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In the Letter to the Galatians the law has been superseded by Christ's cross and faith in Christ is contrasted to the law. The juxtaposition of the law and the cross occurs in 2.19, where Paul speaks of them in terms of dying and living. The purpose of the present study is to do four things.

First, Paul's letters have been examined for their uses in context of 'cross, crucifixion' and 'law', so that the basis for theological reflection might be the texts themselves. We conclude that although Paul's references to 'law' oscillate in stridency and meaning, and his references to 'cross, crucifixion' are few, the law and cross represent the before and after of Paul's life.

Second, our exegesis of Gal 2.19 leads to three observations. 'Dying to-living to' refers to death and life within specific relationships, that to law and that with God. 'Being crucified with' refers to Paul's own inclusion and participation in the death of Christ, so that when Christ died Paul also died. 'Through the law' indicates the death-bringing character of the law itself. Behind Paul's statements about dying and living are the death and resurrection of Christ, which serve as the frame of reference for Paul.

Third, Gal 2.19 has been compared to the argument of Galatians 2-3, 4.1-7, and Paul's summary statement in 6.14-15. Our test question is what Paul means by dying 'through law' and whether law should be understood as the
cause of death.

Finally, it is the conclusion of this study that Paul views the law as death-bringer, causing the death of Christ and the death of Paul in relation to law. This heightens the singularly life-giving character of faith in Christ.
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Introduction

The present study began following the observation that although Paul frequently refers to the death of Christ, he refers to the cross or crucifixion of Christ in relatively few places. Why is this the case? Indeed, Paul does not mention the cross or crucifixion in each of his letters. Why then does he find it necessary or helpful to do so in the few letters when the cross is an explicit part of his message? Why, on many occasions, does Paul speak of the death of Christ, and on a few other occasions speak of the manner or means of that death? Does the answer lie within certain aspects of the context which Paul addressed? Or was there a development within Paul’s own thought and proclamation which led him either to or away from language about the cross? Did he come to understand his own experience by way of Jesus’ death on the cross? Was there a combination of these or other reasons? What purpose within the letters do his references to cross and crucifixion serve?

Pursuing these questions leads to texts wherein Paul responds to the problem of the law. More than all his other letters, it is especially Galatians in which the cross and the law together occupy centre stage in Paul’s argument. It is specifically Gal 2.19 alone where Paul refers both to the law and to crucifixion. What then is the connection here between the cross and the law?
The present study is an exegesis of Gal 2.19: ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταρωμαί. The purpose of the study is to investigate what Paul means by dying 'through the law...to the law', and especially what this means in relation to being 'crucified with Christ'. Implicit in this question is the relationship of Paul and first century Judaism. A synopsis of an investigation into that problem will help lay out the present study's method and procedure.

In an insightful analysis of E. P. Sanders' Paul and Palestinian Judaism, B. R. Gaventa surveys the methods by which the Paul-Judaism relationship has been studied, examines Sanders' proposal for a new method, and offers an altered form of that proposal.¹ It is her proposal which serves as a point of departure for this study of Gal 2.19, and it is best to commence with reference to her review.

'Comparison of essences' is one of the major types of studies in which scholarship has dealt with the question of Paul and Judaism.² The tendency in this method is to reduce the thought of Paul and the thought of Judaism to a few key phrases, with the resultant essences set in sharp contrast to each other. Thus, the thought of Paul has been characterized as justification by faith, and Judaism as a religion of works. But there are several

¹ Gaventa, 'Comparing Paul and Judaism: Rethinking Our Methods', pp. 37-44.
problems here, and they compound one another. No religion can be reduced to a phrase or set of phrases. The polemic of Paul's letters has often been used to produce a description of Judaism, and that description has been used in the comparison or contrast to Paul. Finally, the literature which represents two religions may be so different in kind as to make comparison difficult or unfair.

'Comparison of motifs' is another major type of study, in which themes of one religion have been set over against the themes of another. This method, however, fails to take a religion on its own merits, and tends to neglect the whole of that religion for the sake of certain parts.

'Comparison of patterns' is Sanders' proposal for overcoming the deficiencies of these methods. The whole of one religion must be compared to the whole of another, with each defined and described on its own terms. By 'pattern' Sanders means the movement from logical starting point to the logical conclusion of a religion, hence, how getting in and staying in are understood. The pattern which Sanders sees in Judaism is what he calls 'covenantal nomism': in divine mercy God chose Israel, provided atonement in the law, and those who live in obedience to the law remain in the covenant. The pattern which Sanders

---

3 Sanders, Paul (1977), pp. 7-12.
sees in Paul is what he calls 'participationist eschatology': those who believe in Christ have already become one with him, and upon his return will be fully transformed. Sanders' conclusion is that these are two different types of religion, and Paul's critique of Judaism is that it is not Christianity.

One problem which Gaventa sees with Sanders' proposal is that we in fact do not have wholes to compare. In Paul's letters, for example, the Apostle does not set out to establish the entire scheme of his thought and teaching, but rather intends to respond to very specific situations in particular places which involve certain problems and persons. In addition to that, we have in the letters only one side of the conversation, or, to put it another way, we have Paul's answers to questions which at best we can often only infer. Again, the agenda of Paul's letters is often set by others to whom he is responding, and even texts to which he relates have frequently been chosen for him by his opponents' previous use of those texts. A further problem which Gaventa sees with Sanders' proposal is that he has presumed in advance which questions are important. Thus, Sanders' treatment of Palestinian Judaism is selective, as he has confined it to issues which have been deemed as relevant to Pauline scholarship. Sanders' account of Paul is also selective, as what we have in his discussion of Paul 'is a compendium

---

of Pauline thought" on a selection of topics determined by aspects of the history of Pauline interpretation.

The altered method which Gaventa proposes may be described in three stages. First, the use of vocabulary with which Paul addresses his topics is one place to begin ascertaining what was important to him. Then, rather than letting the treatment of Paul be controlled by earlier discussion, we begin with the texts themselves. On the question of law, for example, we should first note where Paul refers to νόμος and where he does not because, 'What is important is that an investigation into the pattern of Paul's religion should begin, not where others have left off, but where the texts themselves begin.'

Second, Paul's conversation partners must be allowed to speak, and the context of Paul's communities be allowed to emerge. This involves examination of each letter in its own right, with a view to discovering what questions each letter itself wishes to ask or answer. Paul's viewpoints may become distorted if attention is not given to the viewpoints of his addressees and the sociology of ancient Christianity. Speaking of 1 Cor 1.10-4.21, N. A. Dahl has made four suggestions which may in fact be paradigmatic for every epistle: (1) the controversy must be studied as such, including Paul's perspective, or answers, and the (Corinthians') perspective, questions, or

7 Gaventa, 'Methods', p. 40.
8 Gaventa, 'Methods', p. 42.
problems inferred from Paul's answers; (2) a reconstruction of the background should be made on the basis of information within the section of text being studied; (3) the contextual exegesis ought not be prejudiced by similarity to Gnostic material, Acts, or other Pauline epistles; (4) at best a reconstruction of historical background will be only a 'reasonable hypothesis'.

Third, given the terminology of Paul's conversation, the issues represented by his partners or opponents, and the situation of the church which he addresses, is there a pattern in each particular letter, or a number of patterns, to his response? Does he consistently present certain convictions or opinions? Do these emerge in more than one letter, or in all the letters, and can we from them ascertain the pattern of Paul's religion?

---

9 Dahl, 'Paul and the Church at Corinth', in Studies In Paul, p. 45. See his, 'The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church', in Neotestamentica et Patristica, p. 266, where Dahl points out that Paul's letters, having been written for particular destinations may have been the reason for which the author of Luke-Acts ignored them, even though he surely knew of their existence. The tendency of the church was for 'catholic' epistles, and with it came a tendency for generalizing interpretation. And yet, p. 271, 'To the apostle himself, letters to particular churches written on special occasions were the proper literary form for making theological statements. Of this fact both exegesis and theology, not to mention preaching, have to take account. The particularity of the Pauline epistles points to the historicalness of all theology, even that of the apostle.' See Cullmann, 'The Plurality of the Gospels as a Theological Problem in Antiquity', in The Early Church, pp. 39-58; Beker, Paul (1980), ch. 1.
To apply this procedure to the literature of two religions such as Judaism and Paul's Christianity would be a difficult task, for the literature of each religion is greatly different in kind from that of the other. Paul's literature, after all, is occasional. It tends to be problem oriented, and is intended for the life of a specific community or congregation. The literature represented by many Jewish texts is not generally as conversational in that same sense. And yet the outline of the method is cited here in order to indicate the direction of the present study. The basic aspects of the method inform this approach to Galatians and to the question of the relation of the cross and the law in 2.19. It is in that relationship that the meaning of each for Paul, in that situation, comes to light, and informs our understanding of what occasioned the letter.

Thus, Part I in the present study surveys the epistles for uses and contexts of the terms, 'law', and, 'cross/crucifixion'. Chapter 1 concentrates on cross/crucifixion throughout the letters. Chapter 2 narrows the survey to Galatians. Chapter 3 concentrates on the law throughout the letters. Chapter 4 focuses on the law in Galatians. Chapter 5 summarizes the place of the law and the cross in Paul's epistles, and particularly in the Galatians argument. And yet the presupposition here is not that an understanding of Paul's message is to
be derived on the basis of statistical evidence. But the point remains: if Paul is not talking about a particular topic, there must be very good reasons for the interpreter to import that topic into the text. Conversely, if the words are present, the question why they are present must be asked, and the meaning of the words examined. This is true not only of individual words, but of words in combination with other words, in the context of the theological argument of the epistle. Thus, the place to begin is with the exact speech of the text itself.

Part II is a study of the various parts of Gal 2.19. Chapter 1 relates 2.19 to its immediate context, especially as it commences in 2.14b, and then examines the 'dying to, living to' concept. Chapter 2 examines the verb, 'crucified with'. Chapter 3 concentrates on Paul's phrase, 'through the law'. Chapter 4 compares Gal 2.19 to Rom 7.1-6, and especially 7.4, where Paul speaks of dying 'through the body of Christ'. Gal 2.19 is part of Paul's response to the Galatian situation of law-imposition.

---

10 Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language, p. 233, points out what he thinks is a flaw in a theological method which is 'organized under words' because, 'Theological thought of the type found in the NT has its characteristic expression not in the word individually but in the word-combination or sentence.' On this basis he is critical of Kittel's TDNT. The point would be well taken if individual words were left in isolation and used as inflexible measures of theological thought.

11 Funk, Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God, pp. 277, 304, rightly maintains that the text must speak for itself, within and over against its frame of reference, and thus lexical or comparative investigations must not be disparaged out of hand.
illustrate and strengthen his position, Paul reports the Antioch incident with Peter, and 2.19 is either part of the rebuke that he reports having delivered to Peter, or it is his extension of that conversation now applied to the Galatians. Peter's actions at Antioch must therefore be taken as representative of the Galatian position with which Paul presently contends. Paul's answer to this position is that he has died to and through the law. He speaks of his participation with Christ in terms of being crucified with Christ. These statements express Paul's antithesis to Peter's vacillating behaviour and the Galatian problem with the law.

Does the 'dying to (and) through' and 'crucified with' terminology of 2.19 indicate a particular way of thinking about the event of Christ's death on the cross? If so, what does the epistle itself teach us about what Paul must have meant by such language? And what might be the significance of such a way of thinking for believers in Christ, relative to law-keeping as a way of keeping faith?


The Conclusion summarizes how best we may understand Paul's phrase, 'through the law', in light of what can be
observed from the study as a whole, and especially in light of what Paul means by being 'crucified with Christ'.

It has often been the practice in a church's theological pursuits to support with selections of Pauline texts the principles prescribed by the dogmatic bias of a particular ecclesiastical tradition. ¹² This practice has tended to treat Paul's epistles as though any one of them could have been written to any of the churches. This has obscured the particularity and peculiar logic of each letter. It may have obscured the teaching of Paul himself by making of him much more a rigid dogmatician than he in fact was. Paul used a special vocabulary in the service of his central conviction. His responses to the teaching of those whom he thought would undermine his gospel were sometimes reasoned and sometimes visceral. He relied on patterns of speech and thought which characterize his faith and his proclamation as thoroughly theological despite his being 'not a theologian but a missionary'. ¹³ It has been said that Paul's whole doctrine 'is a doctrine of Christ and his work', ¹⁴ and that for Paul Christ is 'the supreme mighty act of God, the decisive factor in the

¹² See T. David Gordon, 'The Problem at Galatia', pp. 32-43, for a reevaluation which questions the 'Lutheran' as well as other traditional schemes of Paul.

¹³ Manson, On Paul and John, p. 11. But it is more precise to say, with Sanders, Paul (1977), p. 433, that Paul was not a systematic theologian.

¹⁴ Wrede, Paulus, p. 86.
unfolding and realization of the divine purpose'. How did the cross of Christ represent that act and purpose, and why does Paul speak of the cross so explicitly in Galatians? What did it mean for Paul to be crucified with Christ? Did Paul see the law impinging on the central teaching of the cross? And what does it mean for Paul to say that he died through the law? In order to investigate these questions it will be helpful first to locate the places throughout his letters where Paul speaks of the cross and the law. When we have seen the unique place of the cross and the law in Galatians, we can move to Gal 2.19 and its context in Paul's theological argument.

---

15 Manson, On Paul, p. 16.
PART I

THE CROSS AND THE LAW IN PAUL
1.1 PAUL AND THE CROSS

In Gal 2.19 two central aspects of Paul's theology occur in juxtaposition. These two aspects are the law and the cross.¹ And yet when we describe these as central aspects we encounter a problem, for in some of Paul's letters neither one of them is mentioned and in other letters the mention of either is indeed scanty. To begin with Paul's use of σταυρός, σταυρίζω, a survey of his epistles shows the relative infrequency with which he mentions the terms.² In 1-2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon neither the noun nor the verb are used in any form.

1. In 1 Corinthians the problem of κύριοςματα, 'dissensions' (1.10), and ἐρωτά, 'quarreling' (1.11), manifest in the 'Εγώ slogans of various parties (1.12), is the problem that Paul immediately addresses.³ He reminds

¹ Although RSV places 'I have been crucified with Christ' in v. 20, both the Nestle and UBS editions of the Greek text place it at the end of v. 19. It is this latter arrangement to which this study refers, in viewing both law and cross as part of v. 19.

² Moulton and Geden, A Concordance to the Greek New Testament; Aland, Vollständige Konkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament; Kubo, A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament. What are commonly accepted as genuine letters of Paul are to be distinguished from those probably of deuto-Pauline authorship. For the sake of inclusiveness all letters bearing Paul's name in the canon are in the survey.

³ Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, pp. 136-139, is not convincing in his denial that factions existed in Corinth. 'Bickerings' (p. 139) seems weak for describing a problem that Paul saw fit to address
his hearers that it was Christ, and not Paul (and by implication thus no other party hero, either) who was crucified for them (1.13).

Paul introduces the cross on the personal level, in connection with his own name, thus mentioning it for the first time before he begins his argument from scripture in 1.19. But having named the problem of dissensions (1.10) and quarreling (1.11) Paul moves forward immediately to his extended argument against wisdom. This suggests that the divisions (or threat of them) were an effect of a larger cause, namely the Corinthians' involvement with worldly wisdom. The movement from the party problem to the wisdom argument is clear and concise in 1.13-17. It includes Paul's assertions that: (1) he baptized only a few of them, so none ought to say that they were baptized in his name (1.13-15);4 (2) he was not sent to baptize but to preach, (1.17);5 (3) his preaching of the gospel was straightaway in his letter. The basis and mark of the cleavages was attachment to individual leaders, making common thought difficult and jeopardizing the common meal. Cf. Dahl, 'The Church at Corinth', pp. 42-43; Maurer, TDNT 7:964; Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 10. The split into groups has not led to the dissolution of the community. See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 32; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, pp. 41-42.

4 See Lohse, The Formation of the New Testament Canon, p. 63, on the relationship between the initiate and the mystagogue in the mystery religions, and how for the baptized in the Christian community a firm and significant relationship was also a factor.

5 Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 36-37, points out that only the preaching of the cross can check the developments in Corinth, and this preaching characterizes Paul's call to be an apostle.
not with words of wisdom, lest the cross of Christ (1.17b) be emptied (of its power). In this second use of cross terminology Paul seems concerned that the manner of his preaching should not be out of harmony with its content. His references to baptism do not devalue baptism, but indicate that his call is to preach the word of the cross. This is what will check the developments in Corinth and bring the Corinthians to common persuasion about Christ crucified.

The third use is when Paul characterizes his own preaching as ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ (1.18), in contrast to ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου (1.17). The theme and contrast are continued into chapter 2, as Paul speaks of the rulers of this age with their wisdom of this age (2.6-8). In 2.2 he relates his deliberate decision (ἐκπίνακα)9 to know nothing among the Corinthians except Jesus Christ, and him crucified (ὁ σταυρωμένον). This again is in contrast to σοφίας (2.1). The aorist ἐκπίνακα refers to Paul's first

---

6 Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 49, speaks of preaching as the proclamation of the cross, the cross as the source of power in preaching, and the message of Christ crucified as that which persuades.

7 Weiβ, Der erste Korintherbrief, pp. 22-23, sees here a concern for both form and content, for 1.17; 2.1, and 2.4, taken together, show 'daß beide Begriffe dem P. dicht neben einander stehen...daß für P. das Rhetorische und das Dialektische-Zwingende nahe bei einander liegen.'

8 See Munck, Paul, p. 154.

9 ἐκπίνακα indicates a conscientious and deliberate decision about what ought be said. See BAG, p. 452. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 54, speaks of it in terms of 'resolve'.
visit among the Corinthians, a visit that would have come after Athens, Luke's recounting of which (Acts 17) shows no mention of the cross in the Areopagus sermon.\textsuperscript{10} Paul recalls the deliberate decision about the content of his preaching as having been made upon coming to Corinth. Although the deliberateness of his word of the cross may have seemed clearer for Paul while writing than it was for his hearers when he visited and preached among them, he here couches the recall in the aorist to suggest that the decision, having then been made, is one from which he has not departed. He is now not writing as though introducing new material, but reminding his hearers of what had been there from the start, as an established part, indeed the centre, of Paul's kerygma. The third use in 1.18 and the (fifth) use in 2.2 thus both speak of the content, not the manner, of Paul's preaching.\textsuperscript{11} The fourth use in 1.12 conforms to this same concern for content.

Paul is reacting against two aspects of wisdom: (1) wisdom as speech (1.17; 2.1-5; 4.20), and, (2) wisdom as

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} Haenchen, \textit{Die Apostelgeschichte}, p. 468: 'Lukas hat die Lehre vom Auferstandenen als den Stein des Antstoßes stehen lassen.' In 1 Thes 1.9-10 (which may summarize Paul's message to the Thessalonians) Paul also speaks of the living God and the resurrection of the Son, but not the death or cross of Christ.
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Käsemann, \textit{Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen}, p. 268, maintains that in keeping with the religious character of sophia in Hellenism, we ought translate it as 'theology' throughout the wisdom argument in 2.6-16. This means not theology in the usual sense: '...daß damit nicht Wissenschaft im modernen Sinne, sondern Heilslehre gemeint ist.'
\end{itemize}
a means of knowing God (1.21; 2.6-3.4). It is speech as sophia, and it is sophia as salvation. It is not simply special wisdom, but saving wisdom. To counter such claims the cross is upheld by Paul as the very ground of salvation, and content of his proclamation.

Thus the contrast in 1 Corinthians 1 is not between wisdom and no wisdom, but between wisdom and cross or between worldly wisdom and God's wisdom. Paul's argument focuses on τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν (1.19) and τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου (1.20). Essential to the argument is wisdom's

12 Horsley, 'Wisdom of Word and Words of Wisdom in Corinth', pp. 224-229, here pp. 224, 229. For the different shades of meaning which 'wisdom' may have in Paul see Barrett, 'Christianity in Corinth', pp. 278-282.

13 Weder, Das Kreuz Jesu bei Paulus, p. 165, says that Paul takes over the Stichwort, 'wisdom', at the beginning of 2.6, and forms his own wisdom with it, thus usurping a term that had been misused in Corinth. God's coming into the world has its correspondence in just such a usurpation of worldly speech, and suffuses not only the wisdom of the world but the world's speech, with the word of the cross. 'So erobert Gott die Sprache ...' (p. 166) with a hidden wisdom in which (p. 168-169), 'der Herr der Herrlichkeit kein anderer als der Gekreuzigte ist.... Der Respekt vor diesem Geheimnis verbietet es, vom Gekreuzigten zum Auferweckten fortzuschreiten (wie die Korinther es getan haben mögen).' Weder quotes Jüngel, 'Der Schritt des Glauben im Rhythmus der Welt', in Unterwegs zur Sache (BEvTh 61), p. 270: 'Wer den Tod des auferstandenen Herrn überspringt, überspringt den irdischen Jesus und damit die Geschichte der Welt.' Paul seizes back for his own use a traditional 'revelation schema' (see Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 58) of God's decreed mystery now revealed. It is critical to note that this schema is interpreted by the history of the cross, not vice versa. God is thus known historically only in the death and resurrection of Christ. This is the sense of the new turn given to the Stichwort, 'wisdom'.

14 The wisdom of the wise (1.19), the debater of this age, and the wisdom of the world (1.20) are not to be understood generically, but in connection with what is happening in Corinth. Hence, Schlatter, Die korinthische Theologie, in Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher
opposite, μωρία (1.18, 21, 24, 25). This description of the cross would have been particularly meaningful to a Greek-speaking Gentile community, to whom the 'slave's death' on the 'barren tree' was a well-known form of 'folly' and 'madness'. Such descriptions of Christianity abounded in the pagan judgments on Christians, and the term serves Paul's 'bold oxymoron' as he speaks of the foolishness of the kerygma in contrast to wisdom of the world.

It is the inability to perceive this fundamental distinction that led the rulers of this age (2.8) to crucify the Lord of Glory. This sixth usage of cross terminology leads on to the contrast between the spirit of the world and the Spirit which is from God (2.12), the unspiritual (2.14) and spiritual man (2.15), and the

---

15 Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 21, point out that μωρία is peculiar to 1 Corinthians in the NT (1.18, 23; 2.14; 3.19).

16 Hengel, Crucifixion, pp. 1-10, 39, here p. 2: 'The folly and madness of the crucifixion can be illustrated from the earliest pagan judgement on Christians'; Helmut O. Gibb, "Torheit" und "Rätsel" im Neuen Testament', pp. 6-10; Bertram, TDNT 4:845-847.

17 Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 21.

18 Weder, Kreuz, p. 167: '...dass die Machthaber dieser Welt den Herr der Herrlichkeit gekreuzigt haben, bringt ihre Nicht-Erkenntnis der Weisheit Gottes offen zu Tage.'
mention again of the party heroes, Paul and Apollos (3.4), allegiance to whom has been evidence that the Corinthians are σαρκίων (3.1). With this term Paul thus places the Corinthians in the realm of the old aeon, in which category he also places sin, death, and law. Whether the Corinthians' problem should be understood in terms of an 'over-realized eschatology' in which 'they already live on the far side of eschatological judgement in the perfection of the new aeon (4.7f)', or in terms of their failure to comprehend the discontinuity between the new aeon and the old, Paul counters their position with his word of the cross. The cross is thus the antithesis to the Corinthian tendency, by which Paul overturns their values: what is great in the eyes of the world in fact runs contrary to God's purpose, and God's saving purpose is established in what seems weak and foolish to the world.

---

19 See 2.1; 2.4; 3.1 of the present study.


21 Wilckens, TDNT 7:520.

22 K. Barth, Resurrection of the Dead, pp. 116-121.

23 Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 54 n. 16: 'The Corinthians have gone on from the cross to the exaltation. Paul reverses the direction of thought: from exaltation to the cross. The result of the resurrection is not that the cross is superseded, but rather that it becomes possible to speak of it.'

2. Cross is not mentioned in 2 Corinthians nor Romans, and crucify only once in each of those letters.

2.1. In 2 Cor 13.4 Paul speaks of the crucifixion of Christ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, 'in weakness', in contrast to Christ living presently ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ, 'by (the) power of God'. Paul's own sufferings and weakness correspond to the weakness of Christ, and are the paradoxical signs and vehicles of God's power (12.9-10). This strength in weakness (12.10) is in contrast to the superlative apostles' reliance on outward signs and commendation (12.11-13), about which they have apparently boasted (11.12, 21; 10.18).²⁵ Paul here clearly speaks in two-aeon language, and places his opponents and their ministry, along with Moses (3.13) and the law (3.6), in the old aeon. In this context Paul spoke of weakness, and pointed to his own ἡλίψε (1.4, 8; 2.4; 4.17; 6.4; 7.4; 8.2, 13) as over against human strength, in order to defend his apostolicity against the superlative apostles (11.5) to whom he had unwillingly been compared. The cross in 2 Corinthians represents the paradoxical 'when I am weak, then I am strong', as Paul sees in his thorn in the flesh a correspondence between his own condition and the death

of Christ. As Christ died in weakness, so Paul will boast or glory only in that which corresponds to Christ's death.

2 Corinthians uses καθόμας, καθήμα, and καθήσεται a total of 29 times. But the one use of a form of σταυρός (13.4) comes in Paul's warning about his impending third visit, in which he expects to deal with the Corinthians according to God's power. This power manifests itself in Paul's weakness, which for him was the sign of true apostolicity (11.30; 12.9-12). Here σταυρός is not used with καθήσεται but with ἀσθενεία. Christ crucified in weakness is the paradigm for apostolicity. The theme of weakness in 2 Corinthians 10-13 indicates the letter's

26 Park, 'Paul's Skolops Tae Sarki: Thorn or Stake?', pp. 179-183; Giallanza, 'When I Am Weak, Then I Am Strong'.

27 See Bultmann, TDNT 3:645-653. The term is used in the NT almost exclusively by Paul, and can indicate human self-confidence as over against faith in God, which 'implies the surrender of all self-glorying' (p. 649). But see Dunn, 'Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law', pp. 523-542, who speaks of boasting in national privilege and identity. See 3.1 below. The new possibility of an appropriate and proper boasting is opened up for Christians for whom the object of boasting is Christ and his work. See 2 Cor 1.12; 7.4; 8.24; 11.10; 7.14; 9.2; 10.8, 13, 17; 11.30; 12.1; Gal 6.14.

28 Bultmann, The Second Letter to the Corinthians, p. 243, points out that ἐὰν ἀσθενεία is scarcely meant in a causal sense --- "as a result of his weakness"...", but rather that ἐὰν is chosen for the sake of its rhetorical correspondence with ἐὰν σωμάμεως θεοῦ, and means, 'as one who is weak'. The crucified and the risen Christ are contrasted, but the one who would share the risen life must also share the suffering and death. This is the witness of Paul's own life.
implicit *theologia crucis*. 2 Corinthians and Galatians have certain ideas in common. 2 Corinthians is like Galatians in its view of the law as negative and inferior (2 Cor 3.6-11). 2 Cor 5.21 is similar in thought and structure to Gal 3.13. A similar problem, that of extraneous interlopers, is represented by 2 Cor 11.4 and Gal 2.4. The 'all' of 2 Cor 5.14 reminds us of the 'all' in Gal 3.26, as the new creation in 2 Cor 5.17 reminds us of the same theme in Gal 6.15. But despite these similarities the total absence of the word νόμος in 2 Corinthians indicates that the law as such was not the problem in that situation, although Paul does refer to it in 3.6-11. The problem was the self-sufficiency of the superlative apostles (12.11) who gloried in written letters of recommendation (3.1), which, like the 'written code' (3.6) on 'tablets of stone' (3.3) are in contrast to the new covenant, the life-giving Spirit (3.6) and the surpassing splendour (3.11) of the dispensation of righteousness (3.9).

2.2. In Rom 6.6 the compound verb, συνεσταυρώθη (aor. pass.) refers to the old self and its enslavement to sin.

---

29 'Implicit' in as much as the cross terminology is for the most part absent, but also implicit in another sense. Beker, *Paul The Apostle*, pp. 201-202, points out that in contrast to John's gospel, in which the cross is glorified as the gateway to heaven, in 2 Corinthians the cross is the hour of Jesus' weakness.

30 Hooker, 'Interchange', pp. 352-3.

31 Keck, 'The Post-Pauline Interpretation of Jesus' Death in Rom 5.6-7', *Theologia Crucis-Signum Crucis*, p. 237, has noticed that in Romans Paul never expressly mentions the cross, but only alludes to it at 6.6. Keck
Paul's only other use of this compound verb is in Gal 2.19, where συνεστάφρωμαι (perf. pass.) refers to Paul's relation to the law. The only other NT uses of the compound form are Matt 27.44, Mark 15.32, and John 19.32. On Golgotha the robbers were crucified on their crosses alongside Jesus. The passive voice in all references shows something done to a person, an action neither initiated nor completed by the person. Did Paul know this tradition of the robbers crucified with Jesus, and shape it to his own particular theological interpretation? The origin of Paul's idea probably lies elsewhere.

3. Cross is used twice in Philippians and (for the sake of comparison, questions of authorship aside) once in Ephesians and twice in Colossians.

concludes that, 'Clearly, the importance of the cross for Paul is not disclosed by statistical evidence. ...'


33 On the speculation that the use of this verb in Gal 2.19 is rooted in the scene on Calvary see Duncan, Galatians, p. 71. But the explanation of Wedderburn, Baptism and Resurrection, pp. 346-7, is more likely. He sees it rather as Paul's adaptation of an old idea (solidarity of the many with a founder) for a new purpose (dying with Jesus as one for whom Jesus died). The idea of being 'with Christ' would have had to undergo a considerable shift in meaning from the idea of two fellow-victims who were with him at his crucifixion to the idea of being with Christ in Paul's sense.

34 For the sake of completeness in this survey all epistles attributed to Paul in the English Bible (RSV, et al) are included, with cognizance that most scholars would include only seven as authentically Pauline. One interesting exception is proposed by Morton and McLeman, Paul, The Man and the Myth, p. 110, who, on the basis of computer analysis of material that bears the imprint of one mind, derive a five-epistle Paul (Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philemon). With respect to
3.1. Phil 2.8b is part of the Christ-hymn which Paul quotes, and is probably a gloss added by Paul to the hymn to bring more emphasis to the text than is carried by θανατός. The emphatic δὲ modifies σταυρός, not θανατός, and focuses on the completeness of Christ’s self-emptying and obedience. The gloss indicates Paul’s shaping of pre-Pauline material to serve his theologia crucis. With this word of the cross, he encourages the Philippians in

Ephesians, in particular, two different ways of understanding certain characteristics of the letter are represented by M. Barth and Käsemann. Barth, Ephesians, 1:48-50, sees a mature Paul behind the ecclesiology of Ephesians. Käsemann, 'Paul and Early Catholicism', pp. 236-251, here p. 243, sees a catholicizing of Paul by the church, as his apocalyptic is replaced by a sacramental presence of Christ in the church.

35 M. Barth, Ephesians, 1:6-8, has a helpful listing of characteristics by which hymnic material may be recognized; cf. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 335.


38 Weder, Kreuz, p. 209, speaks of this text as ‘Das Ende mythologischer Rede’. And, p. 213, he says that the question of who Christ is can no longer be answered on the grounds of mythological dramas about a Redeemer who descends and ascends again to heaven. The question of who Christ is, is inseparably connected to another question, that of who Jesus was. The insertion in the hymn of the death on a cross thus has an important result for the understanding of the entire hymn. It becomes its middle, by which the other statements appear in a new light. Thus, p. 214, ‘Der Mythos wird jetzt im Rahmen des Kreuzes verstanden, nicht mehr das Kreuz in die Allgemeinheit des Mythos aufgehoben.’
their suffering for Christ's sake (1.29), to strive for the faith of the gospel (1.27), and not to fear their opponents (1.28). As in 2 Corinthians 10-13, suffering is viewed from the perspective of personal identification with the cross.

3.2. Phil 3.18 speaks of the enemies of the cross whose minds are fixed on earthly things. The oblique reference to circumcision (ἀρχήν)³⁹ and the earthly (ἐπίγεια) mind-set in 3.19 remind of the circumcision conflict in Galatians (5.2) and the cross-wisdom contrast in 1 Corinthians (1.18-20).

3.3. Eph 2.16 speaks of reconciliation of Jew and Gentile through (ἐκατοντάκτης) the cross, as the means by which Christ ends the hostility between them, making 'both one' (v. 14). This 'one' is a new entity, since it is neither

---
³⁹ Kümmel, Introduction, p. 328, calls the term a euphemism for genitals. To the contrary Michael, Philippians, p. 176, sees it as a reference to debased liberty; Bruce, Philippians, p. 107, does not think the sexual sense is well attested by the word itself; Loh and Nida, A Translator's Handbook on Philippians, p. 117, judge by the context ('bodily desires, things that belong to this world') that it refers to immoral conduct. With Kümmel, Vincent, Philippians, p. 117, agrees with Bengel, who refers it to vs. 2 and explains it as pudenda; K. Barth, Philippians, p. 113, understands it in terms of the biting polemic of v. 2, with v. 19 'a further allusion to circumcision which for concreteness leaves nothing to be desired'. See Bultmann, TDNT 1:190, who recognizes here the usual meaning of 'disgrace', although the word is used in this verse in such a way as to play on its sexual meaning. The observation of Hawthorne, Philippians, p. 166, regarding the structure of the sentence is convincing: the καὶ links ἡ κοσμία and ἡ δόξα together as a single subject, with ὁ ἐστὶς as the predicate. It thus should read, 'they have made their stomach and their glory in their shame their god'. Paul's accusation, then, is that what has become god to them is food laws and the rite of circumcision.
of the former sides which were divided by the 'wall of hostility'. There is 'one new person' (v. 15). The theme is similar to the 'new creation' of Gal 6.15, where Paul shows a third alternative to the two communities represented by 'circumcision' and 'uncircumcision'. These two communities were indicative of the old cosmos. A new entity, people of faith in Christ, indicating the new creation, follows from the cross of Christ.

3.4. Col 1.20 strikes the same theme of reconciliation, this time of all things to God, making peace διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ.Forms of ἀποκαλλάσσω are used both here and in the Ephesians text. This reconciliation is another way of speaking of the deliverance from the dominion of darkness and transfer to the kingdom of the Son (1.13).

3.5. Col 2.14 speaks of nailing to the cross the legal bond which stood against us. The act of nailing (προσηλώσας) reminds us of the ἀλων (John 20.25), marks of which were proof of Jesus' identity as the Crucified One. The legal demands (δύνασκά) of the (handwritten) bond were blotted out. The terminology points to the law as that
which was nailed to the cross. Taken together the two thoughts about the antagonistic law and the blotting out of the written record remind us of Gal 2.19ff: Paul is dead to the condemning law that was instrumental in the curse and death of Christ.

The greatest number of σταυρός, σταυρῶν uses occurs in Galatians and 1 Corinthians. 1 Corinthians uses cross twice (1.17, 18) and crucify four times (1.13, 23; 2.2, 8). Galatians uses the noun three times (5.11; 6.12, 14) and the verb four times (2.19; 3.1; 5.24; 6.14). The compound form of the verb in 2.19 is the same compound as the sole usage in Romans, at 6.6.

Since these are all the texts in which cross and crucify are used in the Pauline (and deuto-Pauline) epistles, it is clear that the uses are few indeed compared to the theological weight assigned Paul's theologia crucis. And yet Christ's redeeming death on the cross is a message so central to Paul's kerygma that news of One 'who gave himself for our sins' is pivotal in every letter Paul wrote. If we accept the most common consensus about the chronology of the letters we see that

43 Käsemann, for example, quotes Luther's exposition of Psalm 5.12, 'crux sola est nostra theologia', in Perspectives, p. 34, regarding the importance of the cross in Paul's theology. Luz, 'Theologia Crucis als Mitte der Theologie im Neuen Testament', p. 122, says of Paul's theology of the cross: 'Für Paulus besteht Kreuzestheologie nicht darin, daß er das Kreuz interpretiert, sondern daß er vom Kreuz her die Welt, die Gemeinde, den Menschen interpretiert.'

