Christ and the Cross in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *Louvain Studies* 18 (1993): 283-96.
- _____. *Galatians*. Sacra Pagina 9. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Matlock, R. Barry. "The Arrow and the Web: Critical Reflections on a Narrative Approach to Paul." Pages 44-57 in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Edited by Bruce W. Longenecker. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- _____. "Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective." *Novum Testamentum* 42 (2000): 1-23.
- _____. "Helping Paul's Argument Work? The Curse of Galatians 3.10-14," Pages 154-179 in *The Torah in the New Testament: Papers Delivered at the Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008*. Edited by Michael Tait and Peter Oakes. New York: T&T Clark International, 2009.
- _____. "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 3.26: Neglected Evidence for 'Faith in Christ'?" *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 433-39.
- _____. "The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2:16, 3:22, Romans 3:22, and Philippians 3:9." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (2007): 173-203.

- Mayer, Friedrich. *Die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Glauben: der rechtschaffene Glaube: Betrachtungen über den Galaterbrief und den Jacobusbrief*. Metzgingen: Franz, 1986.
- Mays, James Luther. *Micah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 25-44.
- McCown, Chester Charlton. *The Testament of Solomon*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922.
- McKnight, Scot. *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Meagher, Patrick. "Faith Active Through Agape (Gal 5:6): A Study of the Formation of a Christian Community of Agape According to the Letter to the Galatians." Ph.D. diss., Pontifical Institute, Rome, 1984.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from Jewish Communities." Pages 93-155 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, Others in Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- _____. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity." *History of Religions* 13 (1974): 165-208.
- _____. "Judgment and the Brother: Romans 14:1-15:13." Pages 290-300 in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for his 60th Birthday*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- _____. Review of Hans Dieter Betz. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 304-7.
- _____. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. 2d ed. New Haven: Yale, 2003.
- _____. *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Library of Early Christianity 6. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- _____. *The Origins of Christian Morality*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- _____. "The Social Context of Pauline Theology." *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 266-77.
- Meineke, August. *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*. 2 Vols. Berlin: Reimer, 1839-1847.
- Menander Rhetor*. Edited and translated by D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
- Merk, O. "Der Beginn der Paränese im Galterbrief." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 60 (1969): 83-104.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1994.

- Minor Attic Orators*. Translated by K. J. Maidment and J. O. Burt. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941-1954.
- Mitchell, Margaret. "Chrysostom, John." Pages 28-34 in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*. Edited by Donald K. McKim. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1998.
- _____. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Mitchell, Stephen. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Morgan, Theresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Morland, Kjell Arne. *The Rhetoric of Curse in Galatians: Paul Confronts Another Gospel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Fullness and Fill in the New Testament." *Scottish Journal of Theology* (1951): 79-86.
- Mullins, Terrence Y. "Formulas in the New Testament Epistles." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 380-90.
- Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Translated by Frank Clarke. Richmond: John Knox, 1959.
- Mussner, Franz. *Der Galaterbrief*. 3d enl. ed. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 9. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.
- Murray, Gilbert. *Aristophanes: A Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.
- Myers, Jacob M. *Ezra Nehemiah*. Anchor Bible 14. Garden City: Doubleday, 1964.
- Nadeau, Ray. *Hermogenes On Stasis: A Translation with an Introduction and Notes*. Speech Monographs 31 (1964): 361-424.
- Nanos, Mark D. *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Neville, Graham. *Saint John Chrysostom: Six Books on the Priesthood*. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Newman, Judith H. "Nehemiah 9 and the Scripturalization of Prayer in the Second Temple Period." Pages 112-23 in *The Function of Scripture in the Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 154. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- _____. *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Bewitched in Galatia: Paul and Cultural Anthropology." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 72-100.

- Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1. Edited by Philip Schaff. 1886-1889. 14 vols. Repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *Commentary on Philippians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- _____. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Patrologia graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-1886.
- Patrologia latina. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Pauly, August Friedrich von. *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. New ed. Edited by Georg Wissowa. 49 vols. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1894-1963.
- Perelman, Chaïm. *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982.
- Perelman, Chaïm and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Philo*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1953.
- Philonenko, Marc. *Joseph et Aséneth. Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, et Notes par Marc Philonenko*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Philostratus. *Apollonius of Tyana*. Translated by Christopher P. Jones. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005-2006.
- Plumer, Eric. *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Plutarch. *Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914-1926.
- _____. *Moralia*. Translated by F. C. Babbitt et al. 16 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-2004.
- Polybius. *The Histories*. Translated by W. R. Paton. 6 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922-1927.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1994.
- _____. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Preisendanz, Karl ed. *Papyri graecae magicae: die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973.

- Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Translated with Introduction and Notes by George A. Kennedy. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. Translated by Donald A. Russell. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.
- _____. "Gerichtsdoxologie." Pages 245-54 in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament Band 2*. Edited by Rudolf Smend. Munich: Kaiser, 1973.
- Redditt, Paul L. "The Concept of *Nomos* in Fourth Maccabees." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 249-70.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "Nehemiah 9: An Important Witness of Theological Reflection." Pages 111-17 in *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*. Edited by Mordechai Cogan et al. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Rice, Philip and Patricia Waugh, eds. *Modern Literary Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Roberts, J. J. M. *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.
- Roo, Jacqueline C. R. de. "The Concept of 'Works of the Law' in Jewish and Christian Literature." Pages 116-47 in *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 192. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
- Rose, Margaret A. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rosner, Brian S. *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.
- Rowe, Galen. "Demosthenes' Use of Language." Pages 175-99 in *Demosthenes' On the Crown*. Edited by James Murphy. New York: Random House, 1967.
- _____. "Style." Pages 127-57 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 300 B.C. – A.D. 400*. Edited by Stanley Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Russell, Donald. *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Russell, Donald and Michael Winterbottom, eds. *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Rutherford, William G. *Scholia Aristophanica: Being Such Comments Adscript to the Text of Aristophanes as Have Been Preserved in the Codex Ravennas*. 3 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1896.
- Sanders, E. P. "Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11-14." Pages 170-88 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.

- . *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.
- . *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983.
- Scaliger, J. C. *Poetics Libri Septem*. Lyons, 1561.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. "Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible: A Re-Examination of Galatians 3:10." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27 (1984): 151-60.
- Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 48. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992.
- . "Paul's Use of Deuteronomic Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 645-55.
- Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Senft, Christophe. *La Première Épitre de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens*. 2d ed. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament 7. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990.
- Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939-.
- Silva, David A. de. *4 Maccabees*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Smith, D. Moody, Jr. "Ο ΔΕ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ." Pages 13-25 in *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark*. Edited by Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs. Studies and Documents 29. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.
- Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Spengel, Leonard, ed. *Rhetores Graeci*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1853-1856.
- Sprinkle, Preston M. *Law and Life: The Interpretation of Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and in Paul*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 241. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Staats, Reinhart. "Chrysostomus über Die Rhetorik des Apostels Paulus." *Vigiliae christianae* 46 (1992): 225-40.
- Standaert, B. "La rhétorique ancienne dans saint Paul." Pages 78-92 in *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style, et Conception du Ministère*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 73. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- . “‘Under A Curse’: A Fresh Reading of Galatians 3.10-14.” *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 481-511.
- Steck, Odil H. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geshick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum, und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. “Das Problem theologischer Strömungen in nachexilischer Zeit.” *Evangelische Theologie* 28 (1968): 445-58.
- Steiner, Richard C. “On the Dating of Hebrew Sound Changes and Greek Translations (2 Esdras and Judith).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 229-67.
- Stocker, Peter. “Parodie.” Pages 637-49 in vol. 6 of *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Edited by Gert Ueding et al. 10 vols. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992-2012.
- Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. Edited by H. F. A. von Armin. 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1905-24.
- The Speeches of Aeschines*. Translated by Charles Darwin Adams. 1 vol. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Thayer, Joseph H. *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1896. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Theocritus. *Bucolici Graeci*. Edited by Andrew S. F. Gow. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.
- Theon, Aelius. *Progymnasmata*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002.
- Theophrastus. *Characters*. Edited by Jeffrey Rusten and I. C. Cunningham. 1 vol. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Thiessen, Matthew. “The Function of a Conjunction: Inclusivist or Exclusivist Strategies in Ezra 6.19-21 and Nehemiah 10:29-30.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 34 (2009): 63-79.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians II: Commentary on 2 Corinthians VIII-XIII*. International Critical Commentary 9. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- Throntveit, Mark A. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 1992.
- Thurén, Lauri. “John Chrysostom as a Modern Rhetorician.” Pages 218-40 in *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics*. Edited by James D. Hester and J. David Hester. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Trapp, Michael B. “Demetrius (15).” Page 450 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. 3d ed. rev. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Vos, Johan S. “Paul’s Argumentation in Galatians 1-2.” *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994): 1-16.