44 It is generally accepted that 1 Thessalonians was Paul's first letter, followed by either Galatians and 1 Corinthians, or vice versa, with Romans and Philippians
Paul did not refer to the cross in his earlier writings and did so infrequently in his later writings. The chronologically middle epistles have the most references.\textsuperscript{45} Answers to why this is so may lie within Paul's own theological development,\textsuperscript{46} the specific nature of each situation he addressed,\textsuperscript{47} and the ways in which those situations influenced his message.\textsuperscript{48} Our survey of Paul's crucifixion terminology refutes the notion of a fixed Pauline schema and attendant vocabulary with which he encountered every situation. And yet, there is a firm, later. See Jewett, A Chronology of Paul's Life; Hurd, 'Chronology, Pauline', IDB, Supp. Vol.; Hurd, The Origin of 1 Corinthians, pp. 3-41; Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 179-181.

\textsuperscript{45} Benoit, 'The Law and the Cross according to St. Paul', in Jesus and the Gospel 2:11-39, observes this same phenomenon in Paul's use of νόμος.

\textsuperscript{46} Marshall lists some of the writers who have attempted to trace the stages of development in Paul's thought, as those stages are reflected in the epistles, once the epistles have been placed in chronological order. See 'Pauline Theology in 1 and 2 Thessalonians', in Paul and Paulinism, p. 182 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{47} Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, pp. 4-8, cites the danger of abstracting a biblical term from its historical situation. He advises a contextual analysis which must: (a) take account of the literary context of sentence, paragraph, and letter as a whole; (b) analyze (anthropological) terms in relation to historical situation, theological argument, and chronological framework; (c) relate the term to the 'linguistic horizon' of the first century, to discover the assumptions of Paul's conversation partners and the impact and alteration of his arguments.

\textsuperscript{48} Grant, Historical Introduction to the New Testament, p. 175, has pointed out that, 'there are very wide variations in Paul's use of words. His usage depends primarily on subject matter, not on some ideal norm.' The subject matter would in turn depend on the contingency of the situation. See Beker, Paul (1980), pp. 23-36.
consistent centre to Paul's message. So far we have seen that centre expressed in terms of cross and crucifixion the most explicitly in 1 Corinthians. The references there occur mainly within Paul's argument from Scripture, in a setting which called for him to emphasize the cross as the overturning of worldly values. These two factors, scriptural argument and antithesis of his opponents' values and theology, are also central in Galatians, where Paul's references to cross/crucifixion are relatively frequent.\(^49\) We concentrate next on these references to the cross in Galatians.

\(^{49}\) See 3.2 n. 19 below. The pattern of the scriptural arguments in Galatians and 1 Corinthians is the same. But in Galatians Paul seems to argue from the OT because his opponents have done so, and Paul responds to their use of particular texts. In 1 Corinthians his argument is not based on the biblical texts in so fundamental a way. If 1 Corinthians were written soon after Galatians, then it is reasonable to think that these two aspects of Paul's approach carried over from one letter to the other. That is, he used Scripture in Galatians because he had to, and used it in 1 Corinthians because it was a means of argument thus fresh in his mind. And in Galatians the crucified Messiah who died as one who was accursed epitomized the reversal of values which also informed Paul's approach to the wisdom problem in Corinth.
1.2 THE CROSS IN GALATIANS

In Galatians Paul refers to cross or crucify eight times. Four of these references use some form of the verb: 2.19; 3.1; 5.24; 6.14. Three references use the noun: 5.11; 6.12, 14. Gal 3.13 does not explicitly mention either cross or crucify, but the reference to hanging on a tree indicates crucifixion.

1. In Gal 2.19 Paul uses the phrase Χριστῷ συνεσταθρωμαι to speak of his relation to the law. The perfect passive in 2.19 refers to an event that has taken place at a definite time and which is still in effect. There is nothing in the context to warrant ascribing this death to the time of Paul's conversion or call. In 1.15-16 Paul has spoken of that call in terms of revelation and apostolicity. In 2.19 Paul may be referring to the event and time of Christ's death on the cross, which, when it happened, included Paul in its meaning and effect. Paul uses this phrase in conjunction with διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον. This putting together of crucifixion and death to and through the law may correspond to 3.10-13, where Christ's death under the curse of law could offer a clue to understanding 2.19.

2. In Gal 3.1 the use of ἐσταυρωμένος represents a

---

1 Benoit, 'The Law and the Cross', pp. 11-39.

2 Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 145, points out that the use of the perfect participle 'expresses an existing (in this case permanent) result of the past fact
point of close similarity to 1 Corinthians. The same word is used at 1 Cor 1.23 and 2.2, both times modifying Xριστάνειν, the object of Paul's preaching (1.23), and the content of what Paul had deliberately decided to know among the Corinthians. Thus Paul identifies his gospel with Christ crucified. In Gal 3.1 the participle also modifies Jesus Christ as that message which was placarded (προεγραφη) before the eyes of the Galatians.

In the context of this argument from experience (3.1-5), and taken together with τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε (3.2) and ἐναρξάμενοι πνεῦματε (3.3) the verb points to preaching about the ἔσταυρωμένος (3.1) which marked the beginning of the Galatians' faith. The Crucified One was their message of salvation. These three texts in 1 Cor 1.23; 2.2, and Gal 3.1 speak of Christ crucified as the content of Paul's kerygma. It is only the Galatians text, however, in which ἔσταυρωμένος is implicitly in contrast to ἔξ ἔργων νόμου of crucifixion'. A present participle would indicate 'in the act of being crucified' or 'hanging on the cross'. Thus, the thought here is not of Jesus as having been affixed to the cross and hanging there, but of Jesus who was put to death on the cross and thereafter, although risen, is yet the Crucified One. On crucifixion as a means of death see Burton's bibliographical references, pp. 146-147; Schneider, TDNT 7:572-584; Hengel, Crucifixion.

3 See 1.1 nn. 5, 6, 9 above.

4 For several meanings of this word, and the choice of 'placarded' or 'publicly announced' (i.e. preaching) see Burton, Galatians, pp. 144-145; Lightfoot, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, p. 134; Betz, Galatians, p. 131; Schrenk, TDNT 1:771; Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, 1:292-294; Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 49; Weder, Kreuz, p. 182.
In 3.2, hearing with faith and reception of the Spirit are placed on the same side as ἑσταυρωμένος in 3.1, against the impossibility of faith having begun with ἐγραυνόμον. Then in 3.3 Spirit and flesh are placed in opposition, and in 3.5 Spirit and miracles are placed on the same side, along with faith, against works of the law. The law is thus opposed by Spirit, faith, miracles, and the Crucified One.

3. Paul uses σκάνδαλον once in Galatians and 1 Corinthians, and on both occasions it is in proximity with σταυρός.5 In Gal 5.11 Paul says that if he had preached circumcision6 (of which he apparently had been accused)

---

5 The word also occurs in Romans (9.33; 11.9; 14.13; 16.17) but never in proximity to the cross. The verb occurs at Rom 14.21; 1 Cor 8.13; 2 Cor 11.29. See Stählin, TDNT 7:339-358.

6 Betz, Galatians, p. 269, identifies this phrase, used only here, as an ad hoc formulation of Paul, used in contrast to κηρύσσω Χριστοῦ. Borgen, 'Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men', in Paul and Paulinism, p. 44, suggests that Paul reacts to the Judaizers' misunderstanding of his position. They thought that, 'Paul continued to preach (and practice) circumcision after he received his call to be an apostle... In his letter Paul objects to this misunderstanding....' Watson, Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles, p. 200 n. 99, does not speak to Borgen's main thesis and contends, p. 69, that 'Paul opposes circumcision because it is the rite of entry into the Jewish people, and for that reason alone. Thus, denial of circumcision means exclusion from the Jewish community, i.e. persecution (Gal. 5:11). Christ is incompatible with circumcision not because "Christ" involves a theological principle (receiving salvation as a sheer gift) which is incompatible with an alleged principle underlying circumcision (earning salvation), but because Paul has already decided that the church is only the church when it is separate from the Jewish community.' But Paul's argument is that the church is the church by faith in Christ, not that the church is the church by separation from the Jewish community. Watson's view presumes an earlier split between church and synagogue than is usually attested. See Davies, 'Paul and the Law:
then the scandal which is the cross would be removed. The scandal of the cross as the way of salvation would be nullified (5.2), they would be severed from Christ (5.4), and they would be obligated, following circumcision, to keep the whole law (5.3). This obligation amounts to slavery (5.1). In 1 Cor 1.23 the cross is scandal to Jews and μορφα to Gentiles. The general scandal is that of the crucified man, and especially in Galatians a crucified Messiah. This is expressed by Paul in his use of Deut 21.23 at Gal 3.13. In Gal 5.11 the scandal points to God's way of establishing justification and granting grace. Gal 3.13 is the only text in which Paul explicitly refers to Deut 21.23, with hanging on a tree interpreted to mean crucifixion, although in Gal 3.13 he does so not in connection with scandal but with curse. The same thought seems near to 1 Cor 1.23, although there the Deuteronomy text is not cited and curse is not mentioned. In Gal 5.11 the use is part of the argument contrasting works of the law and hearing with faith (5.2-6), a contrast introduced in 2.15 and running throughout the letter. In 1 Corinthians the use of σαρκωμοντος is anti-wisdom and part of Paul's defense of his own apostolicity,7

Paul's apostolicity is at stake in Galatians as an issue that is parallel to the attack on the truth of his gospel, the law-free salvation of Gentiles, and Paul's understanding of his mission. That is, the question was whether it would be Paul's apostolicity or that of others that was authoritative for the Galatians. The same question recurs in 1 and 2 Corinthians. The literature on

Reflections on Pitfalls in Interpretation', pp. 4-16, here p. 6; Betz, Galatians, p. 323. Finally, the texts of Galatians do not speak of separation from Judaism.

7
and it is in the context of that argument that scandal is used in combination with the cross. Only in Galatians are cross and scandal used together in the argument against circumcision and the law (5.11).

4. Gal 5.24 is the sole declaration that the flesh has been overcome which is spoken of in terms of crucifixion. The reference to 'crucified with' in Rom 6.6 is part of Paul's argument against sin, not against flesh, and is passive, whereas Gal 5.24 uses the aorist active. This indicates a past activity on the part of the believer in crucifying the flesh. In Rom 6.6 the 'old man' is put to death. 'Flesh' in Gal 5.24 refers to the sinful nature, while in texts like 6.13, where it is used with 'your', it clearly refers to the physical flesh that was cut in circumcision. Flesh in 5.24 is in contrast to Spirit. Works of the flesh are opposed to fruits of the Spirit. To be led by the Spirit is to be free from the law (5.18). In 5.24 Paul's use of ἐστάρωσαν is part of the law-Christ (or law-faith) contrast, with belonging to Christ (οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) excluding works of the flesh.

Apostolicity is immense, but a place to begin is with Barrett's Signs of an Apostle. See 1.3 n. 5 below.

8 Betz, Galatians, p. 289, argues against a sacramental interpretation of this text, stating that it refers neither to baptism nor to a moral-religious decision made by Christians after their baptism. It is rather a statement of 'Christian ethical existence with specific reference to the "flesh"'. That is, being in Christ enables the Christian to neutralize the power of the flesh to produce its passions and desires.

9 Jewett, Terms, pp. 96, 453ff.
and life under law.

5. The anti-circumcision statement in Gal 6.12 contrasts 'good showing in the flesh' with 'persecuted for the cross', and is the only place where Paul speaks of the cross as that for which one might be persecuted. It is this persecution which the promoters of circumcision wanted to avoid, although they are not really interested in keeping the whole law.\(^{10}\)

6. By contrast to his opponents, Paul glories only in the cross (6.14a). This is similar to Phil 3.18, where Paul speaks of the enemies of the cross whose glory (δόξα, not καθαρισμός) is in their shame (αἵροθύνη, 3.19). The good showing in the flesh corresponds to glorying in their shame (Gal 6.12: Phil 3.18), and what is negatively implied in Phil 3.18-19 is positively stated in Gal 6.14a: Paul glories only in the cross. Only in Galatians are persecution (μὴ διώκωντας, 6.12) and cross used together, and Gal 6.14 is the only text that uses σταυρός with καθαρισμός. Paul equates a return to life under the law with gloriing in the flesh, as flesh takes on the double sense of both life in the power of the old aeon and the

---

\(^{10}\) Jewett, 'The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation', pp. 198-212, especially pp. 202-203. The term in 6.13 depicts the advocacy of circumcision. Reicke, The New Testament Era, pp. 212-220, traces the historical events, beginning with the martyrdom of James 1, about 42 A. D., through the 50's and the increasing pressure against the church from the Judaizing and Zealot movement. As the Hellenistic mission grew so did the pressure. Gal 6.12 may reflect this pressure.
flesh that was cut in circumcision.\textsuperscript{11} As such, flesh is opposed to life in the Spirit, faith, and the cross. The Galatians text alone places cross and glorying together, and does so as part of the contrast between the law and the cross, between works and faith.

7. In Gal 6.14b Paul says that by the cross in which he glories he is also crucified to the world. He does not glory ἐν σαρκί (6.13), and is thus in contrast to those whose lives are measured by the worldly standards which are characteristic of the two communities of 6.15a: περιτομή, ἀκροβυστία. Here alone Paul speaks of crucifixion in a three-fold sense: (1) that of Christ, 6.12, 14; (2) that of the world: (3) that of Paul towards the world. This ἡμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταθρωται leads to κατνη κτίσις, the third alternative to the two communities of 6.15. Where this crucifixion happens there is a total devaluation of κόσμος, and the world is finished as a cause of glorying or triumph. Where the world ends the new creation begins.\textsuperscript{12} This ending and beginning is accomplished by the cross of Christ, in which the believer has been included.

8. Gal 3.13 is a significant crucifixion text, although it is one in which cross is not explicitly mentioned. The mention of the tree in Gal 3.13 plays on the word ἔλαον in the quotation from Deut 21.23. Certain

\textsuperscript{11} Jewett, Terms, p. 101.

\textsuperscript{12} Minear, 'World', pp. 397-398.
malefactors whose crime was punishable by death (stoning) were hung on a tree after execution. In some interpretations this hanging was, by NT times, associated with curse. Only criminals guilty of certain crimes were subjected to this ignominy, and the body was not to be left hanging overnight, lest it defile the land given to God's people. Even before the death of Christ some Jews applied this Deuteronomy text to crucifixion, although in the OT the hanging was not a means of execution but of announcement. Later the text was likely used by some Jews against Christians in pointing out that Jesus could not have been the Messiah. Paul himself could have used this argument against Christians prior to his conversion. But the exegesis in 3.13 that equates hanging with crucifixion is an exegesis that did not originate with Paul, and the application of that exegesis to the death of Jesus did not originally come from Paul either. But Paul

---


16 In Gal 1.15-16 Paul speaks of being set apart, called, and made a recipient of revelation. Stendahl emphasizes call as over against conversion in his 'Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West', pp. 78-96. And yet in view of Paul's break with his past, going over to the Christ side, and death to the law, conversion seems the appropriate term.

uses both exegesis and application in his argument against the law, to show that Christ became a curse 'for us' so that the blessing of Abraham might fall upon the Gentiles. Paul's contribution to the history of interpretation of Deut 21.23 was to see the 'accursed' death of Jesus on the cross as God's divine event of salvation, done so as to free believers from the curse of the law. The use of tree in reference to the cross is central to this argument about blessing and curse. This tree-cross identification comes within Paul's argument from Scripture in ch. 3 in which a number of OT texts are woven together with his exposition and application. The purpose of both quotation and exposition is to serve Paul's christological starting point: faith, not law (2.15). Galatians 3 becomes a focal point of the letter's theologia crucis, as Christ's hanging on the tree of the cross turns the law's curse into blessing for the Gentiles.

In Galatians Paul thus consistently used references to the cross and crucifixion in his argument against the law. Without exception in Galatians it is the law-faith contrast which is served by σταυρός, σταυρῷ terminology. It is to the other side of this contrast to which we now

---

Kim, Origin, p. 47 n. 3.


go, examining first the place of the law throughout Paul's
letters, and then its place in Galatians.
Examination of Paul’s letters shows that his references to the law are, like those to the cross, widely varied in number, purpose, and frequency. There are no uses of νόμος in 2 Corinthians, Colossians, or 1-2 Thessalonians, one in Ephesians and three in Philippians. The term, νόμος, occurs 32 times in Galatians, 74 times in Romans, and nine times in 1 Corinthians. These references to the law are of a marked difference in kind from one letter to another. Galatians and Romans often speak of the negative role of the law, and its inadequacy for bringing righteousness.¹ In 1 Corinthians, however, the polemic against the law is not only absent, but Paul freely refers to the law in support of his own position.

1. In 1 Cor 9.8-9 Paul cites the Deut 25.4 text about the right of an ox to feed upon the grain it treads as support for the divinely decreed apostolic right of material benefits from the church. Paul has renounced this right (9.15) so that he might be free from all in the material sense (9.19) even though he is a slave to all in

¹ And yet, Gal 5.14 has a positive sense about it, and Rom 7.7ff clearly counters what negative reports about Paul’s attitude towards the law may have preceded him in Rome. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People (1983), pp. 17ff, 107ff, says that ‘not by works of law’ is Paul’s consistent answer to the question of entrance, while in 1 Corinthians the question of right conduct in the church leaves room for Paul to refer to the law in support of his position.
such ways as being 'as one under the law' to appeal to those under the law.\(^\text{2}\) In 1 Cor 9.22 this 'all things to all men' attitude overrides either commitment to or freedom from the law, and points to an allegiance greater than law as the motivating force in Paul's ministry.\(^\text{3}\) It is διὰ τὸ ἐυαγγέλιον, 'for the sake of the gospel' (9.23). But here, law supports Paul's case.

2. In 1 Cor 14.21 Paul cites law and prophetic texts from Deut 28.49 and Isa 28.11-12, in support of his argument that γλῶσσας, 'tongues', be used in a limited way and orderliness in worship be maintained (14.40). In 14.34 Paul appeals to what 'the law says' without citing a particular text, to support his statement about subordination and silence of women in the churches.\(^\text{4}\) Gen 3.16 may be in mind at that point. In 15.56 the only negative statement in 1 Corinthians about the law occurs. The law is δύναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας. This connection of sin with the law is similar to that made by Romans 7.13, and is an exception to the generally positive references to the law in 1 Corinthians. The law references in 1 Corinthians indicate that the problem there was not law vs. gospel (or faith), but κόσμος vs. gospel, σοφία vs.

\(^\text{2}\) Hock, 'Paul's Tentmaking and the Problem of his Social Class', pp. 559-562, sees the slavery as referring to Paul's choice of an occupation.

\(^\text{3}\) Longenecker, Paul, Apostle of Liberty, pp. 230-244; Chadwick, 'All Things to All Men', pp. 261-275.

\(^\text{4}\) But is it his statement? See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 246, who regards it as an interpolation.
cross, and the question of apostolic authority. In speaking about the grounds of faith and behaviour for those who belong to the body of Christ, Paul is free to cite the law in his own support and in service of his gospel.

3. In Phil 3.5-6 Paul speaks of his Pharisaic attitude towards the law (3.5) and his blamelessness under the law (pertaining to righteousness, 3.6) as part of the κέρδη that he forsook διὰ τῶν χριστῶν (3.7) and ἑνα χριστῶν κέρδησον (3.8). Law is thus contrasted to life in Christ, similar to the either/or of Galatians (3.2, 5). Righteousness by law is contrasted to righteousness by faith (3.9). Thus, in Philippians the polemic returns, with negative (ἡγημα...ημίαν, 3.7), and stinging (σκόπαλα, 3.8) comments about Paul's former life as a law-abiding Pharisaic Jew.

4. In Eph 2.15 the καῖνος ἀνθρώπος who has replaced the division and hostility between Jew and Gentile was the end (the new creation) to which the means was the abolition of the law. The law here indicates that which had previously made Israel unique and separate. This is similar to Gal 6.15, where Paul says that what counts (i.e. for glorying, 6.14) is the new creation, and not circumcision nor uncircumcision.

5 Thiselton, 'Eschatology', p. 513: 'From the eschatological vision in Corinth one can see no need for apostles'. That is, the Corinthians seemed to have no need of apostles in the Pauline sense, but had reduced the apostles to party leaders, as in 1.12.
5. The law vs. faith contrast is also evident in Romans, where νόμος occurs in each of the chapters 2-10, and again in 13. 8, 10. The most references to the law are in ch. 2; 3.19-31; and ch. 7. Rom 3.21 represents the law-faith contrast, and so does 4.13-25, which, like Galatians 3, uses the Abraham story. In Galatians law and curse are lumped together in contrast to faith and blessing, while in Romans law (or works of law; see 3.20ff) and faith are the two sides of the contrast, with law as the instrument of sin and the agent of death. The cross is not part of Paul's argument against the law in Romans, but is used in his argument against sin (6.6). Sin has seized the law, found opportunity in it (7.8), and so brought death (7.10, 12). So in Romans sin uses the law to bring death (7.13), and sin, death, and law thus belong together (7.9-11; with flesh, 8.3). The polemic is 'softened' as it focuses on sin's use of the law, rather than the law's curse on Christ and on those who wish to adhere to the law (Gal 3.10, 13).

Sanders notes one distinct difference between Galatians and Romans regarding the law:

In Galatians the polemic had to do with the entry of Gentiles into the people of God, and the status of Jews and Gentiles prior to or without faith was referred to in a confusing way (e.g. Gal. 3:23-4:10). In Romans, on the other hand, Paul strives to state what he perceives to be the plight of Jews and Gentiles without faith in a way that distinguishes between them, while still concluding that their...
status, whether prior to faith or in the Christian community, is the same (Rom 1:18-3:9; 4:11f.). This change of focus leads him to discuss in detail, for the only time in his extant correspondence, the situation of 'Israel according to the flesh' (Romans 9-11), and he also attempts a much fuller account of the role of the law in God's plan than appears in Galatians.7

It is clear that Paul's use of νόμος, like his use of σταυρός, is not consistent from one letter to another. His break with the law, to which Gal 2.19 refers, was by no means a finished topic, although in the Galatian context his argument against the law is the most sharply defined.

6. The variety indicates need for a kind of categorization, although this ought not be imposed on the various epistles for the sake of reducing them to systematic consistency. Fitzmyer has summarized four distinctions by which Paul's references to the law may be categorized.8

6.1. Paul occasionally uses νόμος in a generic sense, not specifically designating any particular law. Representative of this type of use are texts such as Gal 5.23; Rom 4.15b; 5.13. It must be added, however, that this category is not clearly distinct from category 4, the law of Moses. Although the references cited refer to no particular law they seem clearly to mean the law of Moses. Even Gal 5.23 can as well as not be understood this way:

---

8 Fitzmyer, Paul and His Theology (1989), pp. 75-76.
the law of Moses has nothing against such spiritual gifts.

6.2. Paul sometimes uses a figurative sense for law, as a kind of principle (Rom 3.27a; 7.21, 23a). As such it can refer to the principle of sin (Rom 7.23c, 25b), of sin and death (Rom 8.2b), of human nature (Rom 2.14d), or of faith (Rom 3.27b), Christ (Gal 6.2), or Spirit (Rom 8.2a). In Gal 6.2 the term is not to be understood as being synonymous with the law of Moses. Paul uses it in a loose, almost metaphorical sense, to speak of life in Christ.9

6.3. Paul can use νόμος in quoting the OT, referring either to Psalms (Rom 3.19a), Prophets (1 Cor 14.21), or Torah (Gal 3.10b; 1 Cor 9.9; Rom 14.34; 3.31b).10

6.4. Mostly, 'about 97 times in all', Paul uses νόμος (with or without the article) to refer to the law of Moses. Representative texts include Gal 2.16, 19, 21; 3.2, 5, 10a, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24; Rom 2.12, 13, 14; 3.19b, 20, 21; 5.13, 20; 6.14, 15; 7.1-9.11

Fitzmyer makes a general distinction between Paul's use of the law in Galatians and his use in Romans, as he suggests that Paul is proposing two different explanations


10 In Rom 3.21 Paul uses 'law' in two somewhat different ways: God's righteousness has been manifested apart from law (as such), although the law and the prophets (the Scriptures) witness to it. See Käsemann, Romans, p. 93.

for the law. First, 'In Galatians Paul sets forth an extrinsic explanation, ascribing to the law of Moses a temporary role in salvation history....(Gal 3.23-24).'¹² The law here is temporary and provisional (3.17), inferior to the promises (3.19), having been given through a mediator (3.20). Second, in writing Romans Paul had to deal with the inability of humankind to observe God's law:

In composing Rom 7.13-8.4, then, Paul abandoned the extrinsic explanation and used a more intrinsic one, that is, a philosophical explanation of the human predicament. In Rom he shows that the difficulty is not with the law, but with humanity in its this-worldly condition of sarx, 'flesh', alienated from God and hostile to him.¹³

Thus, Paul says that he is carnal and sold under sin (7.14), sin dwells in him, captivates him, and wars with God's law (7.17). In Galatians Paul describes humanity as having come to the last stage of salvation history, in which freedom from law has been granted.¹⁴ The date set by the father (Gal 4.2) has been reached with the fullness of time. In Romans, on the other hand, God has done in

¹⁴ Fitzmyer, Paul (1989), pp. 30-31, 44-45, 79, describes 3 stages of Paul's salvation history, based on rabbinic thinking: (1) The first period, from Adam to Moses, was a law-less period (Rom 5.13-14; Gal 3.17); (2) the second period was after the law was added (Gal 3.19; Rom 5.20) and humanity was imprisoned or in custody (Gal 3.23) from Moses to Christ; (3) the third period is the time of the Messiah, when persons are justified by faith. On p. 19 n. 34, Fitzmyer attributes this three-fold scheme of history to later rather than early rabbis, but sees Paul viewing human history 'through solely Jewish spectacles'. But it is Paul's own interpretation of this scheme that sees the end of the law in the time of the Messiah, and the new status being that of faith in Christ.
Christ Jesus what the law could not do (8.3). Acquittal has been brought about through Christ's death and resurrection. This justifies and brings about the status before God that the law did not achieve, since the law was weakened by the flesh. Sin had to be condemned in the flesh for this justification to happen. Fitzmyer's analysis is helpful in two ways. First, it takes seriously that there is a difference between Romans and Galatians regarding Paul's treatment of the law. Second, it warns us that the uniqueness of each epistle's view of the law is lost if harmonizing or generalizing is attempted.15

7. These references to πλαστικός in the epistles have shown a variety of ways in which Paul speaks of the law. The either/or of Philippians, the general support for his arguments that Paul finds in the law in 1 Corinthians, the inadequacy of the law and its captivity to sin and flesh in Romans, the inferiority and termination of law, historically considered, in Galatians, and the absence of the subject in other letters, show that there was no fixed doctrine of law with which Paul approached every situation.16

15 Beker, Paul (1980), chs. 4 and 5, and especially pp. 104-108, describes the differences between Galatians and Romans. But on his notion that Romans is a 'dialogue with Jews' see Sanders, Paul (1983), pp. 58-59 n. 75.

16 Paul does not seem to have dealt with the law until it had become a problem for his churches. Then, when speaking of it, the law is made to have a place relative to the central Christological convictions which Paul preached. See Sanders, Paul (1983), pp. 4-5.
7.1. Räisänen rightly concludes that there are contradictions and tensions which are constant features of Paul's statements about the law.\textsuperscript{17} The only suitable approach is to accept these as indications of Paul's theological and personal struggles.\textsuperscript{18} Räisänen uses the term 'oscillation' to describe Paul's view and use of the law,\textsuperscript{19} and this is an appropriate word if into it we do not read 'wishy-washy'.\textsuperscript{20} There is no consistently systematic whole of Paul's thought on the law, and we therefore need to understand his statements as something other than parts

\textsuperscript{17} Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 11.

\textsuperscript{18} Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 12, rejects three other approaches to Paul which he thinks are inadequate: (1) existentialist interpretations, such as that of Conzelmann, because they fail to (a) distinguish the exegetical and theological tasks, and (b) take psychological or sociological considerations into account; (2) contextual criticism begins with a logical Paul and posits someone else's hand commenting on and enlarging the text as a way of explaining Pauline obscurities, but Räisänen thinks it was personal power, not logic, that made Paul's impact; (3) development theories tend to rest on an early date for Galatians and on the South Galatian hypothesis, neither of which have been conclusively proved; so also a short time-span between Galatians and Romans makes a dramatic theological development seem unlikely, and internal inconsistencies within a given letter are not rendered explicable by this theory.

\textsuperscript{19} Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 16.

\textsuperscript{20} Oxford Concise Dictionary, p. 1236, explicates this term with 'weak, sloppy, feeble, or poor in quality or character'. 
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of a systematic scheme. Each epistle has a logic of its own.

7.2. On the personal level Paul struggled to understand his Jewish past on the basis of his Christian present. As a Jew he had found his Jewish identity in his faithfulness to the law and in being anchored in its traditions. Then the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal 1.12) shook apart the former foundations and established a new foundation for his life. So Paul could speak of his former life. This new foundation was faith in Jesus Christ. This had to mean for Paul, 'einen tiefen Einschnitt in sein Leben'. Its consequences were on a theological and biographical level. In his letters we see him struggling to understand and apply what had happened to him. He sees that Christian existence is based on the foundation of faith in Jesus Christ. Seeing that, he is

---

21 That Paul was not a systematic theologian has long since been noticed by Gardner, The Religious Experience of Saint Paul, pp. 16, 139; Wrede, Paul, pp. 74-77, 80; Manson, On Paul, pp. 11-12. Not ideas but events, not theologian but missionary, not theory but conversion, are the ways in which Manson describes Paul and his theology.


23 Schoeps, Paul, p. 54, points out that Paul uses the language of theophany to understand the event of his call: ἀποκαλύφθη (Gal 1.16); φωτισμὸς τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor 4.6). Although discussions have taken place on whether this had psychological preparation in Paul, Schoeps, p. 55, says, 'It is difficult to get anywhere in this way'. Cf. Kertelge, 'Authorität', p. 3; Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 93. And yet, Theissen, Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology, pp. 234-243, makes a case for 'a long retrospective bringing to consciousness of a conflict that had once been unconscious', of which Romans 7 is the result. See 1.5 n. 6 below.
not free from having to deal with the question of the law, but he is free for that struggle. 24

7.3. This tension is further brought to light by the diverse situations of the churches, and the demands which church problems placed upon Paul. To a certain extent, the different things Paul said depended on the questions that were raised or the problems that were posed. In that light, each answer has its own logic, comprehensible only when viewed through the context of the particular situation. Each epistle is a unique historical composition that is directed to specific circumstances and the argument of a letter needs accordingly to be understood first of all on that basis. 25 With respect to the law the oscillation of which Räisänen speaks is thus partly attributable to the needs of each situation, and variations within Paul's statements about the law, from one letter to another, can accordingly be understood.

7.4. But there are also variations or oscillations within a given letter. In view of such inconsistencies Fitzmyer's analysis of categories does not go far enough. Most of Paul's statements about the law mean the Mosaic law. And yet, certain distinctions which he could have made even within that body of material are largely ignored.

24 Kertelge, 'Autorität', pp. 1-2: '...daß er christliche Existenz auf dem Fundament des Glaubens an Jesus Christus gegründet sieht....daß er vom Gesetz nicht loskommt.'

or are inconsistently applied by Paul. Paul never alludes to distinctions within his concept of law, and neither definitional distinctions nor differentiations arrived at on linguistic grounds provide adequate explanation of his views.\textsuperscript{26} Although Paul never clearly defines the content of the law, Räisänen states that, '...\textit{nomos} in Paul refers to the authoritative tradition of Israel, anchored in the revelation on Sinai, which separates the Jews from the rest of mankind'.\textsuperscript{27} The whole sacred tradition of Israel seems to be included, with an emphasis on the Mosaic centre, and its role of identifying Israel. And yet this Mosaic centre could be viewed from different angles, although they are angles that Paul himself does not emphasize, but rather oscillates between them as though they did not always exist. Räisänen points to two principal ways in which Paul's use of \textit{νόμος} oscillates.

7.4.1. Paul often makes a clear distinction between Jews who are under the law and Gentiles who are without the law (Rom 2.12ff; 1 Cor 7.17ff; 9.20ff; Gal 2.14-15). In this way Paul speaks of the law as the decisive separating factor between Jews and Gentiles, so separating Jews from the rest of humankind.\textsuperscript{28} At other times Paul


\textsuperscript{27} Räisänen, \textit{Paul} (1983), p. 16.

\textsuperscript{28} It is a separate question whether the Mosaic law of Sinai, if denoted by \textit{νόμος}, therefore by definition concerns only the Jews; cf. Räisänen, \textit{Paul} (1983), p. 18 n. 20; Herntrich, \textit{TDNT} 3:933: The law was given \textit{to} Israel to manifest God's love and justice \textit{for} the nations.
includes Gentiles among those who are under the curse of the law or who have been redeemed from the curse of the law (Gal 3.13-14, 23-26; 4.5-6; 5.1). In Gal 3.13-14 Paul does not explicitly deal with the difference between Jews and Gentiles. The *us* who are redeemed from the curse of the law (3.13c) would seemingly refer to Jewish Christians who were under the Torah before becoming Christians. The *we* (3.14) who received the Spirit seemingly refers to Galatian Gentile Christians. And yet Paul gives no indication of a contrast between *us* and *we* (3.14), or between Jews and Gentiles. And so Räisänen concludes, 'Strange as it may appear, the conclusion is hard to avoid that even Gentiles were, in Paul's mind when dictating this passage, under the curse of the law. This is in tension with Paul's assumption in 1 Cor 9.21 or Rom 2.12, or even Gal 2.14'.

Paul's oscillation is thus between 'a historical and particularist Torah and that of a general universal force'. While Paul seems to be speaking of the Mosaic law of Sinai, the situations of Jew and Gentile melt together, as law assumes wider dimensions in his thinking and works as something that concerns all people.

---

29 Räisänen, *Paul* (1983), p. 20; the inclusion of Gentiles under the curse of law is not strange, according to Bruce, *Commentary on Galatians*, p. 167, because: (1) an innate sense of right and wrong (Rom 2.14f), and activity of conscience make Gentiles liable to the curse of the law, and (2) the blessing which replaces the curse is intended for all people.


Paul thus tacitly operates with a double sense of law, on the one hand speaking of the Sinaitic Torah, and on the other hand giving the law a wider application than only to Jews. Thus, in Gal 3.23ff νῆμα carries the judgement of pre-Christian existence for both Jews and Gentiles. While dating the law from the time of Moses (3.17ff) Paul speaks of the law as covering all humankind. It is a universally enslaving power.

7.4.2. The second main area in which Paul oscillates on the law is that he makes no explicit distinctions between the cultic (or ritual) and moral aspects of the Torah. It was generally the ritual laws such as circumcision, Sabbath, and food laws, that brought about the social distinction between Israel and other people. In Galatians it is this cultic side of the law that is in the forefront of Paul's discussion, for he deals with, (1) circumcision (2.1-10; 5.2-12); (2) food laws (2.11-12); and (3) calendar (4.10). And yet Paul makes no explicit

---

32 Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 21 n. 37. Räisänen sees this universalist application of law to be in some tension with the particularist sense of law as having arrived late on the scene (Gal 3.15-20).


35 Bousset, 'Der Brief an die Galater', pp. 28-72, here p. 50, points out that in Galatians Paul seems to have the ceremonial (i.e. cultic, ritual) law in mind, and (p. 59) Paul does not make any fundamental distinction between ceremonial and moral law. In spite of this lack of distinction, Bousset says that the emphasis on ceremonial in Galatians is, 'der ursprüngliche Sinn der
distinction between such ritual codes as those mentioned
and the whole law by which righteousness is not available.
Law as such is set in opposition to gospel, faith, cross,
and Spirit. Had Paul made such a distinction, pointing
out to the Galatians that it was ritual requirement about
which he differed, and thus taught his converts that
ritual law and that alone has been replaced, 'his task
would have been very much easier'. But silence on that
point must be taken as symptomatic rather than accidental.
In other words it is simply incredible that Paul, a
Pharisee who was rabbinically trained, would either not
have known the distinction or would have unknowingly
oscillated from one aspect of the law to another without
realizing his 'looseness of speech', or that he was doing
so in 'many confused senses'. Much less could he have
expected those who were similarly trained to let him get
away with it. It is more plausible that,

What interests Paul is the 'lawlessness of law', whatever
that particular law or obligation might be. Paul
thinks phenomenologically about law. This is why he
shows no concern to salvage law by distinguishing one
law from another, the cultic from the moral law....

Lehre des Paulus von der Rechtfertigung "nicht aus
Gesetzes-Werken".


37 Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 28, uses these phrases,
in agreement with Grant, Sanders, and Gardner; see his n.
74. However, to use the law in many senses does not
necessarily indicate confusion.

38 Keck, Paul and His Letters, p. 86; Sanders, Paul
(1983), says that what Paul rejects in Galatians is law as
an entrance requirement for Gentile Christians, and on the
'getting in' question Paul consistently answers in the
negative, 'not by works of law'. Regarding the statement
Paul thus works inductively, as he generalizes from specific aspects of the law to the law as a whole.

And yet, despite the inconsistencies and oscillation in Paul's dealing with the law, he remains, as Bruce and Sanders have rightly pointed out, a 'coherent' (though not systematic) thinker. That is, certain central convictions inform Paul's theology. The Christ event had become central for Paul. Everything else, including law, was given its place in his perspective in relation to the centre.

---

by Keck, Sanders, pp. 158-159, says that he disagrees with the analysis of lawness of law, as a substitute for trust in grace, and yet Sanders fails to show that his position and Keck's exclude one another. See Bornkamm, 'Gesetz und Natur, Röm 2.14-16', pp. 93-118.


40 Bruce, 'Recent Research', p. 124, rightly sees this fact pointing to the 'the logic of Paul's Damascus-road experience - the experience which brought home to him in a flash the "powerlessness" of the law to accomplish what it was designed to do'. But this does not imply that a fully worked out view of the law was a sudden revelation on the Damascus Road, for the experience and the understanding of it may be separate. Bruce recognizes this, as he says, 'Certainly the implications of this sudden insight had to be worked out in the conflict with judaisers and in other controversies'. See Davies, 'Paul and the Law: Reflections on Pitfalls in Interpretation', pp. 4-16, here pp. 6-7.
1.4 THE LAW IN GALATIANS

It is in the relationship between central and secondary aspects of his theology that Paul's inconsistency is best explained. In Galatians the cross represents what is central. The law is an impinging secondary factor. In that situation the aspects of the law that were promoted as unwitting competitors to God's redemptive act on Christ's cross led to Paul's polemic against the law. It may be argued that to attack any part of the law is to discredit law as such. This is exactly the opposition that Paul sets up in his response to the Galatian situation, as he juxtaposes the law and the cross. The wider dimensions that Paul gives to the law as that which concerns all people, and the inexactness of failing to differentiate ritual law from moral code, are logical conclusions of Paul's gospel, as he proclaimed the death of Christ to be the supreme liberating event for all people, who henceforth are free from all enslaving powers and impotent codes. In Galatians this view of law as enslaving and impotent is related to the motif of dying and living, and the transfer from one state to the other. But before turning to those themes in Part 2, we will examine more fully the place of the law in Galatians.

1. In Galatians Paul argues against the imposition of the law on Gentile converts to faith in Christ. He speaks against the whole law. He does not distinguish moral,
cultic or ritual law. Although in 2.1-18 Paul refers to specific works of the law, namely circumcision and table laws, he generalizes in 2.19 to the law as such.¹ He mentions works of the law again in 3.2, 5, 10, but aside from that his argument is directed against νόμος. In 3.17, 19 it is the law of Moses to which he refers, as that which was given 430 years after the covenant with Abraham and was ordained by angels through an intermediary. This points to Sinai and the Mosaic Law. The reference in 5.23 may be generic. The law of Christ in 6.2 is likely a play on the word νόμος, with no attempt to say that Christ or faith in Christ re-establishes the

¹ Cranfield, 'St. Paul and the Law', pp. 43-68, distinguishes between Paul's view of the good law (the law as such), and Paul's view of the abused law (the idea of legalism), as Paul dealt with it in Galatians. Legalism is indicated by the phrase 'works of the law' and once his argument is established by this phrase, then Paul speaks simply of the law. But see Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 43, for the inadequacy of this view.
law. Galatians' other references to the law may be classified in four general categories.

1.1. The law is opposed to Christ, faith, promise, Spirit, righteousness (justification), and life: 2.16, 19, 21; 3.2, 5, 11, 12, 18, 21; 4.21; 5.4, 18. 5.14 figures in the contrast of which 5.3 is also a part. The contrast introduced in 5.13, between freedom and flesh, connects freedom with love. In 5.14 love is connected with law (as its fulfillment), and the contrast proceeds in 5.16ff.

2 Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 16, 50, points out that terms like 'law of Christ' in Gal 6.2, the 'law of faith' in Rom 3.27, and the 'law of the Spirit' in Rom 8.2, are used in a 'patently metaphorical sense'. They are 'metaphorical ways of speaking of the new order of things', and cannot be used to support a notion such as that of Hübner, Das Gesetz bei Paulus (ET Law in Paul's Thought), p. 119ff, who says: 'The "law of faith" designates "the right attitude to God's will...as it finds its expression in the Torah"'. Two faults with a view such as Hübner's relate to grammar and syntax: (1) in Rom 3.27 the active role of νόμος in destroying boasting (of Jew as regarding Gentile) can hardly be construed as a function of Torah. Paul speaks of what happened to boasting through the law of faith, not what happened to the law because of faith. Furthermore, if the νόμος πίστεως in 3.27 referred to the Torah, then the question of 3.31, νόμον ὁδ' καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; would never arise; (2) in Rom 8.2 Paul speaks of the 'order' of the Spirit. The law of the Spirit has 'liberated me' from the law of sin and death. Here law is the subject, not the object, of liberation. The subject is not human understanding. Similarly in Gal 6.2 there is no sense of a renewed Torah. In all these instances Paul's is a metaphorical use with polemical nuances. So Räisänen, 'Gesetz', p. 113, says, 'Paulus spielt mit Worten, und zwar nicht ohne einen polemischen Zweck. Er nennt diejenige Ordnung einen νόμος, die eigentlich der Gegensatz des mosaischen νόμος ist'. Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 52, also says, 'There is no reason to abandon the until recently almost universally accepted view that in these two passages Paul is playing with words and using nomos - this time consciously, to be sure! - in different senses'. Cf. his 'Gesetz', p. 117, and 'Sprachliches zum Spiel des Paulus mit nomos', pp. 131-154.
between Spirit and flesh. Thus, 5.14 implicitly belongs to this first category. 5.3 and 6.13 connect law with circumcision, which in turn is contrasted to faith in Christ.

1.2. The law is connected with curse, transgressions, and death, using such cause and effect language as γάρ, ὥστε, κατάρατον: 2.19; 3.10, 13, 19; cf. 3.17-18.

1.3. The law is part of a means to an end, and is not an end in itself, as shown by ἵνα clauses: 3.24; 4.4, 5; cf. 2.19; 3.14, 22.

1.4. The law is a temporary and late addition to God's plan of salvation: 3.17, 23.

2. In the light of these categories of Paul's references to the law in Galatians, four observations are indicated.

2.1. The role that Paul assigns to the law in this epistle is essentially negative, and is manifest in two ways. First, that the law is not an entrance requirement means that when Paul is faced with the question of entry into the church, Paul's answer is consistently, 'not by works of law'. Second, Paul assigns the law a negative role in God's plan of salvation.³ The explicit contrast established in 2.15 also answers the justification question: 'not by works of law'. This contrast is implied earlier by the recounting of the Antioch episode (2.11ff), wherein Paul connects lack of straightforwardness about

the gospel to Peter's fear of the circumcision party and representatives from James. In Galatians Paul does not distinguish between the questions of getting in and staying in. The problem represented by Gal 2.1-10 reflects the same concern as that of Acts 15: entrance into the church. The problem represented by Gal 2.11ff reflects the concern of behaviour within the church, particularly as it affected church unity. And yet Paul moves from one problem to the other, with the continuity between the two episodes being the place of the law as such. He thus indicates that the law plays no positive part in either the getting in or staying in question. Paul is uncompromising in the either/or nature of this argument. The greatest positive thing Paul can say of the law is that, having been added late and ruling for only a

---

4 Weiß, The History of Primitive Christianity 1:273, points out that 'from James' in Gal 2.12 could mean either, (1) some men had been sent and authorized by James, or (2) these men belonged to the group which followed James' opinions. Both options point to law observant Christianity.


fixed time (3.17, 23), it has made ready for the Offspring (Christ, 3.16) and the status of justification by faith in Christ (3.24).

2.2. Paul refuses to compromise the divine origin and ownership of the law. He quotes freely from the law as an authority. He uses standard introductory formulae that indicate divine authority. Paul finds a place for the law in God's plan of salvation, but it is an essentially negative place. Only if the law could make alive (3.21) would it truly be a competitor with Christ's death, and render that death purposeless (2.21). These two uncompromising convictions must simply be allowed to stand in tension in this letter, as the law which is placed in opposition to gospel, cross, Christ, faith, Spirit, and promise, yet remains God's law. When these two factors are left unharmonized and in tension, a negative role for the law is the necessary theological consequence.

2.3. The function of the law is derived from its relation to the gospel which has superseded it and with which it is in opposition. The gospel assigns meaning to the law. That Paul locates the law's meaning and purpose

---

7 Against Hübner, Gesetz, pp. 27-28, who maintains that the angels in 3.19 are to be understood as demonic beings who authored the law with the evil intention of causing sin in humankind, and the phrase 'ordained by angels' indicates God's lack of involvement in the giving of the law. But see Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 131-3.

8 Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 68, discusses the tension between its being God's law and its yet not saving, and how a place, consequently negative, therefore had to be found for the law so as to account for its presence.
outside of the law itself, parallels his refusal to speak of the law in terms of revelation. The language of apocalyptic is reserved for the gospel of the Son of God (1.12, 16; 2.2), revealed to Paul that he might preach to the nations. The ways in which Paul speaks of the law clearly indicate that it is not an end in itself. Not only by contrast to the terminology of the gospel, but also by the forms of speech and the law's connection to curse, transgressions, and death, the law is shown to have a subservient role. The law is no longer the ultimate priority for Paul. This is shown by purpose clauses and cause and effect phraseology. Purpose clauses using ἵνα show that the law serves an end other than itself: ἀνετὸν νόμον παραδογχός ἦμων γένονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαίωσώμεθα (3.24; cf. 4.4-5). The means to an end constructions imply that the desired end has priority over the means in its service. Cause and effect phraseology could indicate a causative role of law. This may be true in 3.19: τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη. Rather than checking transgressions, the law has increased or produced them. The ὅτε clauses in 3.10 also show cause and effect: 'Because (ὅτε) it is written, "Cursed be every one who does not abide by all things written in the book of

9 Dana and Mantey, Grammar, p. 283, point out that purpose clauses show the aim of the action denoted by the main verb, and that, 'Pure Final Clauses are those which express a distinct purpose conceived as the aim of the action indicated in the principal verb'.

10 See pp. 206-208 below.
the law, and do them", therefore (γάρ beginning of v. 10) all who rely on works of the law are under a curse. The γάρ in 2.19 may be a further example of this causal relationship.11 These forms of speech show the demotion through which the law has gone for Paul because of the revelation of Jesus Christ.

2.4. Paul moves from the problem of single aspects of the law, such as food, calendar, and circumcision, to speaking about the law as a whole.12 It is the law as such against which he speaks. It is the law which does not justify. The movement is more sweeping than if Paul had generalized to include all aspects of ritual or cultic law. He includes the entire Mosaic law as that which is antithetically opposed to the gospel. This makes sense when we understand him to have thought two things about the law: (1) it is the law-ness of law that is involved, not simply the meaning of a certain ritual aspect; (2) in an obverse way, just as circumcision binds one to do (ποιεῖν) the whole law, so also to negate an aspect of the law such as circumcision is to speak against the whole law. Thus, it is the law itself against which Paul militates in Galatians. This precludes that the problem

11 See 2.1 below, on the relation of γάρ in 2.19 to 2.18; Bruce, Galatians, p. 142; Mußner, Der Galaterbrief, p. 177; Lambrecht, 'The Line of Thought in Gal 2.14b-21', pp. 484-494.

12 See Jeremias, 'Paulus als Hillelit', pp. 88-94.
he addressed was misinterpretations of the law.\textsuperscript{13} It also shows that the tradition of law-keeping was a life from which Paul had separated himself.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13} See Räisänen, \textit{Paul} (1983), pp. 42-50; n. 1 above, and n. 14 below.

\textsuperscript{14} Räisänen, \textit{Paul} (1983), pp. 73-77, especially p. 76, says that Gal 5.12 is related to Phil 3.2 and 3.8, as indicators of Paul's alienation from Torah-centered piety. Cf. Manson, 'Jesus, Paul, and the Law', p. 141: 'There is thus no place of final authority left for the Law in the New Testament.' Manson gives three reasons for this: (1) as a means of salvation the law is ineffective and a stop-gap; (2) as moral demand the law is superseded by the life and teaching of Jesus; (3) but what can be said of law is stated by Paul in Gal 3.24: \textit{δότε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν.}
1.5 THE CROSS AND THE LAW

In 1 Corinthians and Galatians Paul uses more explicit references to the cross and crucifixion than in his other epistles. In 1 Corinthians the cross is central in Paul’s argument against wisdom. In Galatians the cross is central in his argument against the law. In both Galatians and 1 Corinthians the arguments relate to the question of salvation. In Galatians the argument centres on the relationship with or righteousness before God, and the righteousness terminology is used frequently throughout the discussion (2.16, 17, 21; 3.6, 8, 11, 21, 24; 5.4, 5). In 1 Corinthians the righteousness terms are scarce, occurring only in three places (1.30; 4.4; 6.11). With the exception of 1.30 the justification language is absent from the anti-wisdom argument of 1 Cor 1.19-3.23, and yet the saving content of Paul’s message is emphasized in a fundamental way. The salvation emphasis is seen in Paul’s use of σώζω (1.18, 21; 3.15; 5.5; 7.16; 9.22; 10.33; 15.2), πίστες (2.5; 12.9; 13.22, 13; 15.14, 17; 16.13), and πνευμα (1.21; 3.5; 9.17; 11.18; 13.7; 14.22; 15.2, 11). This indicates that in 1 Corinthians the matter at hand is not simply that of differing christologies nor standards of behaviour within the body, but the very ground of salvation and faith.¹ Paul can and

¹ Funk, Language, p. 248, points out that here Paul’s is a kerygmatic concern, ‘...an attempt to refer the Corinthians to the ground of faith, Jesus....’ See Grant,
does address the question of salvation without relying on righteousness terminology, and thus, justification ought not too quickly be singled out as the sum and substance of his proclamation.

In 1 Corinthians Paul's antithesis to \( \sigma \omega \phi \alpha \) is \( \mu \omega \rho \iota \alpha \), which he identifies with the cross. The Greco-Roman world, which was familiar with the madness of crucifixion and charged with the quest for wisdom, identified the cross with \( \mu \omega \rho \iota \alpha \). The greater foolishness would be to assert that a cross or crucifixion was God's world-saving event. Paul thus contrasts God's \( \mu \omega \rho \iota \alpha \) with worldly wisdom.

In Gal 2.19 Paul uses the compound verb, 'crucified-with', to speak of an accomplished past event which yet has a present effect in his own life, particularly regarding the law. 'Living to God' and having been 'crucified with Christ' indicate Paul's placing life and cross together, against the law. He again aligns 'Christ...crucified' with the gospel, Spirit, faith, and miracles in 3.1-5, opposite which are set works of the law and flesh. The reference to hanging and curse, in 3.13, may reflect Paul's answer to a problem which existed even before the Galatian controversy. This problem was the Jewish polemic against the idea of a crucified messiah.

\[\text{Introduction, p. 181. Weber, The Cross, p. 86, sees the cross as the standard of true faith in 1 Corinthians: '...the faithful must interpret themselves and the entire world through the crucifixion'.}\]

\[\text{2 See Horsley, 'Wisdom', p. 224, especially n. 1.}\]
Paul may have responded to this scandal on previous occasions, and incorporated that previously worked-out response into the present argument. Here he indicates his break with the current Jewish view of the law and of Christ crucified, and tacitly places his opponents in Galatia on the (Jewish) side, to whose view he is opposed. These opponents, whoever they were, were committed to imposing the law upon faith in Christ and membership in the church.³

Paul opposes the position of the opponents by speaking of the revelation to him of the gospel and of God's Son and his call to preach to the Gentiles (1.12, 16). This serves to break the continuity between the gospel and Sinai, and between Paul's previous life under law and present life with Christ. In 1.13-14 Paul characterizes his former life in Judaism under law as persecution of the

³ The question of the identity of Paul's opponents is not pursued here, nor need it be answered for the purpose of this study. Sanders, Paul (1983), pp. 49-51, is right in saying that the position of the opponents is more critical than an answer to who they were. That they were Christians, he suggests, is borne out by three things: (1) Paul refers to their message as a 'different gospel' (1.6); (2) Paul accuses them of wishing to avoid persecution for the cross of Christ (6.12); (3) Paul appeals for defeat of the false brethren and to agreement with Peter and James, factors that have significance only for an inner-Church struggle. For more specific attempts to identify the opponents see Munck, Paul, p. 87; Schoeps, Paul, p. 65; Richardson, Israel, pp. 84-97; Bonnard, L' Épitre de Saint Paul aux Galates, pp. 2-5; Howard, Crisis in Galatia, pp. 17-19; Jewett, 'Agitators'; Davies, Paul, pp. 103-104. Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 183, rightly refers to them as '...Jewish Christians with a rather normal Jewish identity'. Barrett, Freedom and Obligation, p. 6, speaks of 'the work of a convinced and organized anti-Pauline party, prepared to go to any lengths to destroy the apostle's work'.

church, advancement beyond his peers, and zeal for the traditions of his fathers. In 1.15-16, by contrast to his past life, Paul sets out four components of his changed life: he was set apart before birth, he was called through grace, he was given a revelation of God's Son, and he was intended to preach Christ to the nations. The change is signified abruptly by ὅτε ἐν εὐδοκησεν at the beginning of 1.15.

In Gal 1.12 and 1.16 Paul thus uses the language of theophany (ἀποκάλυψεως, ἀποκάλυψις) to speak of what he perceived as divine intervention. In speaking thus Paul says two things. First, his gospel is of divine and not human origin (1.11), an origin later to be contrasted to that of the law, which in 3.19-20 Paul will distance from God. Second, his apostleship is of divine institution (1.1), an institution which Paul will emphasize in 1.17-18 by distancing himself from Jerusalem. 'Revelation' is thus the means, direct from God, by which Paul received his gospel, his apostleship, and his conviction about God's Son.

4 Weiß, Korintherbrief, p. 60, says of the use of ἀπεκάλυψεν in 1 Cor 2.10 that revelations (especially concerning μυστήρια) cannot be attained as though they were natural tendencies, but, '...nur durch eine übernatürliche wunderbare Ausrufung....' Paul does not use μυστήρια in Gal 1.12, 16, but he has been careful to place his gospel in a realm other than that available to natural man. It is not from men (1.1), nor through men, nor belonging to men (1.11), nor pleasing to men (1.10), just as in 1 Cor 2.10-13 it is a gospel not taught by human wisdom.

5 See Oepke, TDNT 3:583-584, and the discussion of revelation in 3.1 below. Barrett, Freedom, p. 10, says, 'Perhaps the negative aspect of this is what he wants to
Similarly, the change in Paul has been due to this divine intervention, and not to a psychological process.\(^6\) Paul nowhere asserts that the toilsome demands of the law caused him to languish in guilt, nor, for that matter, does he say that the law was impossible to do. His point of departure, both theologically and autobiographically, is in 'the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me' (2.20), and who 'gave himself for our sins, to deliver us from the present evil age' (1.4). Sole dependence on faith in Christ would be, for Paul, the mark of the new age. The old age would be marked by life under the law. The cross of Christ marks the transition from old to new.

Beker points out that the cross thus becomes a kind of 'shorthand' term for God's blessings in Christ. It tears us away from the dominion of the world (Gal 6.14), the law (2.19), and the old life (5.24). The cross epitomizes draw out here: he did not go because he was sent for'.

\(^6\) Kertelge, 'Autorität', p. 3: 'Paulus führt die erlangte Neuorientierung und seine Bindung an Jesus Christus nicht auf ein persönliches Scheitern am mosaischen Gesetz zurück, sondern auf die Apokalypse Jesu Chrisi....Seine Bekehrung ist nicht das Ergebnis eines psychologischen Prozesses, sondern Gnade, die ihm Gott unverdient und in Hinblick auf seinen früheren Lebenswandel (v. 13f) völlig überraschend zuteil werden ließ'. Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 57, 229, 231-236, dismisses the usual psychological interpretations of Paul's view of the law, but does posit certain psychological commonplaces that are probably applicable to Paul's situation. This involves the dynamic struggle between what one consciously thinks and what is struggling to be born, and leads Räisänen to a discussion of the Hellenists as a possible source of Paul's practice (later to become his theological position: practice precedes theology) as he came to identify with those whom he once persecuted. Again see Theißen, Psychological Aspects, pp. 234-243.
apocalyptic interpretation, and occurs exclusively in three contexts: (1) cross and wisdom, 1 Cor 1.17-18, 23; 2.2, 8; (2) cross and law, Gal 2.20; 3.1; 5.11; 6.14; (3) cross and new creation, Gal 5.24; 6.14; Rom 6.6.7

Understanding the cross as 'shorthand' for the blessings of God in Christ, or, for the gospel or Christ-event, complements the paucity of some terms in particular contexts. Resurrection, for example, is barely alluded to in Galatians, being mentioned only in 1.1 as part of Paul's greeting. Stanley gives four reasons why even this once Christ's resurrection is mentioned in Galatians: (1) it constitutes the basic testimony of an apostle; (2) it was the risen Christ who called Paul; (3) that Paul had seen the risen Christ refutes any denial of Paul's apostolic authority which may have been based on Paul's not having known Jesus during Jesus' mortal life; (4) the dominant theme of the letter is the gospel of promise, fulfilled in resurrection. Moreover Stanley says, 'In the Pauline kerygma, the thought of the risen Christ includes redemptive death, just as the mention of the Cross includes his resurrection.'8

And yet Stanley's argument does not answer the question of why Paul speaks of the cross so explicitly on

---


8 Stanley, Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, pp. 148-149. See Friedrich, TDNT 3:711, who agrees, 'Whether one speaks of the crucified (1 Cor 1.23) or the risen Lord (1 Cor 15.12), the reference is always to the total Christ who has become Lord by death and resurrection, and who is proclaimed as such, 2 Cor 4.5.'
some occasions, and in other letters does so not at all or very little. If the resurrection was the basic testimony of an apostle, why is Paul not more explicit about that in Galatians? Although it was the risen Christ who called Paul, it is witness to the crucified Christ which he establishes as the central aspect of his proclamation to the Corinthians (2.2) and Galatians (3.1). And in Galatians, where the theme of promise is basic to the argument in ch. 3, fulfillment is not spoken of in terms of resurrection, but in terms of full unity and inclusiveness in Christ. The fact remains, when in Galatians Paul wants to speak of Christ's redemptive death, he does so with specific references to the cross, not to resurrection, nor even to the death of Christ.

The cross in Galatians should be understood as representing the firm centre or central convictions by which Paul speaks of the transfer from the old to the new life. In Beker's terms, coherence and contingency are helpful theological categories for understanding the tension between what is central, uncompromising, and firm in Paul's message, and what is conditional, secondary, and flexible. Paul thus relates the universal truth claim of the gospel directly to the particular situation to which it is addressed: 'His hermeneutic consists in the constant interaction between the coherent centre of the gospel and

---

9 Sanders, Paul (1983), pp. 4-10.
its contingent interpretation." Paul thus makes the gospel 'a word on target' for the particular needs of his churches, without either compromising its centre or reducing it to petrified conceptuality.  

Cognizance of the tension between the firm centre of Paul's kerygma and the contingency to which each letter was addressed helps the interpreter understand the particularity of each epistle. Thus, Galatians must be studied on the basis of its own content, and the conclusions drawn from a study must, in the first instance, be conclusions only about Galatians. The terminology, words in combination, and theological motifs present in the epistle witness to the particular address of Paul's gospel to the peculiar exigencies of the Galatian situation. As we see first where Paul does or does not use certain words, or combinations of words, we are helped to determine whether a thing was a problem for Paul and the churches which he served. In such situations we can further determine what consistent theological patterns emerge in Paul's responses. It is therefore essential to begin with the biblical texts themselves, and

---


11 Beker, Paul (1980), p. 12. Childs, The New Testament As Canon, pp. 301-310, points out that the canonical significance of Galatians is not dependent on the objective accuracy of Paul's historical knowledge about his opponents' theological position regarding the law, but on how his theological construal of the situation bears witness to the kerygma.

12 See Funk, Language, pp. 277, 304; Barr, Semantics, pp. 233.
not with the history of interpretation or its predetermination of what motifs are important.\textsuperscript{13}

In Galatians Paul uses the cross to represent God's saving work in Christ. As such, the cross is indicative of the break with the old age. It stands against the law, which in that situation Paul's opponents promoted as a condition for faith and for entry into the church. In Galatians it is the whole law (not just one aspect of it), and it is the law as such (not misinterpreted or misunderstood law) against which Paul speaks.\textsuperscript{14} Neither Paul's references to the cross nor his strident statements against the law are replicated in Romans. And yet, in both epistles his position regarding the law is the same: he is dead to it (Gal 2.19; Rom 7.4).\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Gaventa, 'Methods', pp. 37-44.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Cranfield, 'Law', p. 56, says that what Christians have been discharged from is legalistic misunderstanding or abuse of the law. K. Barth, A Shorter Commentary on Romans, p. 47, says that our relationship to God is one of law, regulated by Christ. Both interpreters presuppose a continuity between law and gospel, if in fact they do not identify the two. They also generalize about Paul's doctrine of law on the basis of certain Romans texts.
\item \textsuperscript{15} On the development of ideas from Galatians to Romans see Marxsen, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 58; Betz, Galatians, p. 11; Borse, Der Standort des Galaterbriefes, p. 120ff; Der Brief an die Galater, pp. 9-10, 25-26. On Romans as a near repetition of the Galatian argument see Wilckens, Rechtfertigung als Freiheit, pp. 110-170. On the idea of an over-all change from Galatians to Romans, regarding the law, see Eichholz, Theologie, p. 247: 'Wenn man den Römerbrief mit dem Galaterbrief vergleicht, dann muß ausfallen, daß Paulus im Galaterbrief zu den schroffsten torakritischen Formeln kommt---so schroff, daß demgegenüber die Wendungen des Römerbriefs verschlacht und gemildert erscheinen. Vielleicht läßt sich auch sagen, daß Paulus sich im Römerbrief gegenüber dem Galaterbrief korrigiert bzw. sich überholt, was die Radikalität bestimmter Formulierungen angeht, die Paulus
\end{itemize}
both Romans and Galatians Paul speaks of this death to the law as having occurred in Christ's death on the cross. It is this aspect of his message to which we now turn.

________________________

im Römerbrief nicht wiederholt.' Hübner, Law, also addresses the differences between the law in Galatians (pp. 15-50) and the law in Romans (pp. 51-100). Beker, Paul (1980), speaks in terms of 'contextual interpretation' regarding Galatians (pp. 37-58) and Romans (pp. 59-93).
PART II

GALATIANS 2.19
2.1 DYING TO, LIVING TO

Gal 2.19 is either included in or follows after Paul's report of his rebuke to Peter in Antioch. It is not clear whether Paul's account of that episode ends with 2.14 or includes 2.15-21 (or part thereof) as a summary of the speech he made at Antioch.\(^1\) Only the first sentence (v. 14b) indicates direct address to Peter, and yet it seems improbable that Paul would limit his report of that episode to a single sentence.\(^2\) Therefore Paul likely passes imperceptibly from his report of the past episode to his present argument, addressing Peter formally (at least in v. 14b) and the Galatians materially.\(^3\) In 2.15-16 Paul states the common ground or 'point of agreement' about the self-definition of Jewish Christians who are Jews by birth\(^4\) and Christians by faith in Jesus Christ.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) Betz, Galatians, p. 113. Burton, Galatians, p. 111, says of this question, 'Only the first sentence (v. 14b) contains unmistakable evidence of having been addressed to Peter, and the absence of any direct address in the remainder of the chapter makes it unlikely that through the whole of it Paul is still quoting what he said to Peter.' But see Lambrecht, 'The Line of Thought in Gal. 2.14b-21', pp. 484-495, here p. 484, who in agreement with Müßner, Galaterbrief, p. 178, sees the whole section as a speech delivered to Peter at Antioch.

\(^{2}\) Burton, Galatians, p. 111.

\(^{3}\) Betz, Galatians, p. 114, with Burton, Lightfoot, Oepke, Schlier.

\(^{4}\) Betz, Galatians, p. 115.

\(^{5}\) Betz, Galatians, pp. 117-118, rightly points out that whether this is an objective genitive (faith in Jesus Christ) or a subjective genitive (the faith which Jesus
The phrase 'Gentile sinners' uses ἀμαρτωλοί in reference to Gentiles who are sinners in the Jewish sense because they do not have the Torah and therefore they cannot achieve righteousness and so are outside the realm of God's grace. In Gal 2.17-18 Paul moves on to the

Christ had) is not indicated by the grammatical ambiguity of the phrase, and so it must be decided on the basis of context (cf. his n. 43). Betz, p. 117, therefore says: 'The phrase ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν ("we have come to believe in Christ Jesus") interprets the genitive in the previous phrase "[the] faith of Christ Jesus" (πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).' But see Hultgren, 'The Pístis Christou Formulation in Paul', pp. 248-263, who supports the obj. gen. on the basis of syntactical observations. Bruce, Galatians, pp. 138-139, has excellent bibliographical citations for both views of the genitive, but his preference is for the obj. gen. because 'when Paul expresses himself by the verb πιστεύω and not by the noun πίστις, Christ is the undoubted object of the faith, as in the clause immediately following... (which) determines the sense of the preceding... and the next clause.' Cf. Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 240; Borse, Der Brief an die Galater, pp. 113-114; Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, pp. 92-93; Duncan, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 65; Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 170; Burton, Galatians, pp. 121-123; But in support of the subj. gen. see Williams, 'Again Pístis Christou', pp. 431-447, here p. 444: 'Christ is both domain and means, for when persons live in the power field created by the death and resurrection of Christ, they are beneficiaries of Christ-faith.... that faith which was first his and has now become theirs.... With the phrase pístis Christou, Christ-faith, he points to eschatological faith as introduced into the world by Christ as a new possibility of human existence. By písthein he points to the personal act of taking up that mode of personal existence which Christ pioneered.'
disagreement regarding the implications for Gentile Christians. In 2.17a Paul uses a 'correct presupposition' as he picks up the idea of justification by faith in Christ which was stated in v. 16. In 2.17a.2 Paul uses the 'false presupposition' that those who are justified by faith in Christ are sinners in the Jewish sense of the word. Christians who were not law-observant would be sinners from the Jewish perspective. But for Paul the law no longer distinguishes who is a sinner and who is righteous. Therefore the charge about being sinners is false, from Paul's perspective, and so also is its logical conclusion that Christ is an agent or servant of sin (v. 17c). The accusation would have been made because Paul and the Gentiles who believed in Christ had forsaken the law and it was faith in Christ which led them to do so. It is to the accusation in v. 17c that Paul responds in

in the church and/or for justification.

7 Betz, Galatians, p. 119. Lambrecht, 'Line of Thought', p. 490, calls v. 17a 'a simple condition, a realis' with which Paul agrees, while v. 17b is a wrong conclusion drawn from that right premise, and it is this wrong conclusion in v. 17b (not the premise in v. 17a) with which Paul disagrees. Lambrecht's interpretation, however, necessitates taking 'sinners' in v. 17 in a different sense than in v. 15, for in v. 17 the word would have to indicate Christians who in their faith saw that their previous life had in fact been sinful just as the Gentiles were sinful. But this understanding of 'sinners' in v. 17 is erroneous, since the idea of being considered sinners and Christ being the agent or servant of that sin are inseparable. That is, it makes more sense to understand the charge to have been that faith in Christ led people outside the law, and this makes them sinners.

8 Betz, Galatians, p. 120. The word ἀμαρτωλοί here means the same as in 2.15.
2.18-19. In v. 18 he offers a legal critique of the false argument of v. 17. The ἤπο of v. 18 shows a close connection between this and the preceding statements, as v. 18 explains and motivates the objection at the end of v. 17.⁹ The critique says that if the law were re-established then 'he' would be considered a transgressor (v. 18). This 'building up again' is likely an allusion to Peter's conduct at Antioch. Paul is therefore saying that if he were again to build up the law, as Peter was promoting, then it is not Christ who is an agent of sin but the one who builds up the law who is found to be a transgressor. Here Paul could mean either (1) to restore the law again will prove that he had sinned in the first place by tearing it down; or (2) by restoring the law he will set himself up for a life of transgressions as marked by law.¹⁰ But in either case his point is that it is not Christ but the one who would re-establish the law who thus becomes the agent of sin. But if the law were re-established (presumably for justification) then the whole belief about justification through faith in Christ collapses, and Christ died to no purpose (2.21). In v. 19 Paul uses the emphatic ἐγώ which points to his personal stand: 'I for my part' (that is, as opposed to Peter).¹¹

⁹ See Guthrie, Galatians, p. 89; against Lambrecht, 'Line of Thought', p. 495.

¹⁰ Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241, calls v. 18 Paul's first reason and v. 19 his second reason for rejecting the argument of v. 17.

¹¹ See Lambrecht, 'Line of Thought', p. 493 n. 35.
The γάρ of v. 19 is causal. It relates back to v. 18 and also introduces an idea which explains the statement of v. 17: we cannot think of Christ as an agent of sin for we are dead to the law and we are alive to God. 'Living for God is hardly sinful.' The meaning of v. 19 therefore lies in its place in Paul's response to the accusation that Christ is an agent of sin. Paul's answer is that he cannot re-establish or again build up the law, believers in Christ cannot be considered as sinners, and Christ is not an agent of sin because 'I died to the law'.

The concept of dying to one power and living to another is at the heart of Gal 2.19. The contrast which Paul introduced in 2.16, between works of the law and faith in Christ, is a contrast which is carried forward in 2.19, as living to the law is placed in contrast to living to God. This polarity is signified not only by the nouns in the dative case, but also by the verbs, ἀποθνῄσκω and ζω.14

1. There are a number of passages in Galatians and Romans where Paul uses a verb connoting dying, followed by ἀμαρτία, νόμος, or κόσμος in the dative case: (1) dying to sin, Rom 6.2, 10-11; (2) dying to law, Gal 2.19; Rom 7.4,

---

12 Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241.

13 We note the oscillation from 'works of the law' in particular to 'the law' in general in 2.19. See 3.1 below.

14 See 1.3 and 1.4 above.
6; (3) crucified to the world, Gal 6.14. These texts speak of 'dying to' or being 'crucified to' in contrast to 'living to' or 'belonging to'.