- Wakefield, Andrew. H. *Where to Live: The Hermeneutical Significance of Paul's Citations from Scripture in Galatians 3:1-14*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Walker, William O., Jr. "Translation and Interpretation of ἐὰν μὴ in Galatians 2:16." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 515-20.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wallach, Barbara P. "Pseudo-Hermogenes and the Characterizing Oath." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 22 (1981): 257-67.
- Walter, Nikolaus. "Paulus und die Gegner des Christusevangeliums in Galatien." Pages 351-6 in *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style, et Conception du Ministère*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 73. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.
- Walz, Christian, ed. *Rhetores Graeci*. 9 vols. London, 1832-36. Repr. Osnabruck: Otto Zeller, 1968.
- Waters, Guy. *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 221. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Wengst, Klaus. *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*. Studien zum Neuen Testament 7. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: the "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- White, John L. "Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 91-97.
- White, John Lee. *The Body of the Greek Letter*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 2. Missoula: University of Montana, 1972.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Williams, Sam K. "Again Pistis Christou." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 431-46.
- . *Galatians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentary. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- . *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 2. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- . "Justification of the Spirit in Galatians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29 (1987): 91-100.

- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Word Biblical Commentary 16. Waco: Word, 1985.
- . “Structure and Historiography in Nehemiah 9.” Pages 117-31 in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies [1985] Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East*. Edited by David Assaf and Moshe H. Gosen-Gottstein. Jerusalem: Magnes Press Hebrew University, 1988.
- Willitts, Joel. “Context Matters: Paul’s Use of Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians 3:12.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 54 (2003): 105-22.
- Winston, David. *Wisdom of Solomon*. Anchor Bible 43. Garden City: Doubleday, 1979.
- Wisdom, Jeffrey R. Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law: Paul’s Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*. Second Series 133. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Witherington, Ben III. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Wooden, R. Glenn. “2 Esdras.” Pages 405-23 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . “Interlinearity in 2 Esdras: A Test Case.” Pages 119-44 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by W Kraus and R. G. Wooden. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 53. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . “The φορολόγος of 2 Esdras.” Pages 248-57 in *Die Septuaginta- Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Setuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Wooten, Cecil. *Cicero’s Phillipics and Their Demosthenic Model: The Rhetoric of Crisis*. Chapel Hill: University of Chapel Hill Press, 1983.
- Woude, A. S. van der. “Micha 2:7a und der Bund Jahwes mit Israel.” *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 388-91.
- . “Micah in Dispute with the Pseudo-Prophets.” *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 244-60.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Young, Norman H. “Who’s Cursed – And Why? (Galatians 3:10-14).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998): 79-92.
- Ziegler, Konrat and Walther Sontheimer, eds. *Der Kleine Pauly: Lexikon der Antike*. Auf der Grundlage von *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. New edition. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1972.
- Ziesler, Joseph. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. London: Epworth, 1992.

Biography

Kathy Barrett Dawson was born in Atlanta, Georgia, on November 27, 1956. She earned a B.A. from Mercer University in Atlanta in 1977, double-majoring in Religion and History, receiving the Departmental Award in Religion, and graduating *summa cum laude*. Dawson worked as an insurance claims adjuster and lived in many states and Europe during the years that her husband, H. Lee Dawson, was an officer in the United States Air Force. During those years, she and her husband had two children: a daughter, Hayley Marie, and a son, Byron Lee. She received a M. Div. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1997, and then earned a Th.M. in New Testament from Duke Divinity School in 2000. Most recently, she has been enrolled at Duke University in the Graduate Program in Religion. While at Duke, she has taught a year of Hellenistic Greek as a Visiting Instructor at Duke Divinity School. She has also taught two courses on the Life and Letters of Paul and one course on the New Testament as a Visiting Instructor at Duke University Summer Session. She has presented several papers at the Annual Meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature in the areas of Pauline Epistles, Rhetoric and the New Testament, Literary and Biblical Criticism, and Josephus. She currently resides in Rocky Mount, N.C. with her husband and son.