Datives of (dis)advantage 'designate the person whose interest is affected'. They show for whose sake the action of the verb is intended. In 2 Cor 5.13, for example, Paul says, 'if we are beside ourselves, it is for God (i.e., it happened for God's sake); if we are in our right mind, it is for you (i.e., in your interest)'. But there are some datives that introduce the idea of ownership. In 2 Cor 5.15, for example, Paul says of Christ that 'he died for all that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him'. These are datives that express 'more the possessor' and 'living for God' in Gal 2.19 is best understood in this way. But when the verb is not only 'living' but also 'dying' and when the noun is 'sin', 'law', or 'world', then the datives are of an even more specific type. Datives of relation designate respect, 'in the sight of', or, 'in relation to'. This relationship is to be understood in

---


16 BDF, §188.

17 BDF, §188.

18 Moule, 'Certain Datives', p. 370, is nearer to the dative of respect (BDF §197). Wedderburn, Baptism, p. 43 n. 1, says that the verbs εἰσναί and γίνεσθαι are characteristic of datives of possession (BDF §197) but are missing from datives of advantage or disadvantage which have 'more the possessor' (BDF §188) quality to them, such as Gal 2.19. So it is apt to compare them to datives of
terms of possession or rule. Since the implication of ownership is clear, God and sin, or God and law, to whom one lives or dies, 'are not beings of the same level as the one who dies or lives, but are slave masters who rule' over people.\(^{19}\) In Gal 2.19 Paul says that he has died to the law, meaning that the law is the possessor out of whose ownership he has passed by death. This dying is with respect to one specific entity, the law. Dying is made relevant in one particular relationship. It is not dying as such about which Paul is concerned, nor is it living as such. 'Living and dying are defined with reference to an outside object totally external to the subject.'\(^{20}\) It may thus be understood, 'In relation to the law, I died.' Although Paul does not refer to a physical or natural death,\(^{21}\) this is not merely a figurative death either. Paul does not use 'figurative, inauthentic language'.\(^{22}\) The connection with \(\sigmaυνεσταθματ\) keeps the language from being figurative, just as for Paul Christ's death was never docetic, and it is Christ's death in which this death of the self is grounded. This dying does not refer to the satisfaction of the demands of the law, by

\(^{19}\) Tannehill, *Dying and Rising With Christ*, p. 18.


\(^{22}\) Ebeling, *Truth*, p. 144.
way of a costly death, but rather it means that "we have been placed where the law no longer operates: "we are dead"...or "we have been put to death"...so far as law is concerned, with reference to law; our relationship with the law has been annulled'. In Rom 7.4 this annulment by death happens διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In Gal 2.19 it happens διὰ νόμου. But the same condition is described by both texts: the believer has become non-existent or annihilated so far as the law is concerned. Paul thus speaks of freedom by death. Just as any debtor who has died is freed from the creditor, so to die to the law is to be made free from the law.

2. This annulment by death, annihilation in relation to the law, or dying to the law in Gal 2.19, is to be understood as a decisive past event. The aorist of the verb distinguishes the event from dying with Christ as a present experience, especially as that experience is

---


24 See 2.4 below.

25 Moule, 'Certain Datives', p. 373; cf. Bruce, Galatians, p. 144, 'A change of lordship, from law to Christ, has taken place....' The converse to this is suggested by Gal 6.14: the cosmos is annihilated or non-existent as far as the believer is concerned. Tannehill, Dying, pp. 6ff, 84ff, 130ff, has pointed out that besides (1) dying with Christ as a decisive past event (Gal 2.19-20; Rom 7.1-6), and (2) dying and rising with Christ as a present experience, as in suffering (2 Cor 4.7-14; 12.9; 13.4), there is also (3) being with Christ in the future resurrection (1 Thes 4.14; 5.10).

26 Luther, Galatians (1519), pp. 234-235.

27 Tannehill, Dying, p. 7ff.
encompassed in the believer's suffering. The event is past in the sense that it took place in Christ's death on the cross. It is decisive because that death includes the believer in its effect.

3. The concept of dying to the law and the concept of dying with Christ (or in Gal 2.19, being crucified with Christ) are distinct but related ideas. If Gal 2.19 were understood in connection with 3.10-13 and 4.4, the identification of the two concepts in Paul's argument would become explicit: to be crucified with Christ would mean to die to the law and under the law as Christ did. Paul grounds his statements in Gal 2.19ff in sentences that are first-person statements, but their real subject is not only Paul as an individual, as for example, distinct from Peter.²⁸ The logic of Paul's statements is based on both his individual experience and his Christology. The statements about dying and living have the same structure as the christological statements which tell of Jesus' death and resurrection: Christ was dead and now lives, I was dead but now I live to God. This is further grounded in χριστός συνεσταθηκω.²⁹

Bultmann spoke of participation in the saving significance of the cross as that which happens when (1)

²⁸ Lührmann, Der Brief an die Galater, p. 45. But see Müßner, Galaterbrief, p. 179 (citing Stauffer, TDNT 2:357), who points out that Paul's first-person statements do indicate that Paul has taken a way which Peter and the others must also tread.

²⁹ Lührmann, Galater, p. 45.
one is confronted by the kerygma; (2) one acknowledges the question by which one is addressed in the kerygma; (3) one gives up one's old self-understanding. Such an interpretation, however, limits the meaning of dying with or being crucified with to personal human experience. The concept is then limited to what happens in a person when that person hears the gospel and comes to faith. That is, it is a view which more describes πιστεύω than it does ἀπέθανον or συνεσταθησαμαι. It is an anthropological interpretation which understands divine action in terms of what it means for human life. Similarly, both ἀπέθανον and συνεσταθησαμαι have often been interpreted to signify what has happened in baptism.

Although 'crucified with' is used in the Gospels regarding the criminals who were crucified along with Christ, Paul likely does not have in mind in Gal 2.19 the actual scene on Calvary, nor an early account of it. All that the Gospel texts state about Jesus and the criminals

30 For Bultmann's understanding of the cross see, Faith and Understanding, pp. 208-209, 214, 306-310; Kerygma and Myth, pp. 36-38; Theology 1:292-314.
31 Bultmann, Theology, 1:191: 'Thus, every assertion about Christ is also an assertion about man and vice versa; and Paul's Christology is simultaneously soteriology.' Käsemann, Jesus Means Freedom, pp. 61-65, rightly criticizes this view.
32 Schneider, TDNT 7:582-583; Schlier, Galater, pp. 99-100; Oepke, Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater, pp. 94-95; Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 181. For the view that this is not a reference to baptism see Borse, Galater, p. 117; Tannehill, Dying, p. 59; 2.2 below.
33 See 1.1 n. 33 above, and Mt 27.44; Mk 15.32; Jn 19.32.
is that they were crucified together, and even though 'crucified with' is used in those texts, the word 'von einer besonderen Beziehung zwischen ihnen und Jesus nichts weiß'. Paul seems to mean nothing other than that he was included in that death on the cross when on that cross his representative died. Thus, 'mit Christus sieht Paulus sich ans Kreuz geschlagen. Durch ihn ist er der Welt gegenüber gekreuzigt (6.14)....Im Tod Christi sind alle, für die er gestorben ist, (mit)gestorben (2 Cor 5.14). χριστῷ συνεσταθώμεθα could thus be paraphrased, 'When Christ was crucified on his cross, I was crucified, too'.

The concept of participation of this kind is not to be thought of as a formula, because a formula expresses a clear tendency in a set phrase. Rather, the idea appears in various ways, with σῶv as an independent preposition, or compounded with a verb, or in phrases in which the preposition is absent. Thus, as Tannehill says,

The motif of dying and rising with Christ may be said to be present when Paul refers to the believer's participation in Christ's death or resurrection by means of a construction which relates two elements which stand in the same contrast to each other as

34 Dietzfelbinger, Die Berufung des Paulus als Ursprung seiner Theologie, p. 32.

35 Of Paul's eschatological orientation in Gal 2.19, Oepke, Galater, p. 95, says, 'Man versteht sie am besten im Licht der Adam-Christus-Parallele (Röm 5.12ff; 1 Kor 15.22, 45ff)'. See Tannehill, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, pp. 134-135: 'The believers were put to death with Christ because they were included in the collective man or body of the old aeon which was crucified with Christ.'

36 Borse, Galater, p. 117.
'death' and 'life' and are related in thought to these terms.\textsuperscript{37}

All texts referring to dying with Christ as a decisive past event use the type of dative construction which has here been described as the dative of relation or reference. This dying is simultaneous with and included in Christ's dying. The references are to dying in relation to an old power or master and living to a new master. Two dominions are involved, and two aeons, and release from one and transfer to the other is indicated. In Gal 2.19 Paul refers to the law as part of the old dominion. He has undergone a radical break from life under the law in the old dominion, to allow for the newness of Christian existence, which for him is to 'live to God'. The believer's present life cannot be characterized as either a life of works of the law (Gal 2.16) or a life of sin as a law-breaker (2.18), because the relationship to the old dominion has been annulled.\textsuperscript{38}

So far as the law of the old aeon is concerned the believer is dead, and thus free from the master who formerly ruled. Death to the law occurs because the believer participates with Christ, having died with Christ in Christ's death, on the cross, under law. In 2.18 the first half of the if-then clause, \textit{εἰ γὰρ ἐκατέλυσα τὰ ἀνεκδοτά πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ}, is negated by the first half of 2.19:

\textsuperscript{37} Tannehill, \textit{Dying}, p. 6.

διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον. Paul died to the law, therefore he does not build up again what he has torn down.
2.2 CRUCIFIED WITH

We have seen that the term ἀπέθανον in Gal 2.19 relates to dying to one power or dominion and living to another. In the context of Galatians this meant death to the rule of law and transfer to faith in Christ which for Paul meant living to God. What then is the relation between this dying (ἀπέθανον) and being crucified with (συνεσταθρωμα) Christ?

1. Dying to the old aeon, in which law was active and ruling, should be understood in connection with 'I have been crucified with Christ'. That is, ἀπέθανον and συνεσταθρωμα explain one another. The aorist points to the event of dying for Paul. This dying is further specified by the perfect passive compound verb which refers to the cross of Christ.\(^1\) The aorist '...contains no action on Paul's part....he has been drawn into an event in which the nomos itself was dethroned and robbed of its sovereignty'.\(^2\) Paul's identification with Christ includes participating in the experience of Christ under the law and on the cross. The aorist generally has no significance regarding a thing's endurance and is ambiguous about its time of occurrence. It simply attests the action of the verb as attained, that is, the fact of

\(^1\) Betz, Galatians, p. 122.

the action or event, but without regard to its duration nor to the actual point in time of its accomplishment.\(^3\)

The perfect is specific regarding both these matters: the event took place when Christ was crucified, and it is still presently in effect.\(^4\) When Christ was crucified so was, and still is, Paul crucified with him.

2. Verbs compounded with συν- are one of the ways in which dying with Christ is expressed.\(^5\) Eduard Schweizer maintains that the original meaning of 'with Christ' was eschatological, that is, it first referred to the future life with Christ after the parousia.\(^6\) In some texts, however, Schweizer maintains that this post-parousia being 'with Christ' is extended back into the period between death and the parousia, and back even into the earthly life of the believer, and so the phrase occurs only in

\(^3\) Dana and Mantey, *Grammar*, p. 193. But there are gnomic or futuristic aorists where the author had a specific case in mind in which the act had been realized. See BDF §333.


\(^6\) Schweizer, 'Dying', pp. 1-2, refers to such texts as 1 Thes 4.17; 2 Cor 13.4; Rom 6.8b; Col 3.4; Phil 1.23; 3.20; 2 Cor 4.11, 14; 1 Thes 5.10. Generally, he says, 'in Christ' refers to the believer's earthly life as a member of the church, while 'with Christ' is eschatological.
either apocalyptic or baptismal contexts. Thus, '...in the work of the Spirit given by baptism the coming aeon has broken into this present.' Schweizer sees Gal 2.19 as one such text, in which the post-parousia 'with Christ' is interpreted back into crucifixion with Christ, and so, '...Paul uses the perfect tense in order to emphasize the continuing validity of what happened once in baptism'.

---

7 Here Schweizer, 'Dying', p. 3, refers to 1 Thes 5.1f; Rom 14.8f; 8.32. But as Tannehill, Dying, pp. 7, 59, has shown, not all texts relating to dying with Christ as a past event belong to a baptismal interpretation: Rom 6.3-5 and Gal 2.19 are examples.

8 Schweizer, 'Dying', p. 6. And yet Schweizer agrees with Tannehill, p. 4 n. 2, that in most passages which he (Schweizer) quotes Paul is not emphasizing baptism. That a text or motif is eschatological in the sense that it represents the future life as having broken into the present is distinct from making those same texts representative of baptism, even though baptism may indeed signify that eschatological break-in. The terms 'eschatology' and 'eschatological' are used in this discussion in a limited way, as defined by the concept of two ages. The old world or aeon has reached its end or destruction for the believer. The event of Christ is eschatological because what normally was thought to apply to the end of the world has now occurred in Christ's death and resurrection, by which the natural world's time and rule are over for the believer. See Dahl, 'The Messiahship of Jesus in Paul', pp. 37-47, here p. 43; 'Eschatology and History in Light of the Qumran Texts', pp. 129-146, here p. 130; Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 35; History and Eschatology, p. 23; Theology 1:306; Keck, Paul, p. 81.

9 Schweizer, 'Dying', p. 3, says, 'Rom vi.4-8 and Col ii.12f; iii.1 clearly describe baptism. For Gal ii.20 the same may be true....' (He refers to Gal 2.20, thus taking the RSV numbering; cf. 1.1 above.) For baptismal interpretations of Gal 2.19 see Schnackenburg, Baptism, p. 63; Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 181. In addition, that Gal 2.19 is explained by Rom 6.3ff, is understood by Schlier, Galater, p 98-100; Duncan, Galatians, p. 71. However, Kertelge, 'Rechtfertigung' bei Paulus, p. 242, rightly points out that the relationship of faith and baptism here is not made explicit, although a hint of baptism 'als sakramentale Begründung des neuen Lebens' may be present.
But Schweizer's conclusion about baptism in this text is not necessitated by the eschatological understanding of 'with Christ', and certain interpretations of συνεσαύρωμαι in 2.19 are precluded by syntactical constructions within the verse. A baptismal reading is ruled out by διὰ νόμου, for Paul does not mention baptism in this context, and to understand 2.19 as representing baptism means that the law would have to be the power operative in baptism, for death, he says, was through law:

The phrase 'through law' also makes clear that Paul is not speaking of baptism in Gal 2.19. This reference to the law can be understood only in connection with Christ's death under the law's curse on the cross. The law does not bring about a sacramental death in baptism.

The aorist ἀπέθανον is best understood as part of Paul's response to the statement of v. 18. The thought of returning to something to which he has died is absurd. This is not to deny that faith, justification, and baptism are always related or referred to one another, for,

---

10 Betz, Galatians, p. 123, points out that Galatians seems to express the same restraint about baptism as we find in 1 Cor 1.13-17. Paul mentions baptism only once, at 3.27, where he does not mention dying with Christ. Paul speaks of dying with Christ in 5.24 and 6.14 but there does not mention baptism. And in none of the Galatians passages does he mention any of the concepts of Romans 6, such as resurrection. Gal 2.19 may in fact be 'the theological principle by which Paul interprets the ritual of baptism in Romans 6', and not vice versa. See Kertelge, Rechfertigung, p. 242.

11 Tannehill, Dying, pp. 47, 59. Baptism is a manifestation of the eschatological power of the cross and an event by which one enters the people of the new age. But it does not repeat the event of the cross nor make it present.
'...Paul knows no faith without baptism....' But this is a different conclusion from that which says that Gal 2.19 means baptism, or is explained by Romans 6. Furthermore, if Gal 2.19 refers to baptism, one wonders why Paul did not explicitly mention baptism in the verse. There is in fact no hint in the epistle that the Galatians should know that in baptism they died to the law. Paul, on the other hand, pinpoints the termination of the rule of law in Christ's coming (3.24; 4.4) and in his salvific death (2.21; 3.13).

Interpretations which see a reference to baptism in 2.19 tend to approach the text by way of Romans 6. The same question may be asked of Rom 6.1-14 as of Gal 2.19, namely, whether it is a baptismal text in the strict sense of the word. It is not. The real point of connection between the two texts is freedom by death: death to sin in Rom 6.6, 11, and death to law in Gal 2.19. In Gal 2.19 Paul makes no reference to baptism, but rather sees

---


14 Käsemann, Romans, p. 163, points out that the basic motif which is emphasized in Romans 6 is, 'the fellowship of our destiny with that of Christ'. This is not an explicit statement of Paul's doctrine of baptism. The text says nothing about the usual things the church tends to ask in relation to baptism in the early church: conferring of the Spirit, incorporation into the body of Christ, the necessary preparation, the rite as such, the gathering of the community, the administration of baptism by office bearers, the invocation of the name of Jesus, the use of vows, hymns, laying on of hands, immersion or aspersion, whether many people or families were baptized together, and the baptism of infants.
himself nailed to the cross with Christ, and thus, included in the death of Christ, he died to and through law.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, the prefix συν- echoes a being-with-Christ which points to the inclusive and representative nature of Christ's death on the cross. When he died, Paul died with him. Baptism may signify this dying, but the two are not identical.\textsuperscript{16}

3. An apocalyptic interpretation of Gal 2.19 and of the perfect συνεσταθημαι in particular is appropriate. The revelatory language with which Paul counters the Sinai tradition of his opponents (1.12, 16, 21), and the two-aeon theology by which he asserts a discontinuity between Sinai and the cross, between the old aeon of law and the new aeon of Spirit, indicate a breaking into the present of what had been future expectation (1.4).\textsuperscript{17}

But despite the first-person statements Paul does not speak in a purely individualistic way. A psychological interpretation is precluded by the 'dying to' and 'living to' construction. The release from one lordship and entry into another, with the dative indicating the lord in question, points to the law as a power of the old aeon. The old dominion does not die simply because one becomes conscious of bondage and the law's inability to justify

\textsuperscript{15} See Borse, \textit{Galater}, p. 117; Tannehill, \textit{Dying}, p. 59.


\textsuperscript{17} See 3.1 and Part IV (4.2) below.
or make alive.\textsuperscript{18} The old dominion ended with the coming and death of Christ. Law ruled and was operative in the old aeon, but with the birth of Christ under law (4.4) and his giving himself for us (1.4), deliverance from the law and the old aeon was given. It is Christ's death which is the ground and cause of this deliverance. The phrase, διὰ νόμου, thus directs us away from a false subjectivizing that would limit 2.19 to the personal experience of Paul.

And yet Paul's own experience is involved, for Paul has spoken of his call, his being set apart, his reception of revelation, his being sent to preach (1.15-16), and his death to the law (2.19). Although Paul could well have been speaking for Jewish Christians in general, the emphatic ἐγώ of v. 19, which may anticipate the ἐγώ of v. 20, 'suggests that he knew in a special way what it meant to die to law "through law"'.\textsuperscript{19} In relation to Christ and grounded in his own experience of call and revelation on the Damascus Road Paul’s new view of law came forth.\textsuperscript{20} In this new view, as Schlatter rightly points out, Paul places the law and the cross beside one another, and speaks of their respective work as being effectively similar:

\begin{quote}
Durch das Gesetz und durch Jesu Kreuz bin ich in dem Tod versetzt. Denn was uns Gott durch das Gesetz tut und was er uns durch Christus tut, ist
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{18} Tannehill, Dying, p. 58.

\textsuperscript{19} Bruce, Galatians, p. 143.

\textsuperscript{20} Bruce, Galatians, p. 144. Cf. Schlatter, Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon, p. 61.
Schlatter sees the likeness of Paul's death through the law and Jesus' death under the law. Just as the cross of Jesus is the culmination of the law's work, so 'Jesus hat Paulus mit sich hineingezogen in seinen Tod'. Thus διὰ νόμου must be understood on the basis of συνεστάρωμα. Paul's death to and through law is also to be understood on the basis of Christ's death to and through law. The perfect συνεστάρωμα points to νόμος and the role of the law in Jesus' death. Paul also died to and through the law in being transferred to the lordship of Christ. The transfer and death to law happened for Paul when he was included in Christ's death by being crucified with Christ.

---

21 Schlatter, Galater, pp. 62-63. See 2.4 below.
22 Schlatter, Galater, p. 62.
23 Tannehill, Dying, p. 59, and 3.2 below.
24 Oepke, Galater, p. 95; Lührmann, Galater, p. 45; Blank, Paulus, p. 299; Bruce, Galatians, p. 143.
We have seen that Paul's statement that he 'died to the law' means death in the particular relationship of Paul and the law, and transfer to a new dominion. And we have seen that this death is qualified by his phrase 'crucified with Christ', meaning that Paul was included in Christ's death on the cross. We turn now to Paul's enigmatic phrase 'through the law'. What does Paul mean by saying that he died διὰ νόμου? Two aspects of our investigation into this question are the involvement of the law itself in Paul's death to the law, and the involvement of the law in the death of Jesus.

1. Paul asserts that the very death to law which is declared by νόμῳ ἀπέθανον is a death in which the law itself is somehow involved. This involvement is represented by διὰ νόμου. There is nothing in the verse

1 Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 53-56, concludes that τέλος in Rom 10.4 means termination. The polemical language there about the law shows that righteousness from law is contrasted to righteousness from faith, the νόμος of v. 4 is to be associated with the law righteousness of v. 5 because of the explanatory γὰρ connecting the two verses and so '...with regard to such a law Christ can only be its end!' In response to the question, 'Why was the law abolished?' Räisänen, pp. 56-62, asserts three summations of Paul's position: (1) the law was given for a limited period of time, as stated in Gal 3.19, assumed by Gal 3.23-25, and supported by 2 Cor 3.3-13; (2) according to Gal 2.19 the abolition of the law was somehow due to the law itself; (3) the death of Christ has freed us from under the law according to Gal 3.13 (cf. 4.4; Rom 7.1-6), and so has made the law a thing of the past for the Christian. It is the second of these answers which concerns us here.
or its context to warrant distinguishing two laws or referring only νόμῳ to the Law of Moses and διὰ νόμου to the law of faith or Law of Christ.² Both terms refer to the law of Moses or the law as such. It is this one law to which and through which death has happened. Räisänen summarizes three diverse interpretations for the 'abbreviation'³ διὰ νόμου in Gal 2.19 which could be categorized as psychological, preparatory, and causative.

1.1. A psychological understanding of Paul's statements about dying through the law would emphasize Paul's own bitter experiences under the law.⁴ While Räisänen says that this explanation 'can be safely dismissed', he later speculates that Paul's conversion was

² Luther, Galatians (1519), pp. 161-163, understands διὰ νόμου as law of Christ or law of faith. This is accepted by Lagrange, Saint Paul, Épître aux Galates, p. 51: 'Je suis donc tenté de préférer l'explication très simple d' Ambrosiaster: hoc dicit, quia per legem fidei mortuus est legi Moysis.' So also Aquinas, Commentary on Galatians, p. 60, reads 'I by the law spiritual am dead to the law carnal'.

³ Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 57, refers to Betz, Galatians, p. 122, who says that this 'abbreviation' must be 'decoded'.

⁴ Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 57. For discussion of a psychological interpretation see his pp. 229-236, especially nn. 1-17. Such interpretation tends to be based on an autobiographical understanding of Romans 7, and is represented by Deißmann, Klausner, Dodd, Davies, and Buber. In fact, (1) whether Romans 7 (or Galatians 2) is to be taken as autobiography or an intended inclusion of all believers, and (2) whether Romans 7 is a pre-conversion or post-conversion Paul, are in both instances alternatives too narrowly conceived. There is a case to be made for the paradigmatic nature of Paul's experience. Eichholz, Paulus, p. 224, says of Phil 3.4ff, '...Paulus sich selbst als Beispiel für Begegnung des Juden mit Christus versteht'. The same is true of Gal 2.19.
perhaps not so sudden a thing as it seemed to Paul himself, and 'some psychological commonplaces are probably applicable' to Paul, even though we cannot penetrate his psychic life 20 centuries after Paul lived.\(^5\) Plausible as such speculations seem (rendering credible a former fear of punishment in Paul, pointing to Paul's chafing under certain unmotivated precepts of the law, or indicating that Paul embraced the views of the very people he once persecuted, thus accepting the Hellenists' relaxed attitude toward the law in their inclusion of Gentiles and circumcision-free mission\(^6\)) they are matters about which Paul himself offers no clear explanation. Accordingly, the texts with which we have to deal relate to situations in the churches to which Paul is applying the gospel. They are not primarily intended as windows into the personal life of the apostle. To make them such is to shift attention from the author's intention to the interpreter's. Some distinction must be maintained.

\(^5\) Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 232: 'It is one such commonplace that the unconscious can break through in opposition to the conscious belief to which one clings. There is a "polarity, a kind of opposition, between unconscious experience and consciousness" so that "the more we are unconsciously smitten with doubts about an idea, the more dogmatically we fight for it in our conscious arguments....A dynamic struggle goes on within a person between what he or she consciously thinks on the one hand and, on the other, some insight, some perspective that is struggling to be born".' Räisänen is citing May, Courage, p. 59, and Beker, Paul, p. 237, who says, 'How could the Christophany have been so traumatic and so radical in its consequences unless it lit up and answered a hidden quest in his (Paul's) soul?'

between understanding Paul (the person) and understanding Paul's letters.

1.2. A preparatory understanding of dying to the law through the law would emphasize that for Paul the law pointed beyond itself to Christ. This pointing to Christ happens in the law's pronouncement of the death sentence over the sinner, or in its confining all people under sin. If Gal 3.19 were understood to mean that the law produces transgressions, then a preparatory sense would be implicit. So also, 3.22 may implicitly have within the ἐνάκρα τοῦ λόγου clause the sense of law (here Scripture) preparing for the promise of faith. On the other hand, 3.24 uses the term παράδοσις but this does not indicate a preparatory role for the law. Primarily these texts are part of Paul's argument about the temporary and inferior nature of the law. An implicit preparatory function could be seen in 4.4, relative to Christ's birth under law: he was born under law so that those under law could be redeemed. The preparatory function of the law can be inferred from 3.13-14. But Paul does not make explicit statements in Galatians about the preparatory function of the law.

---

7 Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 57: 'Perhaps the general and somewhat vague idea that, by pointing to Christ as the redeemer, the law pointed beyond itself and thus paved the way for the Christian's liberation from it, is a sufficient explanation.' Lietzmann's view is that here is pronouncement of the death sentence, and Betz interprets it as all people confined under sin. Räisänen, p. 58 n. 76, cites Rafael Gyllenberg, who assumes intentional ambiguity behind the abbreviation.
1.3. A causative understanding of Paul's statement about dying to the law through the law would emphasize that the law in fact caused the death of Christ, and because believers were crucified with Christ it has caused their death too. Räisänen's response to this is, 'It is difficult, however, to find in Paul the idea that the law caused the death of Christ....' The question thus becomes, how difficult is it? Therefore, what follows is our investigation into the causative role of the law. There are three interpretations of 'through law' in Gal 2.19 worth considering. Finally, Paul's view of the true character of law is a consequence of how the law was involved in the death of Jesus.

1.3.1. Oepke has categorized five different uses of ὑπὸ with the genitive. He classifies ὑπὸ in Gal 2.19 as instrumental, with genitive of cause, showing the means by which a thing occurs (Gal 1.15; 2.16, 21; Rom 3.22, 25, 27; 5.10; 1 Cor 4.15; Col 1.20, 22; Mk 16.20; Acts 15.11). This is distinguished from a causal sense which points to origin or author as primary cause. The distinction is between cause of death and means or agency of death.

Benoit systematizes this distinction. He takes Gal 2.19 to be a commentary on Rom 7.1-4, where ἐσεαναρώθη

---


9 Oepke, TDNT 2:65-70. The five are spatial, temporal, modal, instrumental, and causal.

10 Oepke, TDNT 2:67-68; cf. BDF, p. 119, for the distinction between agent and originator.
recalls the putting to death of Christ himself. This is a death in which believers participate, a death in which they are included. Christ died to the law by undergoing its sentence. In union with him, believers undergo the same sentence of law and the same death: through crucifixion with Christ the believer dies to the law through the law. Rom 6.11 and 8.10 are analogous to Gal 2.19, as they speak of the death of the Christian to sin and through sin. Benoit points to the difference between διὰ ἁμαρτίαν in Rom 8.10 (which he takes to be causal, pointing to origin) and διὰ νόμου in Gal 2.19 (instrumental with genitive of cause). That is, sin caused the death but law was the agent or instrument of death. Benoit then moves to the death of Christ (the event in which the believer's death is included and the paradigm by which it is understood) and says, '...sin was the cause of the death of Christ but not the instrument of it as was the Law'. Benoit thus maintains the distinction between primary cause on the one hand, and agent (instrument or means) on the other. He sees Gal 2.19 in the second sense. His interpretation is dependent on Romans texts.

Schlier also sees dying to law (Gal 2.19) as analogous to dying to sin (Rom 6.2, 10). This is repeated in the passive formulation of Rom 7.4: ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ. This becoming free from the law is mediated through the law.

---

11 Benoit, 'The Law and the Cross', p. 33.
It is the agent of death, through which I die to it. This is explained by the parallel passage in Rom 7.4: 'Hier ist der Leib Christi als das wirksame Mittel genannt, durch das die Christen dem Gesetz getötet sind....' The law brought death to Christ, and by our being included in his death, the law brings death to us. Schlier thus speaks of the mediation of death through the law, and relates the meaning of Gal 2.19 to Rom 7.7ff, where in the sphere of sin the law is 'die Handhabe der Sünde'. Sin is thus the primary cause behind the mediating instrument or (in Gal 2.19, death-bringing) agent, the law. When sin is made powerless, so also the law has no more power.

Sanders also speaks of the law as an agent of death. He sees Paul, in Gal 2.19, placing law in the old world order, along with sin and the flesh, and hence representing something which Christians must escape. Christians die to sin (Rom 6.5-11), are no longer in the flesh (Rom 7.5, 9), and are dead to or freed from the law (Rom 6.14f; 7.4, 6). Sanders adds,

The law is different from sin and the flesh, however, because it is an agent of death, probably because of its power to condemn: it kills (2 Cor 3.6; cf. Rom 7.9-13). It is probably for this reason that Paul can say both that he died to the law and that he did it through the law (Gal 2.19), although the formulation is difficult. It seems to agree more with his general view of escape from the powers

---

12 Schlier, Galater, p. 100.

13 Schlier, Galater, p. 100.
hostile to God to say that Christians die through Christ (Rom 7.4).\textsuperscript{14}

Sanders is reluctant to ascribe a causative role to the law regarding the death of Jesus: '...while it is reasonable to surmise that Paul saw a fault in the law for its supposed role in Christ's death, neither he nor other first-century Jewish Christians - or non-Christian Jews - seem to have reasoned in this way.'\textsuperscript{15} Sanders doubts that when Paul wrote Gal 3.13 he was actually thinking about the causes which historically led to Jesus' death.\textsuperscript{16}

But in fact, the use of Deut 21.23 (Gal 3.13), probably by Jews who disputed that Jesus was the Messiah, is based on their presumption of Jesus' guilt under law. Paul's acknowledgement of their textual argument, and correction of its application by the addition of ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, indicates his acceptance of Jesus' guilt under law.\textsuperscript{17} But Jesus' acceptance 'for us' of the guilt and the curse becomes the point of Paul's kerygma.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{14} Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 83. To this view it should be added that Paul remembers the God-given nature of the law, and therefore he will not treat it as the personified active malign power as he does sin and flesh. See 1.4 n. 7 above.

\textsuperscript{15} Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 25.

\textsuperscript{16} Sanders is arguing against the position of Harvey, Jesus and the Constraints of History, pp. 22-25, who presents Paul as believing that Jesus was guilty under the law, and so was handed over by a Jewish court as the result of a decision based on law.

\textsuperscript{17} See 3.2 below.

\textsuperscript{18} Schnackenburg, Baptism, p. 63.
vómov may indicate that he is thinking about the causes which led historically to Jesus' death.\textsuperscript{19}

1.3.2. Fitzmyer distinguishes between a primary and secondary cause, that is, between cause as origin, and cause as instrument or agent, by speaking of a proximate and a remote cause for being dead to the law.\textsuperscript{20} He translates this verse, '...because of the Law I died to the Law'. His rendering of the preposition with cause and effect terminology is in accord with the two reasons for which Fitzmyer thinks Paul uses the prepositional phrase διὰ νόμου. What Fitzmyer calls the proximate cause for death to the law

...is the crucifixion of Christ himself, but its remote cause is the Law, the curse of which was levelled against Christ (3.13). It was the Mosaic Law and the mentality it produced among men that was responsible for the crucifixion, and indirectly for the emancipation of Christians from it.\textsuperscript{21}

By 'remote cause' Fitzmyer points to the primary cause or power behind the scenes which brought about both the 'proximate cause' (the crucifixion of Christ) and its consequence, freedom from the law for believers. He thus does not speak of the law as the means, agent, or instrument of sin, but as primary cause (in the sense of Oepke's fifth category), referring to author or origin.

\textsuperscript{19} Oepke, Galater, p. 95, points out that because Paul thinks concretely and objectively, the second half of 2.19 shows a historical connection: 'Der Kreuzestod Christi war Vollzug des Gesetzesfluches (3.13)'.

\textsuperscript{20} Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241.

\textsuperscript{21} Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241.
Ebeling also speaks of the law as cause of death in a similarly direct or primary way. It is in Gal 3.13 that Paul describes what actually happened in the death of Christ. The law played a part in that death, '...because it was the crucial factor that sent Christ to his cursed death on the cross (Gal 3.13)'. So Paul says in Gal 2.19 that through the law he died to the law to express that the law is not only affected by his death, but also functions as its cause.

1.3.3. There is yet another interpretation of 'through law' which must be considered. Borse, in line with Rom 3:27; 4.11; 2 Cor 5.7, understands διὰ νόμου in Gal 2.19 as the accompanying conditions or situation 'in law' from which one is released. Paul thus may be speaking, in line with his own Jewish background, of the condition in which he lived. Law as an active realm or condition accompanied his life. Thus, in spite of the instrumental understanding of διὰ which makes proper sense in 2.16 and 2.21, the same sense ought not be presupposed for 2.19. (This same modal understanding of διὰ νόμου

22 Ebeling, Truth, p. 147.

23 Borse, Galater, p. 117; Gal 4.4 could be read this same way. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 118, speaks of three stages (prior to law, under the law, free from the law) through which believers pass, and thus belongs in the modal interpretation category. See Harvey, Constraints, especially ch. 3, 'The Constraint of Law'; O'Neill, 'The Charge of Blasphemy at Jesus' Trial', in The Trial of Jesus, ed. by Bammel. On the responsibility of Rome for the death sentence see: Winter, On the Trial of Jesus, p. 62; Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus?, ch. 7. But despite the helpful comments of the latter two authors, Jesus was born and died under the law.
would then also have to be considered when speaking of the historical events and forces under which Jesus lived and which led to Jesus' death.) Respect for law had been translated into practices, actions, and a particular religious way of life for Paul. Respect for law was, for him as for Pharisees generally, not a generic principle but specific and prescribed courses of action in compliance with Torah conditions. It is clear in Galatians that Paul's concern is not only with theological convictions regarding the law in the church, but with particular practices being observed or proposed. This would correspond to the rather precise meaning of 'works of the law' as we meet it in 2.16 and the situation to which it speaks. 'Works' were the conditions which the Judaizers wanted to impose on the Galatians. Thus when Paul says that he died διὰ νόμου it would mean that only in relation to Christ, in revelation on the Damascus Road, was the 'moral bankruptcy' of the law disclosed. So ended the old life under the conditions and constraints of law and so began the new life under Christ.

However, the weakness of this modal understanding of the law is that it identifies the law with life and the accompanying conditions under which one lives. The phrase διὰ νόμου, if it meant the accompanying conditions or manner of life, would relate to Paul's previous existence,

---

24 See 3.1 below.

25 Bruce, Galatians, p. 143.
prior to the death to which he refers in Gal 2.19. Thus the phrase would become disconnected from the action of the main verb, ἄνεθενον. But Paul separates life from the law, and speaks of the law in terms of death: 'I died through the law'. It is best therefore to confine the understanding of what Paul means by 'through law' to a causative role in the sense of either origin or agent of death. Then ὑπόνοον is understood in its appropriate connection with the verb ἄνεθενον, with the emphasis, as Paul seems to intend it, on the death-bringing character of the law.

2. Is the law therefore the cause as origin, or the means as agent, in the death Paul, of the believer and behind that, the death of Christ? Paul is flexible on this point. In Rom 7.7-12 he clearly has the law in the power and service of sin, with law as the agent and sin the cause. But in Galatians he does not speak so explicitly of this relationship between cause and agent. He may be close to such a concept in 3.19, where he likely means that the law produces transgressions, and in 3.22, where the law (Scripture) locked up all things under sin. In such texts it is logical to think of the law as being under the power of sin, or in service to sin, even though in Galatians Paul's focus is not on death to sin or through sin, but on death to and through law. The

26 Such a prepositional phrase functions as an adverb, and one must therefore ask which verb they modify. See BDF §184, 203, 214–216; Robertson and Davis, A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament, p. 248.
inclusiveness with which he can speak of sin, death, law, or flesh as aspects of the old aeon, or present evil age, may allow him to focus on any single one of those aspects as the need arises, and allow the item to take on proportions generally appropriate only to the age or dominion itself. Technically each of those aspects could be thought of as a means or agent of the forces and power of the old aeon, with the old aeon itself being the cause or origin of the characteristics operative in the various means. But it is a separate question whether in Galatians Paul has allowed the law to rise to the position of cause or origin for death, even though he seems clearly not to do so in Romans. Paul in fact makes no explicit statement in Galatians about the law as the origin or source of death. The law as an agent of death, in the service of sin, is an understanding not prohibited by Galatians. That is, contrary to its purpose and against its God-given nature the law is exploited by sin to bring death. This is clearly the view in Rom 7.8-13, and this view does not seem to be incompatible with Galatians. It may be best to say that in Galatians the law is the cause of death at least in the agency or instrumental sense. If Gal 3.19 means that the law produces sin (that is, causes sin) then it could be inferred that the law is also the cause or origin which produces death as well. Paul places sin and death together (along with law and flesh) in the old aeon. If the law is the cause or origin of one (sin) then it could be assumed that he would say that the law is also
the cause or origin of the other, namely death. But this is not explicitly stated in Galatians.

2.1. And yet whether the law is the origin or the agent, it has a death-bringing character. Lührmann points out that, as for Christ, so also for the Christian, the law does not only curse, but also kills: 'Der Tod Jesu am Kreuz jedoch stand unter dem Fluch des Gesetzes (vgl. 3.13) und war gerade vom Gesetz nicht gedeckt – im Gegenteil: das Gesetz selber hat Christus umgebracht'.

Thus, 3.13 becomes instrumental in understanding 2.19, as the law in both instances is presented as death-bringer. This death-bringing character of law is not grounded in human failure to keep the law perfectly, but is an attribute of law itself. This death-bringing character of the law is over against the belief that the law brings life. The antithesis of διὰ νόμου ἀπέθανον would be found in the διὰ νόμου δικαίωσιν of 2.21 (cf. 3.21), in which case Christ's death would have been in vain. But in fact

27 Lührmann, Galater, p. 45.


29 Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 180, says that the promise of life which was given in the law was only for those who fulfill it, the one who does not fulfill it falls under a curse, no one fulfills its strict requirements, 'Und so sind alle "durch das Gesetz" dem Tod verfallen, "gestorben"'. Perfect law observance, however, is not Paul's argument in Galatians 2-3. See Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 25.
the law brings death, '...nicht Leben, wie es verspricht....'³⁰

Linton has pointed out that the end of the law occurs because of the law’s death-bringing character. If one is dead one can no longer be reached by the law.³¹ A dead person cannot be brought into a juridical process. Death is the only way to be free from the law. This concept of freedom from the law by death is so important that Paul applies it universally. The expression is not meant as philosophical symbolism, illusion, nor as though one only seems to be dead. The expression is meant in a juridical sense: one no longer exists under law because one has died to the law. Linton maintains that Paul is consistent regarding this fundamental juridical principle: the law can be removed from power only in a ‘lawful’ way. Law can come to an end only if it is over-ridden by something greater. God as law-giver (and therefore only God) can bring the law to an end. Thus, for Paul to speak of the law as he does means that he has had to suppose that God never intended the law to be everlasting. From its beginning the law had a limited time to be in effect. Linton thus maintains, in effect, that the law had its own demise built into the very work (bringing death) which the law does. Hence the law could not have been given for more than a limited period of time.

³⁰ Lührmann, Galater, p. 45.
In light of Linton's helpful comments it is important to remember the connection between Paul's view of the law and the turn-around that happened in his view and in his whole life following the revelation to him of God's Son (Gal 1.16) That is, Linton's analysis pertains to Paul's view (as opposed to Paul's pre-conversion view, the traditional Jewish view, and even the Jewish Christian view) of the law, a view to which Paul came upon or after conversion to Christ. Bruce rightly sees this fact pointing to the 'the logic of Paul's Damascus-road experience - the experience which brought home to him in a flash the "powerlessness" of the law to accomplish what it was designed to do'.

A strength of Bruce's position is that it connects Paul's own experience, signalled by the ἔγωγ of 2.19, to his central conviction about the Crucified Christ, in whose crucifixion Paul has participated or been included. That is, the turn-around (or conversion) which happened to Paul corresponds to the turn-around in his view of law, which he then saw to have brought death, not life, to him. Related to this turn-around is interchange in Christ, wherein Christ's death under law brought life and blessing to believers, and Paul shares in that blessing, or 'lives to God', by being crucified with Christ. The believer's death to law comes about because of inclusion or participation in Christ's death to law. It was therefore in the cross of Christ

---

32 Bruce, 'Recent Research', p. 124.
that the law met its end and repealed itself. Paul shows this in 3.13.\textsuperscript{33} The law thus removed Christ from the sphere of its influence, and this is also true of the believer, who meets freedom from the law by death to the law.\textsuperscript{34} By being involved in the death of the believer who dies to the law, the law is involved in its own demise and end. In Paul's view the law is, in this way, turned against itself.

And yet, it was not the law itself which brought Paul to see that it brings death.\textsuperscript{35} After his conversion Paul came to see his previous life as a persecutor of the church as unspeakably sinful (1 Cor 15.9). It had not been the law that had shown him this or prevented him from previously persecuting the church. In fact it had been his respect for the law that had led him to such sin even as the law brought death to him.

\textsuperscript{33} Lührmann, Galater, p. 56: 'Der Fluch, der dem Gesetz zugeordnet ist, hat hier sein Ende gefunden, indem das Gesetz selber Christus verflucht hat (vgl 2.19)'.

\textsuperscript{34} Oepke, Galater, p. 95: 'Es hat selbst Christus der Sphäre seines Einflusses, der Welt, entrückt und die Gläubigen, welche mitgekreuzigt wurden, mit ihm'. See Weder, Kreuz, p. 177; Schlatter, Galater, p. 61: 'Eben darum, weil er durch das Gesetz ein toter Mann geworden ist, ist er nun auch für dasselbe tot. Es hat sein Werk an ihm bis zum Ende getan; nun ist er nicht mehr mit ihm verflochten, sondern frei'. Bruce, Galatians, p. 143, quotes Schoeps, Paul, p. 193: 'With death obligations towards the law have ceased'.

\textsuperscript{35} Burton, Galatians, p. 133, says that it was Paul's experience under the law that had taught him his own inability to meet its spiritual requirements and its own inability to make him righteous. In fact, Paul's view of the law in Galatians is grounded in God's revelation of the Son to Paul (1.16).
2.2. How then does the death-bringing character of the law relate to the death of Jesus? What was the involvement of the law in the death of Jesus? The statements about dying and living have the same structure as the christological statements which tell of Jesus' death and resurrection: Christ was dead and now lives, I was dead but now I live to God.\textsuperscript{36} Christ's experience is the paradigm for the believer's experience. The death of Christ under the law and the death of the self of which Paul speaks in Gal 2.19 correspond to one another. As for Christ, so also for the Christian: the law not only brings curse, it also brings death. Gal 3.13 is instrumental in understanding 2.19, because what is true of the believer in relation to law is true because it was true for Christ.\textsuperscript{37} Thus the passage 3.10-14 serves as a basis for understanding 2.19, as what first happened to Christ is that which Paul declares has happened also to himself.

Blank sees this connection to 2.19:

\begin{quote}
Dieser Vers, der zunächst einige Rätsel aufgibt, wird klar, sobald man ihn von seinen christologisch-soteriologischen Voraussetzungen her versteht, nämlich als Teilhabe des Apostels am Tod Christi, dem ja tatsächlich der Nomos den Tod gebracht hat (Gal 3.10-14). Wie Christus selbst, so ist auch Paulus 'durch das Gesetz dem Gesetz gestorben'.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{36} Lührmann, \textit{Galater}, p. 45.


\textsuperscript{38} Blank, \textit{Paulus}, p. 299.
From the understanding of what happened to Christ follows Paul's new self-understanding:

Thus, Paul's life is no longer under nor directed by law, he is free from the lordship of the law, because the law brought death to Paul as it did to Jesus. In faith Paul understands himself thoroughly in terms of what happened to Jesus, and this is the way in which he perceives his relationship to the law. But Paul's relation to the law is primarily the result of the law's relation to Christ, not primarily because of the relation of the law to the individual. It was, therefore, Jesus' birth under law (Gal 4.4) and his death under law (Gal 3.13), and this 'for us', in which Paul's death through law happened. Christ was born under the law to redeem those who were under the law (Gal 4.4) and this redemption becomes '...die christologisch-soteriologische "Mitte" der paulinischen Theologie....'40

39 Blank, Paulus, p. 300.

40 Blank, Paulus, p. 301; see Tannehill, Dying, p. 58-59. Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 83, speaks of Christians' escape from the powers hostile to God through their dying through Christ (Rom 7.4). The body of Christ, in Rom 7.4, however, speaks of Jesus’ death on the cross, and the death to law of which Paul speaks relative to believers is grounded in their inclusion in that death of Christ.
2.4 COMPARISON TO ROM 7.1-6

Rom 7.1-6, and especially v. 4, may be compared to Gal 2.19. The two texts have both a similarity and dissimilarity between them, although finally comparison rather than contrast is the appropriate word. The similarity is death to the law: ἐκτός νόμου in Rom 7.4, and νόμος ἀπέθανον in Gal 2.19. Freedom by death is common to both phrases. An important dissimilarity lies in the words which follow διὰ in both texts: διὰ νόμου in Gal 2.19, and διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom 7.4.

It is important that we do not use an interpretation of Rom 7.4 as a key to understanding Gal 2.19. But we can see that the comparison draws attention to a basic pattern with which Paul worked in dealing with the law. This thought pattern of dying to the law through the law or through the body of Christ points to the transition from one lord to another, one age to another, and one central conviction to another.

1. Rom 7.1-6 shows continuity with the preceding argument. Its basic pattern of thought continues that of Romans 6, as bondage, release from bondage, and entry...

---

1 See above, 2.2 nn. 14-16; 2.3 (§2).

2 Gaventa, 'Methods', pp. 37-44. See Part I Summary above.
into a new bondage is the decisive transition that takes place through dying with Christ.\(^3\)

Tannehill lists four concepts common to Romans 6 and 7.1-6: (1) the verb καταργεῖν is used in 6.6; 7.2; 7.6 to describe the end of the old bondage;\(^4\) (2) the old and new bondages are described with κυρίεσθαι in Rom 6.9, 14; 7.1, and with δούλευω or δοῦλος in 6.6, 16ff;\(^5\) (3) the same use of the dative indicates the lord to whom one lives or dies in 7.4 as in 6.2, 10-11;\(^6\) (4) the idea of bearing fruit carries over from 6.21-22 to 7.4-5.\(^7\)

In Rom 7.4 it is the law to which one dies, while in Rom 6.2-11 it is death to sin. Paul connects subjection to sin with subjection to law.\(^8\) Rom 7.1-6 reaches back to

\(^3\) Tannehill, Dying, p. 43.

\(^4\) Compare Rom 3.3, 31; 4.14; Gal 3.17; 5.4. See Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 158, 71; Cranfield, Romans 1:181; Delling, TDNT 1: 453-455; Tannehill, p. 43.

\(^5\) Foerster, TDNT 3:1097, sees κυρίεσθαι referring to the powers which rule human life. Rengstorff TDNT 2:279, sees δούλευω referring to human obligation, either to God or to God's opponents.

\(^6\) See 2.1 above.

\(^7\) Cranfield, Romans 1:337, argues that καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ ἑαυτῷ is not governed by the image of v. 2-3 (Sanday and Headlam, p. 174) but by ἐθανατώθηντε, with much the same meaning as δούλευσαν in v. 6 (Cranfield, p. 336-337). But these contrasting alternatives are too sharply drawn, in view of the dominance of Paul's illustration in v. 2-3 and the use of the verb with τῷ ἑαυτῷ in v. 5. That is, the being put to death in v. 4a is purposive, as shown by the ἔνα clauses. These clauses govern grammatically the form of the verb. But the image of bearing fruit may well come from the marriage analogy in v. 2-3. The question is by whom one shall be ruled. See Hauck, TDNT 3:616.

\(^8\) Dodd, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 102, says that here Paul equates subjection to law with subjection to sin. However, the wording of 7.5 is telling: τὰ παθήματα
6.14-15, and beyond there to 5.20. In 5.20 he uses νόμος, παράπτωμα, and ἀμαρτία, placing them all on the same side against χάρις, δικαιοσύνη, ζωὴν αἰώνιον and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In 6.14 law and grace are opposing dominions. Thus, in 6.14 Paul uses a word crochet (not under law but under grace), as he shifts the focus from sin to law and so prepares the way for his argument in ch. 7. Rom 7.1-6 is an obvious instance of the interchange of ideas, as liberation from sin changes to talk of liberation from law. By such interchange and word crochet Paul's argument is continuous from Romans 6 to Romans 7: 'With respect to the ideas of the two bondages and dying with Christ, Rom 7.1-6 continues the thought of chapter 6. With respect to the question which is treated in these terms, that of law, it begins the discussion which

τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο. That is, the passions are those of sins (gen.) but they are through the law (διὰ + gen.). The implied relationship is that the passions originate in sin, and the law is the agent which arouses them.

9 Tannehill, Dying, p. 43. The role of law in 5.20 informs the sense of 6.1-7.6 as a whole.

10 Harrisville, Romans, p. 99.

11 Reicke, 'The Law and this World according to Paul', pp. 259-266, points out that such interchange also happens in Galatians, where liberation from flesh changes to liberation from law (5.18), being under the law is synonymous with being under the elements (4.3), flesh and Spirit are opposed (5.17), and then law and Spirit are opposed (5.18).
follows.12

2. Paul's illustration from marriage in 7.2-3 uses a mixture of motifs. Paul's main point is in v. 4: you have died to the law. This would have easily followed from v. 1: the law is binding on a person only during a person's life.13 But in 7.2-3 Paul introduces a picture that might seem to confuse more than clarify his point. In v. 2 the married woman becomes free from the law because of her husband's death. To correspond to the main point in v. 4 it should have been the woman who died. In Paul's illustration it is not the dead husband but the living wife who is freed from the obligations of the law.14 But in Paul's main argument, v. 1 and v. 4, it is the one who has died who is freed from the law and, 'Ye are under law as long as ye live, but only as long as ye live'.15 If the illustration and main point were followed through in a straightforward way the married woman (v. 2) would be the person who is bound under law during life (v. 1) and she would also represent the believers who have died in

12 Tannehill, Dying, p. 44. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, p. 268, compares parallel themes in Romans 6 and 7. See Dahl, Studies in Paul, pp. 79-82, for how Rom 7.5-6 concludes what precedes and introduces what follows.

13 Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 61 n. 91 points out that these two points could plausibly have conformed to Rabbinic premises and the Rabbinic rule that 'as soon as a man has died he is free from the Torah and from the commandments'.

14 Dodd, Romans, p. 101.

15 K. Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 233. See Rom 6.7.
order to be free from the law (v. 4a). The woman's husband (v. 2a) would represent the law, and she would be bound to him during life (v. 1b) but could be free only by her death (v. 4b). If one tries to follow the logic between the main argument (v. 1, 4) and the illustration (v. 2-3) it seems to have 'gone hopelessly astray', so that 'the analogy is simply confusing'.

And yet Paul needs both the argument and illustration to make his point, as 'both the maxim of v. 1 and the illustration of v. 2-3 correspond in detail to what happens to the Christian'. For on the one hand, the introduction in v. 1 (freedom from law comes only by death) matches the main point in v. 4 (Christians have died and been released from law). On the other hand, the woman in v. 2-3 who is free from the law, free to marry another, matches the believers' experience in v. 4b-c: they are free from the law so as to belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead.

No example will quite fit what Paul wishes to say, for Christians are both the ones who die and the ones who live on under a new master. Dying with Christ is something more than a figure of speech which can be changed to fit Paul's illustrations. Instead, Paul uses two different ideas to illustrate what he wishes to say about dying with Christ to the law.

---

16 Dodd, Romans, p. 101.

17 Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 61. Reicke, 'Law', p. 267, suggests that Paul has not noticed the transition from one motif to another.

18 Tannehill, Dying, p. 44.

19 Tannehill, Dying, p. 45. See Althaus, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 64.
The same pattern of 'dying to - living to' is in Rom 7.1-6 as in Gal 2.19. With it is bound up the idea of freedom by death.20

3. Freedom by death to the law happens through the body of Christ. The terminology of Rom 7.4 differs from that of Gal 2.19, in that Gal 2.19 says that death to the law happens διὰ νόμου. Rom 7.4 says that death to the law happens διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The sense of διὰ in Gal 2.19 is causal, referring to the death-bringing character of the law. For Paul, death to the law happened because of Jesus' death through and to law and Paul's participation or inclusion in that death. Paul could therefore have said, 'I died to the law because I am united with Christ who died under or because of law'. Paul's thought is christological. Christ's death on the cross included Paul (and believers) and so Paul attests to having been crucified with Christ. Christ's death under or through (διὰ) law on the cross is the paradigm for Paul's relation to the law.

But the same cannot be said for the use of διὰ in Rom 7.4. There Paul does not mean that he died to the law through the death-bringing character of the body of Christ, anymore than in Gal 2.19 could it be understood that the law was his representative, whose death included

Paul. But this representative sense is present in Rom 7.4. But what does 'body' refer to in Rom 7.4?

Schweizer describes three ways in which Paul uses the term 'the body of Christ' in the generally accepted epistles: (1) the body of Jesus offered up for people on the cross; (2) in such eucharistic texts as 1 Cor 11.24, where Paul or the community before him added τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν to σῶμα, thus stressing the act and not the substance of the offering; (3) the community (Rom 12.5; 1 Cor 10.17; 12.13) is not merely like a body, it is a body. The plural ὄμοιος ἔστιν in 1 Cor 12.27 is also to be noted, referring to the community.21

Nothing in Rom 7.1-6 seems to warrant taking σῶμα in the eucharistic sense, and so it has been interpreted as either (1) the body of Jesus on the cross,22 or (2) the community, the church, as forming his mystical body.23 Robinson combines the two meanings, and takes 'through the body of Christ' to mean 'both "through the fact that Christ in this flesh-body died to the law" and "through the fact that you now are joined to and are part of that body"'.24

21 Schweizer, TDNT 7:1067-1071.

22 Cranfield, Romans 1:336; Barth, Romans, pp. 232-233; Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 167; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 174.

23 Dodd, Romans, pp. 101-102; Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 188 n. 1; Best, Romans, p. 77.

24 Robinson, The Body, p. 47.
In line with this combination of ideas many interpreters assume that Rom 6.3, and baptism, is the key to understanding Rom 7.4. Thus, one dies to the law by being joined to the body of Christ in baptism. Baptism thus becomes the means by which participation in the death of Christ is affected. However, to understand what Paul is getting at in Rom 7.1-6, and what he means by 'through the body of Christ' in v. 4, several key features of the text must be noticed.

3.1. In 7.4a Paul uses ἐκκοιμήσατε, instead of ἀπεθάνατε (as in 6.2). He likely does so because he has in mind the act of Christ being violently put to death in execution on the cross. The passive corresponds to κατηγορήσαμεν in 7.6. The death, like the release from the law, is ultimately God's doing (although the immediate agents of Christ's death were Romans), and so is freedom from sin, as in Rom 6.7. It is Christians who have been killed, but the backdrop of this death is the death of Christ on the cross.

3.2. The words 'the body of Christ' are best understood as referring to the body of Jesus on the cross. Although it is natural to assume an

---

25 Harrisville, Romans, p. 101; Käsemann, Romans, p. 189; Nygren, Romans, p. 274; Black, Romans, p. 100.

26 Nygren, Romans, p. 274.

27 Cranfield, Romans 1:335. See Bultmann, TDNT 3: 7-25.

28 See n. 22 above; Schlier, Der Römerbrief, p. 217, says that the reference is to the body of Christ on Golgotha, and by baptism one enters the death of Christ as
interpretation of Rom 7.4 on the basis of Rom 12.5 or 1 Cor 12.12ff, where 'body' has a corporate sense, the word in those texts functions only to emphasize the relation of members to the whole, nothing is said about the dying of the body, and in Rom 7.4 no other function of the body except dying is mentioned. 'Body' does not function in v. 4 as a metaphor for the whole, the community, but speaks of what has been done to us 'in' or 'through' the flesh of the incarnate and crucified Christ.

3.3. The interpretation of 'body of Christ' must nevertheless explain the corporate sense carried by the 'you' who were put to death through that body. This explanation is best given by taking 'body' to refer to Jesus Christ in his humanity: 'His cross performed and completed a perfect work....Paul has primarily in mind a unique, powerful, perfect event in history: Christ crucified....Paul asserts that in the crucified body, then such, not only a present likeness of his death. Thus, it is more appropriate to speak of baptism as signifying the inclusiveness of what happened on the cross, so as to keep from any concept of repeating in baptism the cross event. Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer 2:64-65, speaks of the aor. pass. in v. 4 as a reference to the baptismal event in 6.3f: 'through the body of Christ' is a precise statement of what Paul means by 'through the death of Christ'. Again, it is not baptism that gives a corporate or inclusive quality to the event of Christ's dying on the cross. The cross has that quality in and of itself.

29 Tannehill, Dying, p. 45. The question of the origin of the concept is a separate one. See Wedderburn, 'The Body of Christ in 1 Corinthians', p. 78-80; Robinson, The Body, p. 55, lists 5 different kinds of studies of the derivation of the term.

30 M. Barth, 'A Chapter on the Church---The Body of Christ', pp. 131-156, here p. 142.
and there, the curse, guilt, sin, division of mankind was summed up, gathered in, and put to death....' Thus, the full sense of the term 'body' in v. 4 asserts that both (1) the physical body of Christ which died on the cross, and (2) the corporate body in which believers are present were included in that death on the cross. Karl Barth thus translates v. 4, 'through the slain body of Christ', and interprets it to mean, 'Comprehending Him, ye are comprehended in His death....' Thus of Christians Paul is saying, '...They died in his death....' This speaks then of the collective body of the old aeon which is the body of sin or flesh (Rom 6.6): 'The believers were put to death through this body because this body was put to death in the crucifixion of Christ and the believers were included in it.'

31 M. Barth, 'Church', p. 143.
32 Tannehill, *Dying*, p. 146. See Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, p. 226: 'In das, was Jesus tat, hat er aber alle eingeschlossen, die ihm gehören. Seine gotheitlich starke Liebe macht seine Gemeinschaft mit allen total und für alle wirksam.'
35 Tannehill, *Dying*, p. 47.
3.4. Christ acted as humanity's representative.\textsuperscript{36} When he died, believers died. When he was crucified 'our old self was crucified with him' (Rom 6.6). In like manner Paul has said in Gal 2.19, 'I have been crucified with Christ'. That is, the believer is included in the death of the representative. It is a death to law (Rom 7.4; Gal 2.19). It is a death under law (Gal 4.4). It is a death through law (Gal 2.19). One has died, therefore all have died (2 Cor 5.14). The inclusive nature of Christ's representative death, indicated in Rom 7.4, corresponds to the \textit{συνεσταθημεν} of Gal 2.19. The \textit{δια} phrases of Rom 7.4 and Gal 2.19 both refer to death under law, but do so differently. Rom 7.4 refers to Jesus' body, dying under law on the cross, in a death that includes Paul. Gal 2.19 refers to the law's bringing death to Paul, and behind Paul's death through law is the death of Christ through law on the cross.

The cross is thus itself an inclusive event. Baptism does not make it so, nor does baptism give the cross its character and power as an inclusive event by repeating this event or making it present in the believer. Baptism signifies and makes that power and event manifest in the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{36} Wedderburn, 'The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Corinthians', pp. 74-96, here p. 78, and, Baptism and Resurrection, pp. 37-69, 342-355. Thrall, I and II Corinthians, p. 149: 'The belief that Christ acted representatively on behalf of the whole human race is the key principle of Paul's theology.' Whether this statement can be effectively argued for the entire Pauline corpus, the concept is helpful in understanding the texts under consideration in 2.4.}
life of the church. But the cross itself is an inclusive and representative event of its own accord. Paul is speaking of the significance of the cross. This was God’s eschatological act, which took place only once, and which involved the old and new worlds as wholes. By that event the Christian is no longer enslaved to the powers of the old world (Rom 6.2ff; 7.1ff; Gal 2.19; 5.24). The believer is no longer bound by the values and judgments of the old world (Gal 6.14; 2 Cor 5.14ff). The believer walks in newness of life (Rom 6.4), or in the Spirit (Rom 7.6), or lives by the Spirit (Gal 5.25), and is a new creature (Gal 6.15; 2 Cor 5.17). Christ now lives in the believer (Gal 2.20). Such statements bear witness to the time of God’s decisive act in Christ’s cross. 2 Cor 5.14 emphasizes in a particular way the time of transition from old to new as it happened in the cross of Christ: because he died, all have died. Here again is the inclusive nature of the decisive past event, the purpose clause, and the indirect object which could be rendered, ‘no longer live to themselves’. The transfer to living ‘to him’, resulting from participation in Christ’s death on the cross, more than referring to the time of conversion, is the sense of the words ‘from now on’ in 2 Cor 5.16. That is, it was the death of Jesus which was the turning point. The phrase in 2 Cor 5.16 therefore corresponds

37 Tannehill, Dying, pp. 47, 70-74.

38 Georgi, The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians, p. 278, notes that Paul’s opponents did not recognize this about Jesus’ death. Although Georgi’s
to Gal 2.20: 'the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God....'

purpose is different from the present argument, his emphasis of discontinuity derives from the same thesis: the turning point was in Christ's cross. Georgi thus points out, p. 297 n. 160, that a biographical interpretation of 2 Cor 5.16 'has retreated into the background today'. See Plummer, II Corinthians, p. 176: 'from now on' refers not to the present moment, but to the death of Christ.
SUMMARY

The dying of which Paul speaks in Gal 2.19 is death within a particular relationship, namely that to law. The dative of relation expresses dispossession: Paul has died to the dominion of law. The aorist points to death as a past experience, which together with the perfect passive is identified with Christ's death on the cross. Christ's death is the frame of reference for Paul. He not only understands his own experience in terms of Christ’s experience, but sees Christ as his representative whose death included Paul in death. Christ's death under law is the source of Paul's conviction about the law. Paul does not mention baptism when he speaks of being crucified with Christ and dying to the law. The law was the power operative in this death. But law is not the operative power in baptism. So also, this 'dying to' is not brought about by one's own consciousness of the law's weakness. It is Christ's dying and living which engenders the new age.

The same dying-to, living-to pattern of thought used in Gal 2.19 occurs also in Rom 7.4. The pattern points to the transition from one lord to another, and uses the dative to indicate the lord to whom one lives or dies. In Romans Paul interchanges ideas, from death to sin in 6.2-11 to death to law in 7.4, and thus equates the two subjections as one and the same thing. Paul's point in
Rom 7.4, death to the law, is served with a seemingly contradictory double illustration from marriage which describes what happens to the Christian: one is free from the law by death, one is free for living to and belonging to him who has been raised from the dead. This same pattern exists in Gal 2.19.

The two passages do not contradict one another, even though dying through the law in Gal 2.19 is replaced by dying through the body of Christ in Rom 7.4. The 'body' of Rom 7.4 seems best understood as the actual body of Jesus on the cross. When he was crucified Christ died as humanity's representative. Through his slain body believers were included in his death to the law. That is, through union with and representation by the body of Christ, which was put to death to the law for us, we are dead to the law. For Christ and for the believer the death on the cross was to, through, and under law. The cross of Christ was thus a decisive event for the believer by which the believer is no longer enslaved to the powers of the old aeon. But the phrase 'through law' in Gal 2.19 does not refer to union with or representation by the law, but rather shows how Paul disassociates the law from life, and associates it with death. The law does not make alive but brings death. Thus Paul counters the position of his opponents in Galatia who were promoting law observance as the necessary condition for membership in the church, for righteousness, and for living to God. 'Living to God' in Gal 2.19 corresponds to 'belonging to another... who has
been raised from the dead' in Rom 7.4. In both texts
dying to the law happened so that life in this new
lordship could come about. In Gal 2.19 the dying was
through the agency of the law. In Rom 7.4 the dying was
through the means of Christ's body on the cross, as he
died through law. Thus Gal 2.19 and Rom 7.4 may be
understood as referring to the same event, namely the
death of Christ under law on the cross. But whether διὰ
νόμου in Gal 2.19 can be understood to mean more than that
the law is the agent or means of death cannot be concluded
from 2.19 alone, nor from its immediate context in 2.11-
21. Another step is required, and for this step we must
turn to Gal 3.13 to consider Christ's death under law.

And yet there is a significant difference between
Christ's death under law and our death through law.
Christ's death under the curse of law was 'for us' (Gal
3.13), just as Christ's birth under the law was 'so that'
he might redeem those under the law (4.4). Of us Paul can
say that the law arouses sinful passions (Rom 7.5: τὰ
παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο). These
sinful passions bear fruit for death. But the sense of
Christ's death under law is quite different. It is a
death under law not as though he deserved death, not
because sinful passions were aroused by the law in him,
but because of the death-bringing character of the law
itself, and because Christ who did not deserve to die
died for us who do deserve to die, in whom sinful passions
were aroused διὰ τοῦ νόμου. But Christ's death under law
was because the law kills, and he was born under law so that he could redeem those who are under law. There is therefore an interchange in Christ, as the one in whom there was no sin which was aroused by law nevertheless died under the law, so that we who are under the law and in whom sinful passions are aroused so as to produce death, nevertheless are blessed. The law cannot and does not make alive or bring righteousness. This thought informs Paul's emphasis on the specific works of the law in Galatians 2 and 3. Gal 3.13 speaks of the relation of the law to the death of Jesus, and exemplifies the interchange in which he became a curse so that we might be blessed. It is to these explications of Paul's doctrine of Christ and his work that we turn in Part 3 of this study.
PART III

GALATIANS 2–3
The single term ἔργαν occurs in the Greek OT, often as a translation for the Hebrew נְדָבָה or נְדָבָתוֹ. In such instances it refers to direct or indirect service of the temple, to acts of sacrifice, to temple or tabernacle-building, or to prayerful watching. Cultic service is thus indicated as an expression of works required by God or the Mosaic Law and acceptable to Jewish piety. These are in contrast to works that originate in human self-will. For the Jews the fulfilling of such requirements was a holy work connected with righteousness.¹ Examples of references to works connected with righteousness include Ps 14.2; Zeph 2.3; Ps 7.4f; 17.3ff; 18.20ff, 25; Dan 4.24; Neh 13.14, 31. A casuistry often associated with Rabbinic Judaism's interpretation of the OT is customarily seen in such texts, while in others a total attitude towards life is thought to be expressed. Hence, the Greek of Jos 4.24, ἕνα ὑμεῖς σέβησθε κόρους τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν ἔν παντὶ ἔργα, is seen to stand for the Hebrew: אַחַ-יְהוָה אֲנָשִׁים וַיֹּאמֶר ηַעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעַשׂ.

The general interpretation of works as casuistry influenced early Christianity: '...the works of the commandments (ynamo ὡφθη) often simply called δεσμὺ by the Rabbis... correspond to what Paul calls the ἔργα νόμου

¹ Bertram, TDNT 2:646.
(see Str-B, III, 160ff; IV, 559ff). Their fulfillment is fulfillment of the will of God....'2

But attention must be given to the exactness of biblical texts. The phrase ἐργα νόμου is an expression unknown in the OT and in Rabbinical or Pharisaic writings.3 And yet the succinctness and frequency with which Paul uses the phrase suggests that it was a commonly used formula, and that it indicated acts which had been prescribed by the Mosaic law and/or its Pharisaic interpretations.4

2 The quotation in Bertram, TDNT 2:646, continues, '...and the eschatological expectation is that arduous study of the Torah will no longer have to precede knowledge and fulfillment of the Law, but that God Himself will write ἐργα νόμου on the fleshly tables of the heart (Jer 31.33)'. Bertram refers to Str-B III, 89ff (see III, 160ff; IV, 559ff) and we should note that it is in the commentaries on Paul's use of Jer 31.33, and not in Jer 31.33 itself, that 'das Werk (= Forderung) des Gesetzes' and ἐργα νόμου occur. The phrase, ἐργα νόμου is used by Paul as he alludes to Jer 31.33 (Rom 2.15). What God will write upon the heart, according to Jeremiah, is "ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΧΩΝ. The LXX reads: Διδοχεί τόν υμοίς μου ἐλεήμονα αὐτῶν. What the connection for Judaism was between works of the law and righteousness is a related question, as fulfillment of the requirements was indeed to fulfill the will of God, and this was in connection with righteousness. But the nature of that connection is a separate question, about which it is easy to make assumptions in stating an answer.

3 Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 240, however points out that the phrase does turn up in some of the Qumran literature; cf. 4 Q Flor 1:7; 1QS 6.18; 1 QpHab 7.11.

4 Fitzmyer's use of the word 'frequency', JBC, p. 240, is relative, as the expression ἐργα νόμου occurs only in two letters of Paul (Galatians and Romans), in a total of six verses, the two times in Romans being 3.20, 28, and in Galatians at 2.16 (3 times) and 3.2, 5, 10. The singular ἔργον τοῦ νόμου occurs at Rom 2.15, with reference to the Gentiles, and in other forms or abbreviations at 3.27; 4.2, 6; 9.11, 32; 11.6.
When Paul uses the expression for the first time in Gal 2.16, he does so three times in succession within the verse, each time to emphasize that justification is not \( \varepsilon \rho\gamma\nu \nu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\). It occurs again in 3.2, where Paul appeals to the experience of the Galatians themselves who received the spirit by hearing with faith and not by works of law. And again in 3.5 the same rhetorical question asks whether reception of the Spirit and working of miracles happened \( \varepsilon \xi \alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma\varsigma \) or \( \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \rho\gamma\nu \nu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\). Finally, in 3.10, Paul uses the phrase in a straightforward declarative statement: all who rely on works of the law are under a curse. Works are thus contrasted to faith and miracles and associated with curse (which in turn Paul connects to death by crucifixion, in 3.13). Paul does not return to the expression Galatians, but moves from it to the single term, \( \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma \), throughout his argument about the law.\(^5\)

The introduction of the phrase \( \varepsilon \rho\gamma\alpha \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\omicron \) in 2.16, is the first mention of either works or law in the letter. It follows the reports of two separate debates, which in turn each focused on a distinct issue and specific aspect of law. These were at Jerusalem, 2.1-10, the question of circumcision of Gentile converts to Christianity, and at Antioch, 2.11-14, the question of table fellowship of Jewish Christians with Gentile Christians.

\(^5\) Again we see Paul's flexibility in generalizing from particular \( \varepsilon \rho\gamma\alpha \) to the whole \( \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma \) for the sake of the breadth of his argument. See 1.4 above.
1. Gal 2.1-10 reports Paul's second visit to Jerusalem. The first visit to Jerusalem, following his conversion, is mentioned in 1.18, and was made three years after the conversion, for the expressed purpose of visiting Cephas, Ἰωάννας Κηφᾶς.⁶

1.1. The timing of the second visit is unclear. 'After fourteen years' could mean after the visit to Syria and Cilicia (v. 21), after the first visit to Jerusalem (v. 18), or after the revelation of Christ (1.16).⁷ Paul

⁶ See n. 44 below. Betz, Galatians, p. 76 nn. 190-191, points out that the time period of the first visit is imprecise. The three years could mean starting either from the revelation or the return to Damascus.

⁷ Betz, Galatians, p. 83. On the chronology of Paul's ministry see his, 'The Date of the Letter', pp. 9-12, especially p. 10 nn. 63-64. Jewett's A Chronology of Paul's Life could be added to Betz' bibliographical citations, as well as Georgi's Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem, especially pp. 91-96. Lüdemann, Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles (1984), pp. 71-77, especially p. 75, dates the incident in Antioch (2.11ff) before the Jerusalem conference (2.1-10). But see Barrett, Freedom, pp. 10-14; Suhl, Paulus und seine Briefe, pp. 43-77; Wedderburn, 'Some Recent Pauline Chronologies', pp. 103-108.
went with Barnabas, and took Titus along with him. The expressed purpose of the visit was that Paul could lay before those of repute the gospel which he had been preaching among the Gentiles. Paul went in accord with revelation, in accord with a higher authority by whom he had been commissioned, not ἀπ' ἀνθρώπου, nor δι' ἀνθρώπου (1.1). Paul was sent διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς. Such was the basis of his apostleship, and he went to

8 The phrase is μετὰ Βαρναβᾶ. Barnabas was senior to Paul at this point. See Betz, Galatians, Excursus: Barnabas, p. 84; Meeks, The First Urban Christians, pp. 10-11; Weiß, History 1:207; Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 253.

9 The phrase is συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτου. Titus was taken along as a test case. Those who had come to Antioch from Judea had probably insisted on Titus' circumcision. Duncan, Galatians, pp. 41-45 reads 2.3-5 to mean that Titus was circumcised after coming to Jerusalem, but not because he was compelled. Paul then would mean in v. 5 that he did momentarily yield so that in the long run his law-free gospel would be allowed to continue unimpeded. Thus, Weiß, History 1:271ff. But Linton, 'The Third Aspect', pp. 79-95, here pp. 87-89, and Barrett, Freedom, pp. 11-12, 112, rightly disagree because of Paul's main argument. See n. 55 below.

10 Acts 15.2 has Paul as a delegate sent by the Antioch congregation. This would indicate that: (1) Paul was in Jerusalem at the behest of Antioch; (2) Antioch felt unable to make a decision by itself regarding circumcisionless faith; (3) supremacy of the Jerusalem church or its pillars is assumed. Paul's report in Galatians corrects all three. That he went by revelation is perhaps best understood for its negative aspect: it was not at someone else's behest, nor because he was summoned. See Barrett, Freedom, p. 10.

11 In 2.2 κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν is in contrast to κατὰ ἀνθρώπου in 1.11. Paul uses ἀποκάλυψις in 1.12; 2.2, and ἀποκαλύπτειν in 1.16; 3.23. On ἀποκαλύπτω see Betz, Galatians, p. 71; Oepke, TDNT 3:563-592, especially pp. 582-587. Lührmann, Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden, p. 41, maintains that in 1.12 and 2.2 the meaning 'ecstatic vision' is to be ruled out in accord with Rom 16.25. In fact Paul is not clear about the kind of experience he had. See n. 16 below.
Jerusalem in response to it, thus not to carry out the requirements of those from whom he came in Antioch, but to enable recognition of the truth of the one and only gospel (1.6-9, 11; 2.2, 5) by those to whom he went in Jerusalem (2.2). 12

Apostleship for Paul means acting in accord with what had been revealed to him, and must be understood by way of the content of that revelation. When he speaks of having been set apart (1.15) so that he could proclaim the Gospel (1.16), Paul alludes to Jer 1.5 and Isa 52.7. These texts emphasize the prophet's appointment (even before birth) to preach to the nations, and the good tidings which he was to bring. For Paul, the revelation of God's Son was a means to an end. The end was that Paul would proclaim the Son of God (the content of the revelation) to the nations. Paul thus speaks of preaching to the nations as the purpose of his call to faith in Christ. With this allusion to Jer 1.5 and Isa 52.7, 'So gehen Funktionen des

12 In 1.1 (Galatians' only reference to resurrection) Paul signals the cleavage between 'through man' and 'through Christ' and ultimately between the old aeon and the new. God's defeat of death has been accomplished in raising Christ, and henceforth forms the foundation of Paul's being sent as an apostle. His reception of the gospel (1.12), his recognition of Jesus as Son of God (1.16), his going to Jerusalem (2.2) are all events of the new age. Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, pp. 145-6, speaks of Rom 1.17f: 'Die Gottesgerechtigkeit wird im Evangelium, das Paulus verkündigt, offenbart (Röm 1.17). Mit dem Verbum ἀνακᾶτον bezeichnet Paulus hier wie in Gal 1.16; 3.23 einen eschatologischen Akt Gottes, der den alten Äon abschließt; und wie im Gal. nimmt Paulus die Äonenwende als sich bereits jetzt ereignend an, und zwar als auf Menschen bezogenes Heilshandeln Gottes: Der Mensch erhält die Gerechtigkeit, die er von sich aus nicht hat, im Evangelium von Gott zugesprochen.'
Propheten auf den Apostel über'. 13 Paul does not appeal to the consensus of church leaders to legitimize his gospel. 14 Rather, he means what he has already said in 1.12: what had happened to him as a break between two worlds has become a break with tradition in his own life and person. 'Aus dem Eiferer für das Gesetz wird der Verkündiger des Sohnes Gottes unter den Heiden.' 15 Gal 1.12, in contrasting what (tradition) might have come παρὰ ἀνεφότου to what Paul had in fact received δὲ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, sets the tone for what follows in three ways.

1.1.1. The meaning of the reference to apocalypse in 1.12 ought not be limited to a vision. 16 Although Paul

13 Lührmann, Galater, p. 32.

14 The background of v. 15 is decidedly Jewish. The content of v. 16 is peculiarly Christian. See Betz, Galatians, pp. 69-70: ‘...Paul had not ceased to formulate his task in terms of a Jewish eschatological universal mission....in line with the tradition of the prophetic vocation.’ For Paul this vocation meant conformity to the Crucified and Risen Christ in both his preaching content and way of life. Hence we notice the ἐν ἡμοίᾳ, as the revelation was obtained by a particular recipient, namely Paul. See Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 78. The revelation is not the Christ-event as such, but the interpretation received by the one who has a new beginning because of the new activity of God. Hence, Burton, Galatians, p. 41, says, 'He is speaking neither of an epiphany of Jesus as a world event, nor of a disclosure of him which, being made to men at large, as, e.g., through his life and death, might be perceived by some and fall ineffectual upon others, but of a personal experience, divine in its origin...personal to himself and effectual'.

15 Lührmann, Galater, p. 32. See n. 57, below.

16 Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, pp. 40-44, refers also to 1 Cor 14.6; Rom 16.25; Eph 1.17; 3.3. Gaventa, From Darkness to Light, p. 23, notes that Paul does not just write about a personal event, but about God's revelation, usually linked to God's action in the
could have a visible and/or audible event (the Damascus Road experience) in mind, his real point here is that he wants to set the origin of his Gospel over against his opponents' theological tradition.\textsuperscript{17} Theirs was a law-abiding tradition, grounded in Torah, Moses, and Sinai. It led back to Jerusalem as the measure of legitimate teaching.\textsuperscript{18} It is this with which Paul has broken. The criticism against Paul was that he lacked legitimacy because of that break.\textsuperscript{19} In Galatia Paul's concern was for the unity of the church, consisting of both Jews and Gentiles, founded on faith in Christ without conditions of law. This, accordingly, Paul had received, as 'divine direction...the standard by which he himself and all others are to be judged'.\textsuperscript{20} The conflict thus came between Paul and a tradition for which 'the direct reception of

---


18 Lührmann, \textit{Offenbarungsverständnis}, pp. 72-73: 'Für das Traditionsverständnis der Gegner läßt sich also erkennen, daß sie ihre Tradition auf Jerusalem zurückführten, ob damit zu Recht auf die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde, kann dabei außer acht bleiben.... "Offenbarung" war für sie die Übermittlung des Gesetzes an Mose auf dem Sinai, und diese Offenbarung begründete für sie eine Tradition....Die Legitimierung ihrer Verkündigung durch die Tradition sahen sie in der Berufung auf Jerusalem.'

19 See Lührmann, \textit{Offenbarungsverständnis}, pp. 71-74; Georgi, \textit{Kollekte}, p. 36 n. 113; Stuhlmacher, \textit{Das paulinische Evangelium}, p. 67. It was this legitimacy question, and not merely whether Paul had suited his gospel to human wishes (Kim, \textit{Origin}, pp. 67-68) which is at the heart of this struggle.

revelation is an ideal which is truly fulfilled only in Moses....Israel has in the Torah a revelation which is valid for all ages'.\textsuperscript{21} For Paul, '...das paulinische Evangelium die Offenbarungsmacht und Realität des neuen Äons repräsentiert....Als solches stellt das Evangelium die erwählungsgeschichtliche Antithese zur mosaischen Tora, die Wirklichkeit der neuen Welt Gottes dar', and the opponents criticize Paul, therefore, because they see him as 'also Sprecher eines illegitimen (weil die Tora abrogierenden) Evangeliums'.\textsuperscript{22} Revelation thus has to do with disclosure of the world to come, the unveiling of what is hidden, and requires a divine act.\textsuperscript{23} Paul asserts that his gospel has been that of justification without law from the beginning of his ministry. This emphasis does two things: it identifies his Christ-position as over against his opponents law-tradition; it affirms that his gospel is no different from what it has always been since God revealed it to him.\textsuperscript{24}

1.1.2. The new tradition given to Paul (1.16) in accord with which he acts, is Jesus Christ, the Son of God. That Paul speaks here of Jesus as the Son of God is

\begin{itemize}
  \item[21] Oepke, \textit{TDNT} 3:575, 577.
  \item[23] Oepke, \textit{TDNT} 3:582-583.
\end{itemize}
not coincidental.\textsuperscript{25} It is not just that Jesus was revealed to Paul (as in 1.12) but that he was revealed as God's Son:

...Jesus Christ himself was revealed to him in such a way that as a result he now had a gospel to preach....All that Paul subsequently preached was determined by his experience on the Damascus road, when Jesus Christ was revealed to him in His true significance. Jesus was to be thought of no longer merely as one who had been crucified and was therefore accursed; He was the Christ, the Son of God, who had died to win men's salvation, and who was now exalted as Lord.\textsuperscript{26}

This revelation, which opposes the tradition of Paul's opponents, is the revelation of Jesus Christ in his role as bringer of salvation. He is the eschatological bringer of salvation because he has superseded the epoch of the law and brought about justification without works of the law.\textsuperscript{27} Thus, the eschatological nature of Paul's speech is manifest:

Die πίστες ist das eschatologische Heilsgut, das am Ende der Zeit offenbart wird. Ebenso ist aber auch Gal 1.16 gemeint; die Offenbarung des Sohnes Gottes ist die eschatologische Zeitenwende.\textsuperscript{28}

The new tradition signals the end of the old, and that new tradition is described as Jesus Christ the Son of God.

\textsuperscript{25} Betz, Galatians, p. 70; Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, pp. 279-280; Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, pp. 108-109; 183-184; Schweizer, TDNT 8:383; Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, pp. 76-77; Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 293: 'Here lies the key to all New Testament Christology. It is only meaningful to speak of the Son in view of God's revelatory action.... as God reveals him in redemptive action.'

\textsuperscript{26} Duncan, Galatians, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{27} Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 78.

\textsuperscript{28} Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 75.
1.1.3. Paul's argument in Galatians thus moves to the soteriological level from the start. Even before specifically mentioning particular works of the law (2.3; 2.12), and thereafter generalizing to the whole law (2.19), Paul's christological tradition is implicitly opposed to the law tradition. His use of the Stichwort 'revelation' in Gal 1.12, 16, and again in 3.23, connects his gospel with Jesus Christ, and connects revelation with faith. This points to justification through faith, as over against law. There is for Paul a material connection between the christological title, 'Son of God', and justification. This title is used again at 2.20, in connection with the saying about Jesus being 'given up' in death, and at 4.4 and 4.6, in the sayings about the sending of the Son whose Sonship makes possible the sonship of all believers. At the same time Paul declares that this sending of the Son and giving up of Himself is the conclusion of the time of the law, and the facilitation of justification outside the law (4.5). Paul's choice of the title, 'Son of God' indicates his attitude to the law: 'Die Offenbarung des Sohnes ist die

29 Betz, Galatians, p. 71, points out that in Rom 1.3ff Paul similarly connects 'Son of God' and his Gospel, as he quotes a christological formula as that Gospel's content. Lührmann, Galater, pp. 32-33, points out that Paul uses 'the Gospel of his Son' still again in Rom 1.9, and in 1.7 names the revelation of God's justification by faith as the content of the Gospel.

30 Lührmann, Galater, p. 32.
Grenze zwischen Gesetz und Glaube. 31 This central conviction was signalled in Paul's own break with tradition, which he reports as having happened when he became an apostle to the Gentiles. 32 Paul, therefore, could not seek legitimation of his Gospel from those in Jerusalem: 'Was ihn einzig legitimiert, ist der Inhalt des Evangeliums selber...'. 33 Accordingly, 'Die Offenbarung hat Paulus nicht menschlichen Diskussion ausgeliefert'. 34 His experience of the end of the old aeon could not be measured by the standards which he perceived as σάρξ καὶ αἴμα (1.16). With this phrase the discussion moves from the stand Paul is taking against his Galatian opponents and their law-tradition, to the stand Paul reports as having taken over against Jerusalem.

31 Lührmann, Galater, p. 33. We could infer from 1.16-17 that Paul, having been called to preach, carried on this purpose in Arabia. In accord with his call it was to the Gentiles, while in accord with what we know of his theology it was a gospel of the Son of God and freedom from the law. But Paul does not explicitly say this in 1.17.

32 See n. 80 below. Watson, Paul; Judaism and the Gentiles, p. 21, sees the argument in Galatians as Paul's theological legitimation of a reform-movement which has decided to become a separate sect, with the mission to Gentiles arising out of a failed mission to Jews in which Paul had first participated and preached. Watson's argument about Galatians is based largely on material from other epistles and Acts, and fails to take into account Paul's two-aeon view. He dismisses Paul's teaching about new creation as sectarian sentiment (p. 68), and ignores the fact that the theological concern for the truth of the gospel and the sufficiency of the Christ event for faith and salvation have any other than sociological grounds.

33 Lührmann, Galater, p. 33.

34 Schlier, Galater, p. 58.
Against the opponents, Paul's two-aeon scheme stands behind his statements about the revelation of the Son. The scheme has in it the nature of apocalyptic: this age has been superseded through God's manifestation in Christ. This has initiated the new age. The scheme represents God's eschatological work: the discontinuity to history is in the salvation brought by the new age which has been established without the law of the old age. 35 We can see three differences between Paul and these opponents. First, there is a christological difference. For Paul the Christ-event signifies the cancellation of continuity. For the opponents it was the confirmation of the law. Second, there is a difference in understanding of the law. For Paul revelation has annulled the tradition of law. For the opponents it was through the mediation of Moses that law was given for all time. Third, there is a difference regarding the meaning of revelation. For Paul it was the working of God with people, and it meant 'gerade das Ende des Kosmos'. For the opponents the revelation implemented by Moses mediated between divine power and people, but effected no such discontinuity. 36 Paul herein denies the authority of the opponents' tradition.

35 Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 78: 'Der vergangene Äon war durch das Gesetz qualifiziert, der neue ist durch die Sendung des Sohnes eingeleitet (Gal 4.4) und durch die πίστες (3.23) bestimmt.'

36 Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 78.
1.2. But Paul does not deny the authority of the apostles of the Jerusalem church. He does deny that his Gospel either originated with them or needs to be validated by them. He therefore seeks to establish a distance and independence from them, not totally, but on this point: the validity of his Gospel. Paul has a dialectical relationship with those 'highest but human authorities in the church'.

It is a 'dialectic between being independent of and being acknowledged by Jerusalem'. Four verb uses point to this dialectical relationship.

1.2.1. In 1.16 the aorist of προσαναφέωμεν is used with the negative. Paul begins his denial of dependence first by stating what he did not do following his conversion, and secondly by indicating the immediacy of his response, εὐθέως. The aorist middle form of the verb also implies denial, as 'there is no object, about which

---

37 Betz, Galatians, p. 73, '...Paul does not identify these apostles with the Twelve or any other group. There was no definition of apostleship which all could agree upon'. See Betz' Excursus, p. 74; Rengstorff, TDNT 1:420f; Kirk, 'Apostleship since Rengstorff: Towards a Synthesis', pp. 249-264; Kertelge, 'Das Apostelamt', pp. 161-181; Barrett, The Signs of an Apostle, especially p. 1.

38 Holmberg, Paul and Power, p. 16.

39 Dunn, 'The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem according to Galatians 1 and 2', pp. 461-478.

40 Betz, Galatians, p. 72; BDF 102:2; Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 89: '...von allem Anfang an....'
such consultation could take place'. 41 Paul defends the independence of his commission as he indicates a meaning somewhat more technical than simply taking counsel with a person. The verb here means a consultation with one who is a recognized or qualified interpreter of the significance of a sign. 42 This fits the sense of 1.1 and 1.11-12, as Paul did not deem it necessary to seek out anyone even from among Jesus' followers to give an authoritative verdict on the revelation and apostolicity that had come to him without human agency. In contrast then to the 'flesh and blood' (1.6) and 'Jerusalem' (1.17) with whom Paul did not consult for a verdict, he went away into Arabia. The sense of the alibi is that he was in Arabia and consequently not in Jerusalem. 43

---

41 Betz, Galatians, pp. 72, 95; Behm, TDNT 1:353f. Acts 9.10-19 would substantiate the version that Paul has received his gospel from a human teacher.

42 Dunn, 'Relationship', p. 462.

43 Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 84. This also points to the problem of the relationship to Acts 9.26-30, which has Paul going to Jerusalem and attaching to disciples. Linton, p. 85, points out that this does not necessarily make the Acts material later, for the Galatian adversaries of Paul had already reported a similar thing: 'For when Paul denies that he has gone to Jerusalem it is because they have said that so he had done. And when Paul maintains that he came to Jerusalem only after three years, it is because the "Galatian" version runs thus, that he went to Jerusalem immediately (or very soon). And when Paul asserts that he was in Jerusalem a very short time, it is while it was said that he stayed there for a long time. And, finally, as Paul denies that he communicated with the Apostles---save only Peter and James, the Lord's brother---he is refuting the opinion that he was a docile disciple of the Apostles.' Cf. Suhl, Paulus, pp. 46-51.
1.2.2. In 1.18 the aorist infinitive of ἴσωρέω has an ambiguity to it, as it can mean either, (1) get to know someone, or (2) get information from someone. Indeed, ἴσωρήσας Κηρᾶν ist mit Bedacht gesagt. It does not undermine Paul's argument of independence that he got information from Peter. He was not altogether aloof from Jerusalem, but wanted to clarify his distance on a specific issue: the revelation of his gospel. The point having been made that Paul's apostolicity was not attributable to any human authority, he can freely acknowledge his indebtedness to Peter for information to which Paul would not have had access, namely, information regarding the ministry of Jesus while on earth. This is the kind of information which had not come to Paul with the revelation. That Paul should go to the chief Apostle to get to know him and learn something from him, and at the same time preserve his own experience, revelation, and gospel from a verdict by that chief Apostle would have been as careful a maneuver as Paul's choice of language.

44 BAG, p. 383, adopts the first view. Betz, Galatians, p. 76, calls it 'a non-committal phrase', renders it, 'pay Peter a visit', and thinks it would be out of keeping with Paul's defense if he were to admit getting information from Peter. But Paul wanted a particular kind of independence. Kilpatrick, 'Galatians 1.18', p. 148, sees it meaning that in contrast to εἴσον... Ἰάκῳβου, 'St. Peter had been an eyewitness and disciple of Jesus. St. James could not claim to be a comparable informant about the teaching and ministry'. Dunn, 'Relationship', pp. 465-466, agrees. Cf. Walter, 'Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition', pp. 506-7.

45 Schlier, Galater, p. 60, sees a specific purpose, '...den Besuch zum Zwecke des Kennenlernens... Kephas... als das Haupt der Apostel'. 
indicates, not seeking legitimation but needing to know Peter.  

1.2.3. Paul's uses ἀναίημεν in 2.2, a neutral verb which relays nothing of the relative status of the parties involved. He does not seek approval for validity but recognition for effectiveness and holds a delicate balance in describing his relationship with Jerusalem. He laid his gospel out before them, but he was already convinced

46 Lührmann, Galater, p. 34, puts both issues together: 'Er ist schon Apostel, bevor er nach Jerusalem kommt, denn er ist ja schon mehr als zwei Jahre als Heidenmissionar in Arabien tätig gewesen. Er selbst mißt diesem Besuch keine Legitimationsbedeutung bei, ihm ging es um bloßes "Kennenlernen".' Dunn, 'Relationship', pp. 463-464, has too narrow a choice between Chrysostom's 'to see and honour Peter', and 'to inquire into, or about'. Peter could simply have been the object of Paul's visit for the sake of information, and that 'not just about the weather'. See Dunn, 'Gal 1.18...once more', in response to Hofius, 'Gal 1.18', who denies the 'get information' sense in classical usage. The contrast in this context is not between various renderings of this word, but between this word (a visit was made) and προσανεθήμεν, in 1.16, with all that is entailed in Paul's ἀποκάλυψις, not received from man (1.12). Cf. Josephus, Bell 6:81.

47 Dunn, 'Relationship', p. 467.
of the truth of it (1.8). He could now help its cause. 48

1.2.4. In 2.6 the active sense of προσανέθεντο relates to οἱ δοκοῦντες, 49 who added nothing to Paul's gospel, imposing on him no new burden of doctrine or practice. 50 The προσ- cannot mean 'in addition' to what they had already imparted as either revelation or correction, for this would counter Paul's previous argument for independence on just that point. Hence all

48 That Paul gave a second reading before those who were of repute is seen by Betz, Galatians, p. 87, as analogous to Plato's use of 'men of eminence' to grant recognition of authority without compromise of one's personal conviction. Cf. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 581; Barrett, 'Paul and the "Pillar" Apostles', pp. 1-19, here p. 4; Plato, Apology, 21B-22B; 29A; 36D; 41E; Bruce, Galatians, p. 109: 'It is most unlikely that Paul would have modified his gospel had the Jerusalem leaders not approved it---he had higher authority than theirs for maintaining it unchanged, and "no one is likely to want the independence of his gospel to be confirmed" (W. Schmithals, Paul and James, 43).' Barrett, Freedom, p. 11, rightly points out that Paul was not seeking either correction or validation, for although Jerusalem authorities could prove him neither right nor wrong, they could ruin his life's work by failure to affirm it (2.2).

49 Paul alludes to Deut 10.17, to signify his own attitude toward the Jerusalem leaders. See Lührmann, Galater, p. 38: 'Er will nun nicht seinerseits sein Evangelium durch Jerusalemer Autoritäten legitimieren---legitimiert ist ja durch Gott selber. Woran ihm liegt, ist nachzuweisen, daß Jerusalem nicht gegen ihn ausgespielt werden kann.'

50 Burton, Galatians, pp. 89-91.
they could give was recognition of what had happened. Paul connects here the demand made in Antioch for circumcision with the same demand being made in Galatia by his opponents. That demand was not laid on him by the leaders in Jerusalem and he cannot capitulate to it now. The pillar apostles had already acknowledged the validity of his circumcision-free gospel. That the demand for circumcision was the central issue in Jerusalem which Paul relates to the Galatian situation is seen from two other items of context.

First, in 2.3 the mention of Titus is to be seen in the light of ἐντεύχεται in 2.6. He was taken along as a test case. He was not compelled to be circumcised, meaning either that he was not circumcised, or that he was

51 Weiß, History, 1:270. Betz, Galatians, p. 95: the addition could only be 'to subject the Gentile Christians to Torah and circumcision (cf. 4.9; 5.16)....he is able to report and substantiate that at the Jerusalem conference his gospel was approved as is and that no additional requests, such as the opponents are now making, were made. Thereby the present demands of the opponents are declared illegitimate.' Cf. Schlier, Galater, pp. 74-75; Müßner, Galaterbrief, pp. 114-115; Georgi, Kollekte, pp. 19-20.

52 Dunn, 'Relationship', p. 469.

53 Meeks, Christians, p. 230 n. 2.

54 Betz, Galatians, p. 84 n. 252, sees συμπαραλαβὼν in 2.1 as an indication of inferior rank: 'take along as an adjunct or assistant.' Georgi, Kollekte, p. 16, suggests that Titus was taken along as a test case to be decided at the meeting. Compare Luther, LW 27:200, whose 'all things to all men' view of Paul's attitude to the law may be right generally for Paul, but not in this context. See Betz' Excursus, p. 84; Barrett, Freedom, pp. 10-11.
circumcised but not compelled. Either way, the verse stands in sharp contrast to Peter's inconsistency, as demonstrated in Antioch and described by ἄναγκαζεις in 2.14. Titus was not ἄναγκασθεν, 2.3, and the force of the contrast to the two situations is carried by this verb.56

Second, in 2.7-8, the reference is neither to two gospels nor two apostolates. Περιτομή is an abbreviation for the Jews, and Peter is to go to them, while Paul goes εἰς τὰ ζωνή. It is a division of labour or

55 Of the interpretation that Titus was circumcised, Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 87, rightly asks, '...how could such a deviation from the straight way be said to preserve for the church the truth of the gospel?' Furthermore Linton says, p. 89, 'that the truth of the gospel might continue with you' fits very well with the interpretation that Paul gave way not at all, made no concession, but was strictly steadfast. Weiβ, History 1:271, adopts the 'not compelled' rendering, accepting the alternate reading (D, p46, et al) which omits οἴς οὐδέ, meaning that Paul conceded as a practical accommodation and to disparage fault-finding. Thus Duncan, Galatians, pp. 41-45. But see Betz, Galatians, p. 91 (who accepts the text as it stands) for a discussion, and n. 313 for bibliography. Barrett, Freedom, p. 112 n. 12, finds the majority reading to be defective Greek because it lacks a main verb, while the alternate reading shows Paul making a tactical submission, and concludes: 'The whole of Galatians 2, indeed the whole of the epistle, expresses an adamant refusal to compromise on the issue of circumcision. It seems very much more probable that Paul wrote (or his amanuensis took down) a piece of bad Greek than that he gave way in the test case of the Gentile Titus.'

56 Howard, Paul: Crisis in Galatia, pp. 24-27, sees the verb pointing not merely to the implications of Peter's actions but that 'Peter was teaching outright that Gentiles had to be circumcised to be saved'. Peter thus is breaking faith with the agreement at Jerusalem, an agreement already in effect. But see Dunn, 'The Incident at Antioch', pp. 2-55, here pp. 4-11, on the fact of limited (table) fellowship between Jews and Gentiles.

57 Betz, Galatians, p. 96 n. 370. Schlier, Galater, p. 76: 'Es ist "Heiden-Evangelium" gemeint, aber nicht als ein inhaltlich besonderes Evangelium, sondern als das Evangelium, das unter ihnen verkündet wird'. Schlier, n.
responsibility, but not a distinction in what shall be proclaimed. As εὐαγγέλιον applies to and binds the two categories of people together, so also ἀποστολή pertains to both ministries, including Paul’s.\(^{58}\)

Having described his gospel and its recognized authenticity, Paul speaks of the κοινωνία (2.9) that was extended from James, Cephas, and John, to Barnabas and himself.\(^{59}\) That is, having heard his gospel’s content and seen the independence with which Paul preserved it from any attempts to legitimize it, they accepted him and his gospel not only without further requirements, but διὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας κοινωνίας. Paul’s two-fold point is that, (1) the

3, quotes Tertullian, De praescriptione haereticorum 23: 'Inter se distributionem officii ordinaverunt, non alter sed ut aliis alter praedicarent.' Two different gospels would render nonsensical Paul’s argument in Galatians for equal status of all people. But it is possible that Paul and the others understood both the agreement and his apostolic status differently.

\(^{58}\) Betz, Galatians, pp. 96-98, understands the passage as a quotation of the Jerusalem agreement. The agreement may indeed have referred only to Peter’s mission in terms of an apostolate, and yet here Paul asserts an equality of authority and legitimacy. Schlier, Galater, p. 78 n. 2, and Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 116 n. 91, say that the term 'apostolate' here includes Paul and his mission. It is not likely that Paul would make such a point of his own apostolicity, grounded in revelation and identified with justification, and also emphasize his dialectical relationship to Jerusalem as evidence of his gospel’s recognized authenticity, and then not apply ἀποστολή to himself as well. What Paul argues about apostolicity and gospel in Galatians governs the inclusiveness of ἀποστολή. See BDF §479.

\(^{59}\) Betz, Galatians, p. 99, notes that James appears as the leading figure in this triumvirate of οἱ στόλοι. See Wilckens, TDNT 7:732-736; Barrett, ‘Apostles’, pp. 5-6.
pillars have recognized the grace given him,⁶⁰ and (2) the equality of partnership is clear in the agreement. Having understood his law-free proclamation they accepted it without qualification.⁶¹

1.3. Paul's report of the meeting in Jerusalem (Gal 2.1-10), as well as the events leading up to and following it, leads inevitably to a comparison and contrast with the reports of Acts. But aside from the contrast between Paul and Acts, Linton has detected yet another view of his theology and ministry that Paul is battling against as that view circulated in Galatia. As over against the conflict-synthesis theory which Baur proposes, Linton maintains, 'In fact the unity existed from the very beginning, and the conflicts did never disappear'.⁶² That is, already in Paul's time there were current reports of his life and teaching which he was anxious to correct. Some of the traditions which Paul energetically repudiates occur in Acts, and there are certain affinities between the later literary image drawn by Acts and the earlier

⁶⁰ See 2 Cor 8.9; Phil 3.10: Acts 15.11; 2 Cor 13.6. Betz, Galatians, p. 99, says that because of the theological insight of God's redemptive work as grace, '...the apostles at Jerusalem understood and approved Paul's message and his theology'.

⁶¹ Grundmann, TDNT, 2:38, calls this a sign of agreement and alliance. But that the consequences of this decision had not been perceived is seen from the difficulty in Galatia (and Antioch, too). The single condition, remembering the poor, is something to which Paul eagerly subscribes, and it highlights the difference between his view of the proceedings and that of his opponents.

⁶² Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 79.
representation of St. Paul's person and activity which is contested by Paul himself. Thus there are three accounts of the relations between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles: (1) the version circulating in Galatia is that against which Paul struggles in Galatians 1 and 2; (2) the version given by Paul himself in Galatians; (3) the version of Acts. Scholars have tended to discuss the relationship of (1) and (2), or (2) and (3), but seldom (1) and (3).63 Because of the importance of how each view relates to the others, and the relation of each to the law, it will be helpful to sketch how the three views compare and contrast to one another. All three versions agree that Paul had been a zealous champion of the law, and that he had been a fanatic persecutor of the church.64

1.3.1. There are also points in common between the Galatian version which Paul repudiates, and the Acts version. These can be inferred by omitting the negatives in Gal 1.15-20: Paul has received his gospel from men; Paul has been taught by them; therefore Paul is not an immediate apostle of the Lord; Paul went to Jerusalem and


64 See Gal 1.13f; 1 Cor 15.9; Phil 3.5-6; Acts 7.58; 8.1; 26.12; Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 82; Kim, Origin, p. 46; Hultgren, 'Persecutions', pp. 100-102.
remained a longer time.\textsuperscript{65} There is not full agreement between the Galatian version and Acts: the Galatian version has circumcision necessary for salvation; the Acts version refutes the claim for the necessity of circumcision. And yet, '...all accounts emphasize that the Church cannot have but one standpoint as to the question of circumcision and Law'.\textsuperscript{66} The Galatian description of Paul is not that he is a false apostle because he has forsaken circumcision, but rather that he acknowledged circumcision at Jerusalem (with all the Apostles) and now preaches it.\textsuperscript{67}

1.3.2. Paul and Acts agree that concord was reached in Jerusalem, but of that concord: (1) Paul says there were no conditions; (2) Acts (15.28 and 16.4) says there were certain conditions and these in fact were inculcated by Paul himself. Thus we can understand Paul's sharp rebuke in Gal 5.11. The opponents now expect him to remain within the bounds drawn up by the Apostles, and to which (his opponents say) Paul once subscribed.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{65} Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 83. Acts 9.19f thus agrees with this inferred version which was circulating in Galatia. Linton continues, 'To the author of Acts there is, however, evidently nothing disparaging in Paul being instructed by Apostles or other good Christians'. Acts seems to seek to correct and improve Paul as a means of defending him.

\textsuperscript{66} Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 92.

\textsuperscript{67} In Acts 16 Paul does circumcise Timothy, 'the son of a Jewish woman', following the decision of Acts 15.

\textsuperscript{68} Thus Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 92, says that the Judaizers have not rejected Paul because he is a heretic, but '...have modelled him according to their own intentions and depicted a good Paul---in their eyes---
1.3.3. The view of the Galatian Judaizers is that:
(1) they would not compel Gentile Christians to keep the whole law, but only those regulations which are necessary to distinguish the people of God from the Gentiles; primarily this means circumcision and dietary regulations;
(2) they see Paul as an evangelist but not an Apostle; he is subordinate to the Apostles, and the Judaizers portray Paul as a Judaizer, too; (3) they have a version which differs from both Acts and Paul (both of whom said no to circumcision) and this difference existed already at the time Paul wrote the epistle.69

1.3.4. The view of Acts is that: (1) in agreement with Paul, circumcision is not a requirement; (2) in disagreement with Paul, Acts reports Paul going to Jerusalem because Antioch sent him (15.2); (3) the Apostles and elders in Jerusalem have a kind of supremacy over the whole church, with Peter and James as pillars; (4) the resolution of the question has some conditions. Thus the account of Acts is not identical with but is akin to the Galatian version and sources.70

69 Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 93.

70 Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 95: 'The Author of Acts belonged, he too, to those Christians who wanted to correct Paul slightly in order to make him better....The Paul of the Church is to a great extent a corrected Paul, the Paul of Acts and not the Paul of history....The important point is, however, that he is not only defamed by his enemies but also corrected by his friends.'
1.3.5. The Acts account was preceded by the Galatian version, which was already current at the time Paul wrote to the Galatians. It is the version against which he struggles to make a correction. He appeals to the Galatians for three main changes. They ought to: (1) recognize his authentic and reliable apostleship; (2) abandon their form of the gospel;\(^71\) (3) be free from the law.\(^72\) This fits with the thesis that there was an existing and established law-observant Gentile mission.\(^73\)

1.4. What was the 'gospel' that Paul called on them to abandon?\(^74\) The Judaizers found the absolute point of departure for their theology in the law (5.3-4), and may have coined the expression 'law of Christ' (6.2) to indicate that their teaching was God's law as interpreted by God's Messiah. This 'good news' is for Gentiles and the whole of humankind, and involves a genuine mission outreach through the law of the Messiah. In Gal 3.1-5 Paul contrasts his teaching with that of the opponents and

\(^71\) Gal 1.6 indicates that the Galatians had either gone over to the opponents' view or were considering doing so.


\(^73\) Martyn, 'A Law-Observant Mission to Gentiles: The Background of Galatians', pp. 307-324, here p. 323, notes that prior to meeting this problem Paul made no previous use of Abraham or Genesis texts, had not dealt with the descendants question, and in response to the problem of the law offered the cross as the solution.

\(^74\) Martyn, 'Mission', pp. 314-316, prefers the term 'teachers' to designate Paul's opponents, rather than Judaizers or opponents, because of his emphasis on their thorough-going program of evangelism, with a particular theological content.
emphasizes the cross, which elicits faith, and the Spirit coming upon the hearers. The opponents, using texts to which Paul must respond, quote and interpret the Scriptures with a firm conviction that their theological position is supported by Scripture itself. In their position there is a strict condition laid down for the granting of the Spirit. It indicates the thoroughly conditional nature of the 'good news' which they teach. The congregations, they charge, have been misled by Paul, and need to be woken up with threats to shut the gate to salvation.\footnote{See the references to frighten, disturb, trouble, or intimidate, \textit{ταράδωσι}, 1.7; 5.10, and 4.17 for being 'shut out'.} Gentiles must pass through the 'gate' by circumcision, which signifies full participation in the people of God.\footnote{Martyn, 'Mission', p. 316, calls circumcision the 'commandment par excellence'.} Christ is viewed in the light of God's law, rather than the law in the light of Christ, and this means that Christ is secondary to the law. 'Paul thus seems to have no fear of being contradicted when he repeatedly says they avoid taking their theological bearings from the cross.'\footnote{Martyn, 'Mission', p. 315. Thus, the thing they do not have is a crucified Messiah: 'Presumably they understand Christ's death to have been a sacrifice for sins...in harmony with God's law...they consistently avoid every suggestion that God's Law and his Messiah could even partially conflict with one another....In a word, when they speak of the Messiah they do so in a way which takes for granted that the Messiah is the Messiah of the Law.'}
Thus the question which arose in Antioch and which was sent to Jerusalem for adjudication was that of the terms of admission into the church for Gentiles, with the focal issue being circumcision.\(^{78}\) Acts and Paul agree that the decision meant that circumcision was not necessary. The Galatian version differs on that key point, and it is against this version that Paul writes Galatians. Acts reports the addition of certain kosher-type conditions. Paul’s report in Galatians contains no such conditions.\(^{79}\) Acts and the Galatian version agree that Paul’s apostleship is subsidiary to the Jerusalem apostles, as he has received and been taught his Gospel by them. Paul’s defense is that his Gospel came by revelation. This apocalyptic Good News replaced the tradition of law and

\(^{78}\) Meeks and Wilken, Antioch, p. 16.

\(^{79}\) On the background of the conditions in Acts see Wilson, Luke and the Law, pp. 68-102. Wilson, pp. 92-93, draws two conclusions about the conditions. First, it is likely that by the time Luke wrote Acts abstention from such things as banned by the decree was an established part of Christian mores, and so Luke can present the decree as in no sense a burden but as likely to be welcomed by Gentile churches. The terms of the decree were obligations of a customary but not of a legal sort. Second, if there had been a connection between the decree and the Mosaic law (and a background in Lev 17-18 would still not necessarily be implied) the connection is obscured both by Luke’s insistence that the decree was apostolic in origin and inspired by the Spirit and by the way in which the terms of the decree were probably understood at the time Luke wrote. And yet two important issues remain separate from Wilson’s conclusions. First, whether at the time Paul wrote Galatians the bans of the decree were established part of Christian mores is a separate question from that regarding the time in which Luke wrote. Second, it would not have served Paul’s argument to include anything in his report of the decree which even remotely sounded like extra conditions to his gospel.
set him in opposition to law right from the start. He argues that his Gospel was known and affirmed by the Jerusalem pillars. Later action by them to the contrary would thus be inconsistent with the Jerusalem accord. This is part of the significance of his report of the Antioch incident in 2.11-14.

2. In Gal 2.11 Paul begins his report of what happened when Peter came to Antioch. The report runs at least through v. 14. It focuses on the question of table-fellowship, as represented by Peter first eating with and then withdrawing from Gentile Christians (2.12).

80 Whether Paul knew right from the start that such theological consequences were inherent in the new faith, or came to see that only later, is a separate question from how he reports the same in Galatians. See Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 254-256. In Galatians Paul has the advantage of having his past experience clarified by present questions. See Watson, Paul (1986), pp. 30, 54.

81 Acts has no report of Peter ever having visited Antioch. Paul reports no reason for Peter's visit. See Betz, Galatians, p. 105.

82 Opinion is divided whether Paul's report of the Antioch episode ends at 2.14 or includes 2.15-21, which would then be a summary of the speech Paul made in Antioch. Bligh, Galatians, sees Paul's speech, delivered to Peter at Antioch, extending to Gal 5.13a. But see Barrett, 'Allegory', pp. 157-158. Betz, Galatians, pp. 113-114, refers to 2.15-21 as the propositio, whose function is to summarize an easy transition to the (following) probatio. Whether the function of the text can be that systematically categorized Paul's purpose in relating the Antioch confrontation is to apply its point to the Galatian situation. Hence Schlier, Galater, p. 88, seems right in saying that the statements in 2.14ff have 'den Charakter einer Zusammenfassung', as both the concrete situation in Antioch and the developments Paul is aiming at in Galatia are in his mind.

83 The reference to Gentiles (2.12) and Jews (2.14-15) means Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians. This is an inner Church conflict.
2.1. There were substantial numbers of both Jews and Greeks within the population of Antioch. Jews and Gentiles combined within the Antioch Christian congregation. Within this first mixed church the conversion of Gentiles seems to have come about without accommodation to the law. When this practice was questioned, the Jerusalem Conference affirmed that circumcision was not necessary for membership and Gentile Christians' entrance into the church.

2.2. At Antioch the question was primarily one of fellowship within the church, as certain dietary regulations, re-imposed on Jewish Christians, would have

---

84 Moe, Paul 1:156, says, 'Next to Alexandria, Antioch had the largest Jewish population of any city outside Palestine'. See Meeks and Wilken, Antioch, p. 3; Josephus, Jewish War 7.3.3:44-45; Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries 1:2-3, 10; Meeks, Christians, p. 10; Acts 11.19-26. Moe estimates a population of 500,000 people.


86 Weiß, History 1:172, sees the analogy to the God-fearing Gentiles in relation to Jewish communities of the Dispersion. Such were admitted to worship without circumcision, and observed only some of the ceremonial commands. To the uncircumcised converts in the Antioch congregation Harnack, Expansion 1:60, thinks the title Χριστιανοί was given, itself evidence that the new Christian community in Antioch stood out in bold relief from Judaism: 'The name of Christian was the title of Gentile Christians.' It was later that Jewish Christians were also designated by this name. Meeks and Wilkens, Antioch, p. 1, see that implicit in this Antioch situation is the fact that here Christianity is first perceived as a distinct movement, and that it thus here first crossed the boundaries of Judaism in seeking Gentile converts on a law-free basis. A related but separate question concerns the extent of the influence of Hellenistic Christians on Paul. See Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 251-256; 'The Hellenists - A Bridge Between Jesus and Paul?'
precluded fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians. The two occasions, Jerusalem and Antioch, were enough like what was happening in Galatia, with an attempt to impose certain features of the law, for Paul to apply the histories of the two cases to the present situation. Thus the relationship of the Jerusalem report in 2.1-10 and the Antioch report in 2.11-14 is one of both similarity and dissimilarity. The two occasions are contrasted in that the meeting in Jerusalem reached accord and gave affirmation, resulting in fellowship, while the events in Antioch represented confrontation and conflict, because of broken fellowship. The two occasions have in common that both focused on specific questions of the law, in Jerusalem as it related to Gentiles and circumcision,

87 Weiß, History 1:274.


89 Antioch is evidence that the implications of Jerusalem were not thoroughly thought out, and that the consequences of the conference were not self-evident in Antioch or Galatia. Lüdemann, Paul, pp. 71-77, dates the Antioch incident before the Jerusalem conference. But see n. 7 above and Meeks, Christians, p. 81. Meeks and Wilkens, Antioch, p. 16, point out that Antioch, '... was also the place where controversy between Jews and Gentiles first erupted within the church'. This is not surprising in view of Antioch being the first deliberate mission to Gentiles which made Gentile Christianity 'visible to outsiders as a distinct movement very early in its history. Antioch was the birthplace of "gentile Christianity"'. See Harnack, Expansion 1:59, who traces the faith of the Greeks in Antioch to the 'scattered adherents of Stephen (Acts xi 19f)' who were 'the first missionaries to the heathen; they founded the Gentile church, that of Antioch. In this work they were joined by Barnabas and Paul....' Paul was thus not the first apostle to Gentiles, but joined a movement already in force.
in Antioch as it related to Jewish Christians and eating with Gentiles. That Gentile Christians were not required to observe Jewish food laws in Antioch indicates that their liberty had not been restricted, and yet no social intercourse was possible with Jewish Christians under such conditions. When the men from James came to Antioch (2.12) they found it unacceptable that Jewish Christians were eating with Gentiles, and the Mosaic food laws were thus being disregarded. The food laws regulated clean and unclean foods, proper slaughter of animals for table meat, tithing, ritual purity, and avoidance of food that had been offered to idols. Under this pressure Peter and other Jewish Christians withdrew. Loyalty to their ancestral faith made them want to show that belief in Christ made them no less Jewish than before. That is,

90 But interestingly, Paul does not mention νόμος until 2.16.

91 Weiß, History, 1:274: 'It was equivalent to a division of the church into two separate groups.' Lührmann, 'Abendmahlgemeinschaft? Gal 2.11f', p. 277, speaks of the relationship of the Antioch problem and the unity of the church. Unity had been concretely realized when Peter adopted the form of life of the Antioch congregation. Jewish and Gentile Christians sat at the same table no longer hindered by the prescriptions of the law. Such unity is neither the goal nor means of communion, but its foundation: '...wo Abendmahlgemeinschaft verweigert wird, gibt es keine Kirche mehr. Abendmahlgemeinschaft ist schließlich eschatologische Feier, insofern hier "neue Schöpfung" realisiert wird, in der die für diese Welt nötigen Differenzierungen und Polarisierungen nicht mehr gelten, da alle nur gerechertige Sünder sind vor dem einen Gott und dem einen Herrn.' See Barrett, Freedom, pp. 12-14, about these conditions relative to the Eucharist.

the biblical commands of such explicit stipulations as Gen 17.9-14, Lev 11.1-23, and Deut 14.3-21 could not be ignored by anyone who wished to be identified as a faithful member of God's covenant people. 93

2.3. Table-fellowship, of which the 'eating' in Gal 2.12 is an example, may be described according to both its religious and social functions.

2.3.1. The laws governing table-fellowship included food regulations. 94 The food laws for Judaism had a religious meaning, signifying 'fellowship before God....all have a share in the blessing which the master of the house has spoken over the unbroken bread'. 95 The limits of table-fellowship were determined partly by the commands laid down in the explicit laws of the Torah concerning unclean foods (Lev 11.1-23; Deut 14.3-21). This had been one of the 'make or break' issues of the Maccabean rebellion, for which principle many had chosen to die rather than be defiled by eating. 96 Food should not be tainted by the abomination of having been offered to

93 Dunn, 'Perspective', p. 108, says that especially since the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc 1.62-63; Dan 1.8-10; Tob 1.10-13; Judith 10.5; 12.1-20) the observance of laws regarding clean and unclean food was a basic expression of covenant faithfulness.

94 Dunn, 'The Incident at Antioch', pp. 3-57, here p. 4; Burton, Galatians, p. 104; Oepke, Galater, p. 51; Bruce, Paul, Apostle of the Free Spirit, p. 176; Betz, Galatians, p. 107 n. 448.

95 Dunn, 'Incident', p. 12.

96 1 Macc 1.62-63; Josephus, Antiquities, 11.8.7:346; Dunn, 'Incident', p. 12.
idols. 97 Food must be avoided from which the blood has not been drained in strict accord with the Mosaic commands. 98 Pharisees in Palestine were particularly pre-occupied with defining these limits for the practice of table-fellowship, and 229 of the 341 rulings (67%) pertain to table-fellowship. 99 Two particular aspects of ritual purity emerge: (1) cleansing of hands was intended to safeguard from uncleanness due to an unintentional touching; 100 (2) tithing, not just of money but of food for the table, was necessary to render food ritually acceptable. 101 The idea was to apply to everyday life the purity laws which governed temple ritual.

With respect to observance of such laws there was a variety of different attachments to Judaism on the part of

97 4 Macc 5.2; 1 Cor 8-10; Acts 15.20, 29.
100 Mk 7.2-5; Matt 15.2; Lk 11.38; Dunn, 'Incident', p. 14.
101 Mt. 23.23; Lk 18.12; Dunn, 'Incident', p. 15. See Neusner, From Politics to Piety, p. 83, who distinguishes between (1) Pharisees, who practiced ritual purity outside as well as inside the temple, and (2) lay-people who practiced it only in the temple but not in the non-cultic activities of everyday life. Paul (p. 80) was trained as a Pharisee, was knowledgeable about that tradition, and it seems to be that against which he argues in Antioch and Galatia. Dunn, 'Incident', p. 17, points out that Mk 7.19 and Matt 15.17, 20 attest to the discrepancy of views among Jesus' followers regarding his teaching on cleanliness. The incident at Antioch attests to the same cross-current of debates. What is clear is that the men from James wanted greater definition and observance.
Gentiles, and different levels of acceptance of Gentiles on the part of Jews. Adherence to the law governed behaviour, as strict Jews would have avoided table-fellowship with Gentiles, and those less scrupulous about tithing and purity would have been willing to share meals with Gentiles.\textsuperscript{102} There were three different possible forms of the relationship between \textit{goyim} and Judaism.\textsuperscript{103} The proselyte, or full convert, was a Gentile who had been won over to Judaism.\textsuperscript{104} The proselyte observed the law, including circumcision, and was within the same limits of table-fellowship as a native-born Jew. The resident alien, a Gentile who lived within the borders of Israel, accepted only some of the commands of the Torah, including at least the seven Noachic laws.\textsuperscript{105} The God-fearers attached themselves to Judaism in differing degrees.\textsuperscript{106} Of the three categories they were generally the most acceptable to Jews, frequently found to observe the law as native-born Jews.\textsuperscript{107} Judaism likely reflected varying

\textsuperscript{102} Dunn, 'Incident', p. 23.
\textsuperscript{103} Dunn, 'Incident', pp. 18-22.
\textsuperscript{104} Lake, \textit{The Beginnings of Christianity I}, 5:82-84; Kuhn, \textit{TDNT} 6:736-737.
\textsuperscript{105} The Noachic laws legislated: (1) subjection to established courts of justice; (2) against blasphemy; (3) against idolatry; (4) against adultery; (5) against bloodshed; (6) against robbery; (7) against eating flesh from a living animal. See Moore, \textit{Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era}, 1.339; Str-B.2.729-739; 3.37-38; Kuhn, \textit{TDNT} 6.740-741.
\textsuperscript{106} Lake, \textit{Beginnings} 5:85.
\textsuperscript{107} Josephus, \textit{Apion}, 2:38:282.
attitudes toward the qualifications for belonging to each of these categories, as well as toward those who were in each category. The question thus follows to what extent God-fearing Gentiles were expected to observe laws of ritual purity and tithing in the Antioch situation.108

2.3.2. The nature of table-fellowship included the identity-defining function of the law. In a sociological way a group may be marked off as distinct from other groups by its peculiar beliefs and practices. The boundaries established by such beliefs and practices serve the group's definition of identity, and these boundaries will be emphasized the more a group senses that it is under threat.109 Along with circumcision, the food laws, which set the limits to table-fellowship, were widely regarded as characteristically and distinctly Jewish. They were the 'identity markers' or

...peculiar rites which marked out the Jews as that peculiar people....These identity markers identified Jewishness.... They functioned as badges of covenant membership. A member of the covenant people was, by

108 Dunn, 'Incident', pp. 21-23.

109 Dunn, 'Works', p. 524; Mol, Identity and the Sacred, pp. 57-58, 233. Dunn, 'Incident', pp. 7-11, describes the threats to Judaism's distinctive religious and national identity under Rome, and how the followers of Jesus would have been affected by this same pressure, so that as Judaism struggled to emphasize its boundaries by way of ritual law, some Christians also sought to be defined as loyal nationalistic Jews by means of the same laws. Pressures against the new sect's beliefs or practices were perceived as threats to Jewish institutions and traditions. Dunn speculates whether the men from James sensed this threat and hence reacted to the table-fellowship question as they did in Antioch. See Reicke, 'Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia-Episode, Gal 2.1-14', pp. 172-187; Jewett, 'Agitators', pp. 204-206.
Performance of these laws was seen by the Jews themselves as fundamental observances of the covenant, and it could be seen by others who would thus distinguish the Jews from other people.

2.3.3. There are basically three alternatives for understanding the quality of table-fellowship at Antioch before the arrival of men from James.\textsuperscript{111}

2.3.3.1. Table-fellowship at Antioch as practiced by Jewish Christians, including Peter, meant a total abandonment of laws governing table-fellowship. What the men from James could then have insisted upon was enforcement of the decree as described by Acts 15.29.\textsuperscript{112} The Jewish Christians at Antioch were thus 'living like Gentiles', that is like Gentile 'sinners' who were outside the law. This would fit with: (1) the use of θεοκτῶς, Ἰουδαῖκῶς in 2.14, and ἀμαρτωλοί in 2.15; (2) Acts 10-11, Luke's account of Peter's vision at Joppa, and the subsequent lesson that the law of clean-unclean no longer applies; (3) the Antioch incident preceded the Jerusalem

\textsuperscript{110} Dunn, 'Perspective', p. 108; Sahlin, 'The New Exodus of Salvation According to St Paul', pp. 81-95, here p. 89, adds that proselyte baptism was also required.

\textsuperscript{111} Dunn, 'Incident', pp. 29-36.

\textsuperscript{112} Catchpole, 'Paul, James and the Apostolic Decree', pp. 428-444. Lührmann, 'Abendmahlgemeinschaft', p. 277, says that when Peter came to Antioch he assumed the form of life which was observed by the congregation. But see Wilson, \textit{Luke}, pp. 68-70, for what may have been Luke's view of the Cornelius episode.
council, with the council thus called to resolve the problem of the incident.¹¹³

Having laid out this alternative Dunn shows three problems with it. First, he says that it is unlikely that Jewish believers at Antioch abandoned the law so completely, and cites Rom 14.1-2 and 1 Corinthians 8 as indicators of such reluctance among some Jewish Christians. Total abandonment, Dunn thinks, would have caused problems among the Antioch Jewish believers even before the arrival of men from James.

It is clear that for some Antioch Christians as well as for Paul relation to the law was a problem in the church. But that it was a problem does not preclude abandonment of the law, but more likely indicates that abandonment was taking place. In seeking to understand what happened in Antioch, as reported in Paul's letter to Galatia, the attitudes and events described in Romans or 1 Corinthians are not adequate standards. Paul's apocalyptic gospel, described in Galatians 1-2 as having been laid out for the pillars of Jerusalem, and from the start replacing the tradition of law-keeping in Paul's life with the central conviction of faith in Christ's redemptive death, indicates law abandonment during Paul's Antioch years, and this implies a congregation in which such a position was acceptable, if not expected.

Second, Dunn suggests that the first Gentile converts came almost exclusively from among the God-fearers, who were already accustomed to observing dietary laws in some measure. He cites Acts 6.5. By way of response to Dunn, however, it is to be noticed that Acts 6.5 mentions a proselyte, not a God-fearer. Furthermore, the distinct self-identity which the Χριστιανοί gained in Antioch (Acts 11.26) would indicate more of a break with Judaism and its laws and traditions, rather than continuity.¹¹⁴ This fits with what Paul says in Gal 1.15-24 about himself, his independence, and his proclamation. The impression (in connection with 2.3) is that Paul's proclamation had been law-free from the outset of his apostolic activity.

Third, Dunn says that it must be doubted that Paul would have reacted so strongly if only a requirement for observance of the Noachic laws had been laid on by the men from James. But Paul argues against the whole law, following the instigation of any aspect of law whatever, and the whole tone and content of the letter to Galatia leaves very little room for minor observances of the law. Paul never distinguishes Noachic or any other particular aspects of law once he moves to arguing against the whole law, as in the move from 2.16 to 2.19.

It seems likely that the Christians of Antioch, including Peter, had adopted a life style that was ἀνεφόρως. The boundary separating Jew from Gentile, inside the law

from outside the law, and the threat to Jewish identity were too great for Peter and the others to ignore.  

2.3.3.2. An alternative interpretation is that table fellowship at Antioch involved a fair degree of observance of food laws, and the men from James wanted a greater observance, with the God-fearers being fully proselytized by circumcision. This interpretation would match Gal 2.12 and Acts 15.1. It would explain the Jerusalem council as having been called to resolve the Antioch incident, and it would allow for the number of Gentiles at Antioch who were willing to Judaize.

But the weaknesses of this interpretation, Dunn suggests, are two-fold. First, it does not fit with the language used by Paul. The term `to judaize' refers to the adoption of Jewish customs and is to be distinguished from circumcision, which was the final step in the process of becoming a proselyte. It is not likely that Paul would use the term 'to judaize' with reference to that final step for Gentiles who were already 'judaizing' to a considerable extent. Second, it would be difficult in this interpretation to understand the Antioch episode as the sequel to the Jerusalem agreement of Gal 2.1-10 (as it in fact was).

2.3.3.3. The third alternative has in common with the second the suggestion that the Gentile believers were

115 Dunn, 'Works', pp. 528-529.

already observing basic food laws, but the men from James wanted a 'more scrupulous observance' of what these laws involved, especially with regard to ritual purity and tithing. Dunn would see a match of Gal 2.14-15 with interpretation (3), as Peter demanded a greater ritual purity, or 'judaizing', regarding laws which were in some measure already being observed.

In both interpretations (2) and (3), however, Dunn argues backwards, beginning with the notions that ἐθνικὸς means a limited observance of the law, including at least the Noachic rules and life-style; iovδαγζεων meant enough affiliation with Judaism to make table fellowship possible for Gentiles; consequently, there had been some measure of law observance by the Antioch Gentile Christians for the sake of fellowship with Jewish Christians, and there was no real break with the law or with Judaism prior to the incident of 2.11-14. In fact, the term ἐθνικὸς generally refers to one who no longer lives in observance of Jewish customs and law, or who lives in contrast to them. Thus does Paul seem to use the term in Galatians, in accord with the general argument

---

117 Dunn is imprecise here, but probably means that the men from James called upon the Antioch church to move from a partial to a complete observance of the law. Cf. Weiss, History 1:244.

118 Dunn, 'Incident', p. 25.


120 Betz, Galatians, p. 112; Bruce, Galatians, p. 133; BAG p. 217; Schmidt, TDNT 2:372.
of law versus faith. With the term 'Ἰουδαϊκός Paul indicates observance of Jewish customs and law and uses the term as a synonym for Ἰουδαῖος. The connection to the occasion of his taking Titus with him to Jerusalem, where Titus was not compelled to be circumcised (2.3), is made by the repeated use of the verb 'compel' here in 2.14. Two ways of life are being contrasted. For church unity on Peter's terms full adoption of Jewish ways, including circumcision, would have been necessary. Dunn's categories tend to blur this contrast.

2.3.3.4. Thus, if we are to approach the problem as Paul did it means moving outward from the same centre from which he proceeded. Paul's gospel had at its centre 'the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me', (2.20) who was revealed to Paul so that Paul might preach him among the Gentiles (1.16). This Paul declares by way of contrast to the law-keeping tradition which had been his own past (1.13), and which had from the beginning of his new faith been replaced by the revelation of Jesus Christ (1.12). As Paul argued from the Galatians' own experience, so would he also argue of himself, that he received the Spirit by hearing with faith, and not by works of law (3.2-5). Although there is a distinction to be made between Ἰουδαϊκός and circumcision, the latter being the final step of the former, an over-lapping of

121 Gutbrod, TDNT 3:383: conversion to Judaism is indicated, particularly including circumcision; Bruce, Galatians, p. 133.
iovbair, E, -v with 4evtxws is thereby neither ensured nor implied. Paul uses iovbair in contrast to 4evtxws, not as a synonym for receiving circumcision.\textsuperscript{122}

The terminology of 2.14-15 must be understood in light of Paul's law-free gospel. It cannot be the starting-point for an argument that leads to defining the degree of either law-observance or freedom from the law within that gospel. In the light of that gospel κατέλυσε (2.18), perhaps a technical term for abandoning the law,\textsuperscript{123} reflects Paul's previous break with Judaism. This sense of discontinuity is heightened if 2.18 is taken as part of Paul's report of what he said to Peter at Antioch, a statement he made then about a break that was already real at that time. Any action regarding aspects of the law, not in keeping with the break necessitated by the new tradition which replaced it, would not be in accord with the truth of that gospel.\textsuperscript{124} Hence, Paul intervened and

\textsuperscript{122} Against Dunn, 'Incident', p. 31.

\textsuperscript{123} Büchsel, TDNT 4:338; Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 47.

\textsuperscript{124} On 'the truth of the Gospel', see Betz, Galatians, p. 92; Schlier, Galater, p. 73; Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 111 n. 58; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 107; Burton, Galatians, p. 86. The peculiar expression can mean, (1) the 'true Gospel' versus the 'false gospel' (1.6-9); (2) the integrity of the Gospel; (3) the real consequences of the Gospel. The doctrine of grace is denoted. Ebeling, Truth, p. 117, says that the expression, '...does more than raise the question whether the gospel is true in itself, in contrast to other messages and doctrines; it emphasizes the obligation that the gospel be proclaimed and preserved in all its purity and inward consistency. Cephas' conduct had the opposite effect....'
publicly confronted Peter at Antioch. Peter no longer proceeded 'on the right road', nor was he going 'straight toward the goal', and so his orthodoxy had 'gone lame'.

2.3.4. The horns of Peter's dilemma are stated according to Paul's evaluation. Peter's religious status is that of being a Jew ('Ἰουδαῖος ὁ πάρχων') who, having given up his Jewish way of life, lives like a Gentile (ἐθνικὸς), no longer observing the Jewish law (οὐκ Ἰουδαῖος), 'Way of life' is to be emphasized here. 'The present tense of ζῆς ("you are living") implies much more than an act of table fellowship with Christian Gentiles. It suggests that the table fellowship was only the external symbol of Cephas' total emancipation from Judaism.'

125 Gal 2.14; See Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 143 n. 43, on ἄλλα as signifying the turning point.

126 On ὁρθοποδεῖω see Betz, Galatians, p. 111 n. 483; Preisker, TDNT 5:451; Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 144.

127 On ὁπάρχωv see BAG, pp. 845-846; BDF §414:1. The term, especially in participial form with a predicate noun, is a frequent substitute for ἑιναί.

128 The form, ἐθνικός, is a hapax legomenon in the NT, and signifies contrast to the Jewish way of life of obedience to the law. See BAG, p. 217; Schmidt, TDNT 2:372.

129 The advantage of being Ἰουδαῖος is in having the law. The distinction from ἑιναί is thus not simply of race or nationality, but is grounded in revelation and the will of God. One is Ἰουδαῖος, according to Paul, on the basis of commitment and attachment to the law, and one may thus convert to Judaism from the outside by adopting the law. See Gutbrod, TDNT 3:381-383.

130 Betz, Galatians, p. 112; Burton, Galatians, p. 112; Schlier, Galater, p. 86: 'Das Präsens bei ζῆν steht nicht deshalb, weil damit ausgedrückt werden soll, daß Petrus sein Verhalten nur in bezug auf die
And yet, having broken with a former way of life, Peter is explicitly or implicitly demanding (compelling: ἀναγκάζων)\textsuperscript{131} that Gentile Christians now Judaize (ἰουσσαῖζελν). In 2.3 the demand was for circumcision of Titus. In Galatia the agitators' demand is also for circumcision (6.13). Therefore, ἰουσσαῖζελν, for Paul, means more than submission to Jewish dietary laws, for such submission carries the obligation to keep the whole law (5.3), that is, fully to Judaize, and through circumcision become a proselyte. Paul assumes the obligatory nature of a single aspect of law, and he would argue that selection of special laws is illegitimate. For Paul only God can exempt from any part of the law, and this God has done by abolishing the law in Christ.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{131} Betz, Galatians, p. 112; 1 Macc 2.25; 2 Macc 6.1, 7, 18; 4 Macc 5.2 27; 8.1.

\textsuperscript{132} Linton, 'Third Aspect', pp. 90-94, especially p. 90: 'Paul admits no distinction between indispensable and dispensable commandments. The law is to Paul, as to his rabbinic compatriots, one and indivisible. Therefore, if a man is circumcised, he is a debtor to the whole law. And why does Paul so severely emphasize this? Evidently because there was a tendency in Galatia to oblige Gentile Christians to some commandments of the Mosaic law and not to others. The Judaists were thus not so rigid Judaists as generally supposed.' That is, they may have been rigid about certain conditions of law, but they were not consistent in imposing all aspects of the law.
Summary

Paul's use of the expression, 'works of the law', in Gal 2.16, must be understood in relation to two occurrences: \(^{133}\) (1) in Gal 2.1-10, the Jerusalem conference decided in favour of Paul's law-free, circumcision-less gospel, regarding the entry of Gentile converts, and (2) in Gal 2.11-15, the Antioch incident focused on table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians. The theme of justification, as Paul begins to speak of it in 2.16, is set in the context of that confrontation at Antioch. \(^{134}\) By the expression, 'works of law', Paul thus seems to have very specific aspects of the law in mind, namely circumcision and dietary laws, and these particular observances of the law were characteristically definitive of Jewish identity. The very issues that were problematic for the life of the church were the badges by which Israel had signified its

\(^{133}\) Dunn, 'Perspective', p. 107. Would 'special days' (4.10) have included the sabbath? If so then Schlatter, Galater, p. 64, is poignantly correct: 'Kannst du, werden sie Paulus gefragt haben, wirklich zum Beispiel am Sabbat arbeiten, ohne daß dir das Herz klopft und dich das Wort strafend verfolgt: "Gedenke des Sabattages?" Seine Antwort lautet: Ich bin dem Gesetz tot und werde inwendig nicht mehr von ihm gefaßt. Es hat keinen Zugang mehr zu mir und spricht nicht mehr in mich hinein. Die Gerechtigkeit, die ich mit dem Gesetz erwerben könnte, begehre ich nicht; sie hat jede lockende Kraft für mich verloren....Ich bin gänzlich vom Gesetz los.'

\(^{134}\) Wilckens, 'Werken', p. 86.
covenant membership. These specific works typified the observance of law which represented the standard response to God's covenant. Law-observance as standard response to God's covenant has been called 'nomism', as over against 'legalism', the term customarily ascribed to an attitude that would gain divine favour by law keeping. Paul rejects works of law as a standard of faith in Christ. This undercuts the whole idea of works of law as markers of identity. What is thus affected is the self-understanding of the believer, which is grounded in faith in Christ as the new foundation for righteousness. This self-understanding is thus based on the identity-giving character of religious faith and includes the way of life that flows from it.

Paul's response to these particular aspects of law is in turn set in the context of his gospel of Christ (1.7),

135 Dunn, 'Perspective', pp. 107-108.

136 Longenecker, Paul, p. 78, refers to an 'acting legalism' and a 'reacting nomism'. Paul's relation to the law (pp. 86-155) is a rejection of nomism as well as legalism. Sanders, Paul (1977), pp. 75, 420, 544, describes 'covenantal nomism' as the obedience to law which maintains but does not earn one's inclusion in the covenant. Related to this is the question of whether Paul distorts the Judaism of his day. See Räisänen, 'Legalism and Salvation by the Law', pp. 63-83, and 'Paul's Theological Difficulties with the Law', pp. 301-320. A distortion could be argued if Paul were setting up the straw-man of legalism, but he does not militate against works in general as performed for merit. See Childs, Canon, pp. 301-310, and 1.5 n. 11 above.

received by revelation (1.12, 16), in accord with which Paul now acts (1.16b, 23; 2.2). This gospel of God's Son (1.16a) is the standard of Paul's apostolicity and that to which he calls the Galatians (1.6-9). It places him in a dialectical tension with Jerusalem (1.16c, 18-19; 2.2b, 6c) and open opposition with the teachers in Galatia who sought to reimpose the law (2.3-5). The revelation of the gospel was the transition from a law tradition to 'life...by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me' (2.20b). The replacement of the old tradition with the new is represented by the contrast between works and faith (2.16). The contrast is the chief reason for which Paul introduces justification (2.16-17, 21) at this point in the letter.\textsuperscript{138}

Paul's break with his own past, Judaism's relation to the law, is brought to light in this argument. It is not an abused or misunderstood law against which he argues, nor does he seek to clarify and establish the true law. As one who has not remained a law-observant Jew and who has undergone conversion, Paul saw the need for both Jew and Gentile to 'enter the new community'.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{138} Gal 2.16-17 contrasts how justification does not happen (works of law) to how it does happen (faith in Christ). The fuller exposition of justification is in 3.6-14, as Paul uses the Abraham and blessing-curse material.

\textsuperscript{139} Räisänen, 'Break', pp. 548-550, says of the Jew, 'In a word, conversion was as necessary for him as for a Gentile....Even he had to become a καινή κρίσις. It was a new beginning'.
The break with the law as a whole was not only an example of Paul's flexible generalizing from particular works to the whole law, but is also a break which is implicitly expressed by the theological motifs used from the opening sentence of the letter. Of particular significance, however, is the fact that it was the specific works of circumcision and table laws from which Paul generalized in his militating against the law as a whole. Such works represent the active realm of law, respect for and practice of whose conditions describe Paul's former life.

It was these same conditions which Paul's opponents in Galatia sought to impose on Gentile converts to faith in Christ. This imposition was reminiscent of Peter's vacillating behaviour, which would have brought disintegration to the Church. Such conditions of law bring death. This is reflected in Paul's view of the law, expressed in a phrase which is both a full and final statement: he has died to it (2.19). This death was Paul's break with the law. He has died to the old tradition so that he could live to God. The old tradition was not an option but a barrier, and freedom from it, because it was divinely ordained, could come only by death.

But along with his reference to his own death to law Paul alludes to the death of Christ, as he says that he has been crucified with Christ. What then is the connection between the death of Christ and the law, and
between the death of Christ and Paul's death to the law? To examine these problems we must turn to Paul's statement about the death of Christ in Gal 3.13.
3.2 THE CURSE OF THE LAW

Paul continues to expound his gospel by laying out two arguments which defend the replacement of the rule of law by the reign of faith in Christ. The argument from experience, in Gal 3.1-5, challenges the Galatians to look at their own experience of Christian faith with a series of questions. The argument from Scripture in 3.6-29 develops texts and exposition into a response to the opponents' view, to their use of Scripture, and to the practices of law which they prescribed.

1. Paul's argument from experience is in Gal 3.1-5. The position of the participle ἐσταυρωμένος, at the end of 3.1, is emphatic. Its perfect tense alludes to that which took place on Calvary but which is also the present status of Christ.¹ Together with προεγράφη it points to, (1) the message of The Crucified One which was publicly proclaimed to them;² (2) the message which they had from the very

¹ Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241; Betz, Galatians, pp. 128, 256-257, points to ἐσταυρωμένος as an abbreviation signifying 'Christ's redemptive act of liberation, his crucifixion and resurrection (cf. 1.1, 4; 2.20; 3.13; 4.5)....In the Pauline sense, "to be free" means to participate in Christ's crucifixion and resurrection'. See 1 Cor 1.23; 2.2; 1 Cor 1.13, 17, 18; 2.8; 2 Cor 13.4; Gal 5.11, 24; 6.12, 14, 17; Phil 2.8; 3.18; Col 1.20; 2.14; Eph 2.16; Bultmann, Theology 1:292-306; Käsemann, 'Death of Jesus', pp. 32-59; Kuhn, 'Jesus als Gekreuzigter in der frühchristlichen Verkündigung bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts', pp. 1-46, especially pp. 31-37.

² Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 134; Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241. See Schrenk, TDNT 1:770-72; Schlier, Galater, p. 120: 'Dieses bezeichnet Jesus nicht als den, der am Kreuze hängt und nun als solcher zu betrachten ist, sondern als
beginning (προ-) heard and believed. In view of that firm beginning, τίς όμως ἐβάσκανεν; The verb's meaning in this context signifies the current 'spiritual infancy of the Galatians' as well as the 'envious spirit of the agent'.

Paul returns in 3.2 to the contrast of 2.15. In 2.15-16 the question was the matter of justification. Now the contrast questions how they received the Spirit. Spirit (3.2) and faith (2.16) are thus placed on the same side.

Paul continues his reference to πνεύμα in 3.3, associating it with the Galatians' beginning of faith, and emphasizing the initiative of the verb in v. 1 (προεγράφη). The word σάρξ is introduced to the contrast, against Spirit, and thus on the side of law. 'Flesh' here alludes to the flesh that was cut in circumcision.
In 3.4 the translation of ἐπάθετε as 'experience' (RSV) is too weak, as the Galatians have in fact suffered much trauma in their faith, which Paul interprets theologically for them in ch. 5. There we notice: (1) the pressure to receive circumcision (5.3), which Paul sees as a hindrance to their faith (5.7); (2) a view other than Paul's (5.8, 10) has troubled (5.10) and unsettled them (5.12); (3) the message of the cross is a necessary scandal (5.11b) and issues in freedom (5.13) but is in danger of being lost; (4) behaviour in the congregation which lacks love (5.13-14) is linked to the fleshly life (5.16-21), precludes the Spirit (5.16-17) and so needs to be crucified (5.24). The NT does not use the verb πάσχειν relative to spiritual blessings.⁵ Should they yield to present pressure the past trauma will be εἰκή.

Paul has associated justification with faith and faith with Spirit. In 3.5 he adds miracles to that same side of the contrast, against ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. The phrase, ἀκοής πίστεως has appeared in 3.2 (with τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε) and in 3.5 (with ὁ...ἐπικοφορητῶν... πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν ὀνόματος), and hence serves as Paul's point of departure for the Abraham midrash that commences in 3.6.

Paul draws no line between experience and Scripture, nor between theology and proclamation. The two arguments stand here, side by side, without coming into conflict. Indeed, Paul upbraids the Galatians for being ἀνάητοι.

⁵ Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 135.
(3.1), without understanding (νοθς), for they have not judged their situation correctly: 'Spirituality is defective when, as is so often the case, it lacks the capacity for clear and sober theological judgement.'

Behind Paul's series of questions in 3.1-5 are really two things for which the Galatians must answer: (1) how has the gift of the Spirit come? and (2) where will they end up in the dispute between antithetical proclamations? In view of the justification-Spirit-faith association which Paul has constructed, the two mutually exclusive possibilities by which they may answer are cast in the single rhetorical question of v. 5. It is the question to which Paul supplies his answer in 3.14b: '...that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.' It is also seen by this association that the Spirit is identified as something experienced: (1) the gift of the Spirit had a clear beginning, and was a unique event (hence the past tense of v. 2) and yet is presently effectual (hence the present tense of v. 5); (2) the Spirit is recognized by the working of miracles, and yet the signs are themselves distinguishable from the Spirit. Paul thus traces the Spirit back to its origin: ἀκοὴ πίστεως. In contrast to ἐργά νόμου this phrase emphasizes

6 Ebeling, Truth, p. 156.
7 Ebeling, Truth, p. 158.

8 Weder, Kreuz, p. 186: 'Der ganze Abschnitt 3.6-14 gibt Antwort auf die (eigentlich rhetorische) Frage von V.5....'; Lührmann, Galater, p. 54: 'Die Frage von V.5 wird also in V.14b beantwortet.'
the centrality of faith and the proclaimed word as source of faith. The Galatians' experience of the Spirit, traceable back to ἀκοὴ πίστεως, is linked to the fact of proclamation with which Paul began this argument from experience: προεγράφη...ἐσταυρωμένος (3.1). Thus, the message of Christ crucified is linked to proclamation (3.1), and Spirit is linked to hearing with faith (3.2). Faith was linked to justification already in 2.16. The Spirit belongs not to a second or higher stage of faith than justification, but to the foundation of the gospel. The gift of the Spirit and justification belong on the same side, with faith, gospel, the cross, and miracles, against law (3.2), the flesh (3.3), and curse (3.10).

2. Paul's argument from scripture is in Gal 3.6-29. Paul uses a series of midrashic developments in Galatians 3 to make a scriptural and doctrinal defense of his gospel. The form of the scriptural (OT) argument in Galatians 3 is similar to that in 1 Corinthians 1-3.

---

9 See Ebeling, Truth, p. 160. On the significance of hearing, as a term taken over from Isa 53.1 (LXX), see Bruce, Galatians, p. 149: Paul quotes the OT text in Rom 10.16, 'as referring to the gospel and treats [it] as a premise leading to a conclusion: "so faith comes from what is heard"...'.

10 Bruce, Galatians, pp. 149-150; 151-2: 'The presence of the Spirit in power is the unmistakable sign that the new age has dawned (cf. Joel 2.28ff)....it displaces law and rules out of court every attempt to achieve righteousness by works which the law prescribes.'

11 Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241.

12 Fitzmyer, JBC, pp. 241-244, and Ebeling, Truth, p. 163, divide the scriptural argument into segments which extend through Gal 4.31. However, Gal 3.29 clearly marks the end of the Abraham material begun in 3.6, even though
There are three common characteristics in such presentations of Scripture. First, an OT quotation introduces the theme which is to be addressed. This is the opening statement. In the case of Galatians 3, it refers to Abraham (3.6). Second, subordinate quotations support and develop the argument which was introduced in the opening statement. Catchwords or key words link the initial quotation to the exposition which follows and to the subordinate OT quotations. There is a concentration on key words which are linked paraphrastically, but not every word or phrase of the texts plays a part in the argument. Third, a final OT quotation alludes to the initial quotation and/or summarizes the argument.

The initial quotation is often introduced with an introductory formula using verbs such as ἀναφέρειν or λέγει, the subjects of which may be God, law, Scripture, David, or Isaiah. Gal 3.8 refers to 'the Scripture...saying', and 'it is written' appears in 3.10. 'It is written' also occurs in 1 Cor 1.19; 2.9; 3.19. 4.1ff plays on words and themes introduced in 3.6-29 which are related to the Abraham story.

13 Ellis, Prophecy and Hermeneutic, p. 156; Borgen, Bread from Heaven, pp. 47-50.

Such formulae indicate the accepted authority of Scripture as the declaration of divine will.\textsuperscript{15}

Paul generally quotes from the LXX, but with a freedom that allows him to modify texts to suit his argument.\textsuperscript{16} This indicates the subordination of the exact wording of a text to the subject matter and need at hand, as Paul’s christological convictions are given precedence over the OT text’s literal precision.\textsuperscript{17} Original contexts of OT quotations may also be ignored, along with exact renderings, for the sake of what Paul calls his gospel.\textsuperscript{18}

Texts, therefore, must carry the gospel, and no other standard seems to take priority over that in his use of

\textsuperscript{15} Ellis, \textit{Use}, pp. 23, 25; Wilcox, \textit{On Investigating the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament}, pp. 231-243, here p. 241, says that ‘...the primitive church’s acceptance of the authority of Jesus...enabled it to pesher the OT in terms of him’.

\textsuperscript{16} Ellis, \textit{Use}, pp. 83-84, says that for Paul the true meaning of OT texts is in Christ. After conversion the OT became a new book for Paul. On Paul’s typology see Ellis, pp. 127-146: Paul’s meaning is primary, the exact wording is secondary; cf. Ellis, \textit{Prophecy}, pp. 147-154. However, Paul’s omission of ‘by God’ in Gal 3.13 shows the influence of MT, as over against LXX, which includes the phrase; see Fitzmyer, \textit{Crucifixion}, p. 510.

\textsuperscript{17} Ellis, \textit{Use}, pp. 28-29, quotes Michel, \textit{Paulus und seine Bibel}, ‘Das προφήτης muß aus der Schrift sprechen’.

\textsuperscript{18} Goppelt, \textit{Typos}, p. 127, says that Paul’s ‘basic view of the OT text is that its content corresponds to the gospel, and that its task is to present the gospel to the church’. On the consistency of appearance of εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελιζόμενον throughout Paul’s writings, and the shades of meaning for gospel as event, content, and power, see Friedrich, \textit{TDNT} 2:729-735.
texts. Gal 3.6-29, 1 Corinthians 1-3, and Rom 4.1-22 are examples of this exegetical method.\textsuperscript{19}

2.1. The main argument from Scripture in Galatians 3 is opened and closed with references to Abraham, faith, righteousness, and promise.\textsuperscript{20} 'That in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles' through faith, is the christological conviction served by the OT texts from which Paul argues (Gal 3.14). After alluding to Ps 143.2 in Gal 2.16,\textsuperscript{21} Paul's OT references in Galatians 3 are predominantly texts from the Pentateuch (that is, Torah or Book of the Law texts).\textsuperscript{22} In Galatians 3 the OT references include: Gen 15.6=Gal 3.6; Gen 12.3=Gal 3.8; Deut 27.26=Gal 3.10; Hab 2.4=Gal 3.11; Lev 18.5=Gal 3.12; Deut 21.23=Gal 3.13; Gen 22.18=Gal 3.16.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{19} Ellis, Prophecy, pp. 156-157, 213-214; Use, pp. 119-125; Weber, The Cross, pp. 77-91; Wuellner, 'Haggadic Homily in 1 Corinthians 1-3', pp. 199-204, makes a case for 1 Corinthians 1-3 as a homiletical pattern similar to that noticed in Gal 3.6-29 and Rom 4.1-22 by Borgen, Bread, pp. 43-46.

\textsuperscript{20} Borgen, Bread, p. 48. See n. 12 above.

\textsuperscript{21} In Gal 2.16 Paul demonstrates his flexibility in using Scripture to support his argument. The phrase 'works of law' does not occur in Ps 143.2, but Paul adds it in order to respond to the inconsistency which had occurred in Peter. See Barrett, Freedom, p. 19; Lindars, New Testament Apologetic, pp. 224-225.

\textsuperscript{22} In 1 Corinthians the scriptural argument is predominantly based on prophetic texts, as there Paul acts in accord with the tradition in Israel which was critical of wisdom. See McKane, Prophets and Wise Men, pp. 102-112; Wuellner, 'Homily', pp. 203-204.

\textsuperscript{23} On whether Paul is using Gen 12.3 or 18.18 at Gal 3.8, see Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 21 n. 24.
The one thing these developments have in common is that they all concentrate on Abraham, and show Paul's concern with what it means to have the right of appeal to Abraham.\textsuperscript{24} The question of Gentile righteousness without the law corresponds to the extension also to the Gentiles of the promise made to Abraham. If the righteousness question were answered exclusively in terms of the gospel then there would inevitably come a conflict with traditional interpretations of the Abraham story. These traditional interpretations were in line with the Jewish view of Abraham which 'allowed for faith as trust in the divine promise (and especially the monotheistic confession as the sum of faith) to be itself a work; and the divine acceptance was hence considered as a juridical ratification of an existing piety'.\textsuperscript{25} The faithfulness of Abraham was thus emphasized, in a view that shows up in the Apocrypha,\textsuperscript{26} the New Testament,\textsuperscript{27} and Philo.\textsuperscript{28} Paul's interpretation of Abraham is according to his own theological understanding of faith. That is, Paul uses the Abraham material in accord with his law-faith

\textsuperscript{24} Ebeling, \textit{Truth}, p. 164.

\textsuperscript{25} Käsemann, 'The Faith of Abraham in Romans 4', pp. 79-101, here p. 81; see Heidland \textit{TDNT} 4:286-292. Betz, \textit{Galatians}, p. 140, points out that Paul here uses a text (Gen 15.6) that was famous both to (1) Jews: Str-B 3:199-201 and (2) Christians: Hahn, 'Gen 15.6 im Neuen Testament', pp. 90-107, here pp. 97-100.

\textsuperscript{26} Sir 44.19-21; 1 Macc 2.50-52.

\textsuperscript{27} James 2.21; Heb 11.17.

\textsuperscript{28} De Abrahamo, 262-276. See Ebeling, \textit{Truth}, p. 166.
contrast, and could have used the story because his opponents had introduced it.²⁹

According to the Jewish or traditional interpretation, Abraham's faith is not at all opposed to his deeds. His works included steadfastness in the midst of temptations and his abiding trust in the promise of God.³⁰ A similar view of Abraham occurs in James 2.21-23. It is contradicted by Paul.³¹ Paul understands faith, in his interpretation of Abraham, not as a 'work' of human faithfulness, but rather as faith in Jesus Christ, in whose crucifixion God's saving act has taken place, 'that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles' (Gal 3.14). But Paul's thought here also seems to be, 'if blessed, then not cursed'. This, together with the possibility that his opponents introduced the notion of curse relative to failure to keep the law (3.10), leads Paul to deal with curse in 3.10-14.

To get to the point of freedom from curse in 3.13 Paul's argument utilizes three stages.³²

In 3.6-9 the catchwords are 'faith' and 'blessing'. Two quotations are used: Gen 15.6 in v. 6, followed by a

²⁹ Betz, Galatians, p. 141 n. 19; Burton, Galatians, pp. 153, 156; Barrett, 'Allegory', p. 158; Bruce, Galatians, pp. 154-155; Oepke, Galater, p. 102; Michel, Paulus, p. 91ff.
³⁰ Betz, Galatians, p. 139; Bultmann, TDNT 6:197-228.
³¹ Hahn, 'Gen 15.6', p. 97: 'Wo der Jakobusb Brief von επαγγελμα spricht, nämlich im Zusammenhang der Päranese, vermeidet Paulus nach Möglichkeit diesen Begriff.'
conclusion in v. 7, which is introduced by γενώσκετε ὅτι; Gen 12.3 (or 18.18?) in v. 8, followed by a conclusion in v. 9, which is introduced by ὅστε. The subject of both conclusions is ὁ ἐκ πίστεως, of whom two things are declared: οὗτοι νῦν ἐσιν Ἅβραχμ, and εὐλογοῦνται σὺν πίστι Ἅβραχμ. Those who are of faith belong to Abraham and share his blessing. Paul does not discuss the figure of Abraham first (as he does in Romans). He focuses on ὁ ἐκ πίστεως. Abraham has become the prototype of people of faith. This does not mean faith generally, but faith in Christ (2.16), as attested by the kind of faith which Paul establishes in opposition to works of the law, in Gal 2.16 and 2.20. Paul also attributes to Abraham the unique role of being the only person before Christ who knew and believed the gospel. Paul explains that this happened because (1) Scripture foresaw, thus acting in a personified manner, and (2) Scripture proclaimed the gospel beforehand to Abraham (v. 8).

33 Mußner, Galaterbrief, pp. 222-223, says: '...die späteren Generationen werden "zusammen mit", "in Gemeinschaft mit" Abraham gesegnet, wenn sie glauben.'

34 Betz, Galatians, p. 141, points out that the phrase is used only here, and stands in contrast with ὁ ἐκ ἔργων νόμου in 3.10, and ὁ ἐκ περιτομῆς in 2.28. On sons of Abraham see Schweizer, TDNT 8:365, and Str-B 3:263ff.

35 Betz, Galatians, p. 143; Str-B 3:538; Michaelis, TDNT 5:381-2. The personification of Scripture is a rabbinic idea.

36 Betz, Galatians, p. 143; BAG, p. 712; Friedrich, TDNT 2:737; Luz, Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus, p. 111ff. The verb is a hapax legomenon.
In 3.10-12 the catchwords are 'works of law' and 'curse'. The structure of the previous stage is reversed, with a thesis being followed by a supporting quotation. Each quotation is preceded by an introductory formula: (1) ἔγραψαν γὰρ ὅτε in v. 10, introducing Deut 27.26, and (2) ἔδωκαν ὅτε in v. 11, introducing Hab 2.4. Three propositions take the law as their starting point, and use similar catchwords: v. 10, ἐὰν ἔργων νῦν; v. 11, ἐν νῦν; v. 12, ὁ νῦν. Each of these is followed by an assertion that is negative in content or meaning if not in form: v. 10, ὡς κατάραν εἰσίν; v. 11, οὕτως δικαίωσαν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; v. 12, οὐκ ἔστων ἐκ πίστεως. The unifying theme of righteousness before God is thus answered positively in 6-9 and negatively in 10-12.

In 3.13-14 Paul uses a chiasmus to cover in reverse order the same ideas that occurred in 3.6-12. The first two sections are opposite one another: in 3.6-9 Abraham and blessing are central; in 3.10-12 law and curse are central. In this third section Christ is central, and unites the opposite topics of sections one and two by becoming a curse himself, so as to bestow the blessing of Abraham. In this way Paul shows how the curse is removed (v. 13) and how the blessing is fulfilled (v. 14). The section has a quotation in the middle (v. 13b: Deut

37 Paul quotes Deut 27.26 in a form that occurs only in Gal 3.10; cf. Rom 12.19; 14.11; 1 Cor 1.19; 3.19; Michel, Bibel, p. 72; Ellis, Use, p. 22ff; Fitzmyer, 'Quotations', p. 9; Betz, Galatians, p. 144.
21.23), which substantiates the preceding assertion (v. 13a) and leads to the following statement (v. 14).

Hellenistic Jews and Jewish Christians may have used this same material in such a way as to show the continuity from Abraham to Christ, thus skipping from Abraham in 3.6-9 to Christ in 3.13-14. The continuity would be from latent blessing to fulfillment. Paul, however, inserted his complex assertions about the law in 3.10-12 in order to point 'to the crucified Christ who bears the curse. There is no other way he can account for the fact that only now does the blessing of Abraham come to the Gentiles'.

Previously the promise had been barred by law and the blessing barred by curse. Faith that justifies comes only through deliverance from the curse of the law.

2.2. In Gal 3.7-14 Paul uses subordinate texts together with theological tradition and word plays to link together his argument. The subordinate texts and tradition which we will examine here include (1) Hab 2.4, in contrast to Lev 18.5; (2) Deut 27.26 and 21.23; (3) the ὄπερ ἡμῶν tradition of Isa 53.9b-11. But besides these supporting texts and tradition in Paul's argument there is another structural element which gives continuity and direction to his case. Brinsmead describes Paul's use of a 'word crochet' as the literary device which holds together the argument that runs from 3.1 to 4.11.

---

38 Ebeling, Truth, p. 170.
39 Brinsmead, Galatians - Dialogical Response to Opponents, pp. 82-84. See Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 244, who posits the unity of 3.19-29 and 4.1-7 on the basis of
this means the entire passage is divisible into smaller pericopes, each using a particular word in the last phrase of the pericope. The word will have been used infrequently or not at all in the preceding lines of the pericope. After use in the final phrase, the word crochet will repeat the word in the first phrase of the next pericope, where it then becomes a key word used several times. In the last phrase of that pericope a new word appears, and this becomes the key word in the next pericope. By word linkage Paul thus moves through the various stages and texts of his argument.

Thus in 3.1-5 πίστες is used only in 3.2, ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως, and again in the final phrase. But then the word is picked up in 3.6, Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, and thereafter πίστες or πιστεύειν are used eight times in 3.6-14.

In 3.14 ἐπαγγελία appears in the final phrase of the pericope. It is repeated in 3.16, the beginning of a new pericope, and thereafter is used seven times in 3.15-22. In the same pericope πίστες is not used, until 3.22, ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως...δοθῇ.

In 3.23 πίστες is picked up once more, and used five times in 3.23-29. In the same pericope ἐπαγγελία is not used until the very end, in 3.29. Then 3.29 introduces καλημούμος (also used previously in 3.18) which recurs in

the themes and use of καλημούμος. See n. 12 and n. 20 above: the argument about Abraham extends beyond the formal argument from Scripture.
4.1 and 4.7, where it functions as a bracket.

In 4.7 καθορισμός is associated with θεός, and 4.8 begins with the question of the believer's relation to θεός. This word (θεός) is part of the word crochet that ties 4.8-11 into the entire argument. Gal 3.1-5 and 4.8-11 are both reaffirmations of the causa (1.6-10). These two pericopes have therefore been carefully placed at the beginning and end of a sequence of argument. Both immediately after the first statement of the causa and immediately before the second, the issue is that of sonship (οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὕτως υἱοί εἰσίν Ἀβραάμ [3.7]; ὁτε δὲ ἐστε υἱοί [4.6]; ὡστε οὐκέτι εἰς δοθέως ἄλλα υἱός [4.7]).

Abraham has an essential function throughout the argument. He does not appear before chapter 3 nor after chapter 4, but holds the whole section together, from 3.6 (the issue of the sons of Abraham) to 4.21ff (the two τέκνα, as paradigms of the two spheres of σάρξ and πνεῦμα). Abraham's role is also heightened by the way Paul negates almost all other aspects of Jewish salvation-history. 'Faith alone' rather than 'faith and obedience'

---

40 Brinsmead, Response, p. 83, suggests that the entire sequence is also bound together by the use of εἰκή (τοσάδα ἐπάθετε εἰκή; εἰ γε καὶ εἰκή [3.4]; φοβοῦμαι ύμᾶς μη πως εἰκή κεκοπίσκα εἰς ύμᾶς. [4.11]). He sees the meaning of εἰκή in 4.11 to be the same as in 3.4, since 4.8-11 is 'based on the same pathetic contrast as the earlier pericope'. On the meaning of εἰκή in 3.4 see his n. 195 and n. 196: in both pericopes, the Galatians who once had known God (4.9) and had entered the sphere of πνεῦμα (3.3) are now turning to the powers of the old κόσμος (4.9) or to the sphere of σάρξ (3.3).

41 Brinsmead, Response, p. 83.

is pre-eminent. Moses and Israel have been dropped out completely (as positive factors), as Moses becomes a symbol for slavery (3.19; 4.24), and stands alongside a whole series of enslaving powers. These powers include νόμος (3.24); ἐπιτρόποι καὶ οἶκονόμοι (4.2); στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (4.3); οἱ φόρει μὴ ὄντες θεοὶ (4.8); and οἱ ἀγγέλοι (3.19), through whom the law was given.

In Paul's eschatological scheme κόσμος is identified with the present evil age and brings bondage. Eschatology is central to Paul's argument, as chapter 3 is built around a particular time sequence, climaxing in 4.4. 'This last text grounds eschatology in Christology....The law is elevated particularly in terms of its role in the

to Moses is missing. This heightens the pre-eminence of promise. In Romans 5 there is a sweep from Adam to Moses, and no Abraham. In Romans 4 Abraham is placed alongside David to illustrate the witness of the law to the gospel. Galatians 3 contrasts law and promise. Romans 5 contrasts law and sin. Cf. Beker, Paul (1980), pp. 99-104.

In Romans 4 Abraham first believes and then is circumcised. In Gal 3.15-22 the covenant with Abraham is confirmed with the promise, not with circumcision. In late Judaism Abraham's faith, in obedience to God's will, was a meritorious work. See Jub 23.10; Pr Man 8; 2 Bar 57.2; 58.1. In 1 Macc 2.52, Gen 15.6 is attached to Gen 22.15-18, as in James, showing that Abraham's righteousness was his obedience to the will of God. See Str-B 3:188-94. Thus Judaism emphasizes faith as obedience. Romans emphasizes faith and obedience. Galatians emphasizes faith alone. See Brinsmead, Response, p. 84 n. 201.

See Brinsmead, Response, p. 118, for comparisons and contrasts between Galatians and Romans regarding law and Israel. In Romans 9-11 Israel is part of salvation-history and the oracles of God are part of Israel's treasure. In Gal 4.21-31 Israel is in a Hagar-bondage, brought about by the enslaving Sinai covenant. Rom 4.16 speaks of the 'seed' of both the law and faith. Gal 3.16, 19 speak of only one seed.
death of Christ (3.10-14). The time sequence involves the fulfilling of the time, which coincides with the sending of the Son (4.4). These in turn coincide with the coming of the time of faith (3.23, 25) and thus the end of the rule of law (3.23, 24, 25). Paul's use of Hab 2.4 supports the argument about faith which he began in 3.6. It also supports both the development of that argument in such texts as 3.23, and the conclusion of the scriptural argument, about being Abraham's offspring (by faith), in 3.29

2.2.1. Paul uses Hab 2.4 in opposition to Lev 18.5 to support his argument that Gentiles are justified by faith and not by (works of) law. Because the argument is terminological it is necessary for Paul to use texts in which the ἀκ- root is connected with πίστεως. The LXX contains only two passages in which this linkage occurs, and Paul uses both of them in Galatians 3. Gen 15.6, containing ἐπίστευσεν and δικαίωσθαι, is quoted as Paul's lead text in Gal 3.6. Hab 2.4, containing δίκαιος and πίστεως, is quoted in Gal 3.11 in support of Paul's argument that no one is justified by law. Although it may have suited Paul's purpose better if Hab 2.4 contained a
passive form of δικαίωσιν instead of the adjective δίκαιος. The verse nevertheless connects righteousness with faith.\footnote{Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 21. See his n. 23 on whether ἐκ πίστεως modifies (1) ζήσεται, or (2) ὁ δίκαιος. (1) If ἐκ πίστεως modifies ζήσεται it refers to the manner of life by which one lives who is righteous. See Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology, p. 41ff.; Cavallin, 'The Righteous Shall Live by Faith', pp. 33-43. (2) If ἐκ πίστεως modifies ὁ δίκαιος it refers to the one who is righteous because of faith. Then ζήσεται becomes a promise of life to the one who is righteous by faith. See Burton, Galatians, pp. 166-167. This text must be understood in the context of Paul's contrast between law and faith. See Rom 1.17.}

What 3.11 has in common with v. 10 and v. 12 is a negative assertion about the law, answering negatively the question of righteousness before God.\footnote{Ebeling, Truth, pp. 167-169.} Each assertion in 3.10-12 is then followed by a supporting quotation. By terminological association faith is first linked to righteousness in 3.6, and then πίστες or πιστεύειν forms are used eight times in 3.6-14.\footnote{Brinsmead, Response, pp. 82-84.} Having associated righteousness and faith in 3.6 the linkage is repeated in 3.8 and 3.11. In 3.8 'Gentiles' and 'blessing' are also included with the mention of faith and Abraham from v. 7. Only in 3.11 do faith and righteousness occur alone together, without Abraham, blessing, or Gentiles. The significance of this limitation is to be seen in the relation of 3.11 to 3.12, or, in the relation of Hab 2.4 to Lev 18.5. For Paul Hab 2.4 opposes Lev 18.5 because
faith and works of law exclude one another.⁴⁹ They exclude one another, Paul argues, because righteousness (justification) is based on faith (Hab 2.4=Gal 3.11), while the law is based on doing (Lev 18.5=Gal 3.12).

Lev 18.5 was the biblical evidence for a particular Jewish view of the law: 'It was a basic presupposition for every Jew that God's power to give life was closely connected with the law.'⁵⁰ In this view it was through the law that God gave and preserved life. The law served as a barrier against the destructive powers of sin and evil. Paul's rejection of this claim lies at the centre of his polemics against Jews and Judaizers. He refers to it in connection with its biblical evidence, Lev 18.5: 'You shall therefore keep my statutes and ordinances, by doing which a man shall live: I am the Lord.'⁵¹ In each case Paul counters this verse with another text from Scripture. In Rom 10.5-8 he quotes Deut 30.12-14, and in Gal 3.10-14 he quotes Hab 2.4. In Galatians it is within the exposition of Gen 15.6 that Paul contrasts Lev 18.5 and Hab 2.4.⁵² This contrast governs Paul's use and


⁵⁰ Moxnes, Theology in Conflict, p. 263. See Sir 17.11; Bar 4.1; Pss Sol 14.2; cf. Str-B 3:129-131.


⁵² Beker, Paul (1980), pp. 120-121, points out that Paul differs from Jewish hermeneutical method in that he introduces no third passage to mediate two contradictory texts. 'Paul simply allows the contradiction to stand for the sake of his Christocentric argument... Hab 2.4 agrees
interpretation of Hab 2.4.\textsuperscript{53} 'In the LXX there is only one occurrence of the words ἐκ πίστεως and that is precisely in Hab 2.4.'\textsuperscript{54}

There are two fundamental features of Paul's use of Hab 2.4 in the NT. First, his use is limited to Gal 3.11 and Rom 1.17. This corresponds to Paul's concern with the topic of πίστες in the two epistles. The word πίστες occurs twenty-two times in Galatians and forty times in Romans, in contrast to the relatively few uses in other letters: 1 Thessalonians (8), 1 Corinthians (7), 2 Corinthians (7), Philippians (5).\textsuperscript{55}

Second, in keeping with Paul's frequent use of πίστες in Galatians and Romans, and the use of Hab 2.4 in only

with the gospel....' And on p. 246 Beker says, '...Paul audaciously quotes Scripture against itself in order to create the antithesis between "the work of the law" and "faith-righteousness", and thus he effectively deletes "doing the law" from his canon of Scripture'. Beker refers to Paul's putting Hab 2.4 against Lev 18.5. That the texts are opposed, or placed against one another, is more correct than saying that they are contradictory.

\textsuperscript{53} Moxnes, Conflict, p. 264, says, '...the virtual identity between righteousness and life is presupposed (cf. Gal 3.21)'. See Sanders, Paul (1977), pp. 503-508, where he modifies his view from 'Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison', pp. 470-474, that the 'real' meaning of righteousness is 'life'. This last point about real meaning is nearer the truth than to speak of the virtual identity of righteousness and life. If they are identified with one another then the one could replace the other in a text, statement, or argument. But this would often empty such statements of their force.

\textsuperscript{54} Corsani, 'ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in the Letters of Paul', pp. 87-94, here p. 87.

\textsuperscript{55} Morgenthaler, Statistik des neuestamentlichen Wortschatzes, p. 132.
those two epistles, the Habakkuk term ἐκ πίστεως likewise occurs only in Galatians (9 times) and Romans (12 times). In both uses of Hab 2.4 the ἐκ πίστεως formula modifies the adjective δίκαιος: 'he who through faith is righteous shall live.'\textsuperscript{56} Paul thus links ἐκ πίστεως to δικαίωσιν to describe the true nature of righteousness. Within Paul's theological argument the formula thus relates to the saving acts of God in Jesus Christ and to justification. It 'has more to do with the objective fact of Christ's coming, dying and rising from the dead than with the subjective attitude of man.'\textsuperscript{57} It is therefore faith, not law, that achieves righteousness, and this again stands over against the tradition in rabbinic literature about Abraham's faith.\textsuperscript{58}

Not only does Paul's interpretation of Abraham's faith differ from the traditional Jewish interpretation of his opponents, but Paul's use of Hab 2.4 is a version that differs from both the LXX and the quotation by the author of Hebrews.\textsuperscript{59} There are four different views of Hab 2.4:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} Corsani, 'Letters', p. 89 n. 6. See Longenecker, \textit{Paul}, p. 123.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Corsani, 'Letters', p. 91; See Kramer, \textit{Christ}, pp. 19-44, 45-48.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Ellis, \textit{Use}, p. 93, 56. Rabbinic literature sees Abraham's faith: (1) as a work of merit; (2) inherited by Israel; (3) not contrary to justification by works. See Str-B 3:186.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Dodd, \textit{According to the Scriptures}, pp. 50-51. Ellis, \textit{Use}, p. 152, points out that Paul's use varies from both the LXX and MT where those two texts vary from one another.
\end{itemize}
(1) the Hebrew: נְאֻרֵי חַיּותֵם, 'the righteous will live by his faithfulness';

(2) LXX: ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως μου ζήσεται, 'the righteous one will live by my faithfulness';

(3) Heb 10.38: ὁ δὲ δίκαιος μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, 'my righteous one will live by faith';

(4) Paul: ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, 'the one who is righteous by faith will live'. Paul's use omits the possessive pronoun, leaving the verse open to his own interpretation and theological understanding of faith. The original

60 BDB, p. 53, indicate that נְאֻרֵי can refer either to the steadfastness and fidelity of human conduct or to the faithfulness of God. Jepsen, TDOT 1:318-319, supports the reading of the word in Hab 2.4 as an example of 'that inner attitude which is prerequisite to a genuine life....Such emunah is peculiar to the ṭsaddiq and brings him to life'. See Szeles, Wrath and Mercy, pp. 30-33. Gaster, p. 253, The Dead Sea Scriptures, translates 1 QpHab 8.1-3: 'But the righteous through his faithfulness shall live. This refers to all in Jewry who carry out the Law (Torah). On account of their labor and of their faith in him who expounded the Law aright, God will deliver them from the house of judgement.' See Brownlee, The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk, p. 55.

61 Jepsen, TDOT 1:319, suggests that LXX could assume a different Hebrew text or it could be a well-known interpretation which makes the life of the righteous dependent on God and not on its own quality.

62 Bonsirven, Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne, p. 327, points out that Paul is materially unfaithful to the original sense of Hab 2.4, as he invests 'faith' with the full sense given by the doctrine of justification. Ellis, Use, p. 121, points out that the original context of Hab 2.4 was a prophetic complaint: the wicked (Chaldeans) have triumphed after invasion, and God has allowed it to happen. The hope that followed predicted that the vision would be fulfilled in the future, in that future the righteous will triumph, and in that triumph the earth will be filled with the knowledge of God. For Paul the messianic age is inaugurated by Christ and ushers in fulfillment of the vision, and faith in Hab 2.4 is defined by the Abraham story (Gen 15.6), and means faith in Christ. However, J. Sanders, 'Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul, and the Old Testament', pp. 232-244, here p. 233, rightly observes that Hab 2.4 emphasizes faith in the
context and sense of Hab 2.4 are thus laid aside, as Paul rephrases and reinterprets the verse to serve his theological argument about faith in Christ. This same method of dealing with Scripture prevails in Paul's use of support texts from Deuteronomy.

2.2.2 Deut 27.26 and 21.23 are central to Paul's argument about curse in Gal 3.10 and 3.13, as he connects law with curse and then curse and law with crucifixion.

2.2.2.1. Deut 27.26 reads, 'Cursed be he who does not confirm the words of this law by doing them'. The verse is the final declaration in a series of twelve curses pronounced by the Levites on Mt. Ebal, in Shechem. This Shechemite Dodecalogue may have been periodically repeated as part of a covenant renewal ceremony. Corresponding blessings occur in Deut 28.1-6. The entire Dodecalogue.

sovereignty of God through adversity. Paul, like Qumran, used Hab 2.4 to speak of obedience and responsibility, but the distinction is that Paul's interest was in responsibility after justification, and he applies the passage to Christ's atoning death (p. 240). So Stendahl, The Scrolls and the New Testament, p. 17, says, 'It is Jesus that makes the difference'. See Fitzmyer, 'Hab 2.3-4', pp. 236-246, here pp. 240-242; 'Pauline Theology', JBC 79:125-127. On the differences between the Galatians and Romans uses of Hab 2.4, see Ellis, Use, pp. 117-124; Beker, Paul (1980), pp. 95-96. Dodd, Scriptures, p. 51, says that the variety of uses of Hab 2.3-4 suggest that it should be included in the list of traditional testimonia from the church's earliest period. See K. Barth, Romans, pp. 41-42.

63 See Lewy, 'The Puzzle of Dt. XXVII: Blessings Announced, But Curses Noted', pp. 207-211.

64 Bruce, Galatians, p. 158, refers to an elaborated form that was used by the covenant community at Qumran (1QS 2.1-8). On the relationship of curse and covenant see Fensham, 'Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near Eastern Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament', pp. 1-9.
deals with crimes which convey the curse regardless of whether the perpetrator ever submitted to due process before a human court. The curses were automatic and there is no specific penalty prescribed for each offence. Yahweh is called upon to execute divine curse on the wrongdoer. The curse effectuates itself through the threat of each command. The curse involves exclusion from the covenant community.

The LXX makes the text more emphatic than the MT with the addition of πᾶς after ἐπικατάρατος and πᾶσιν after οὐχ ἐμμένει. Paul takes over this twofold 'all', and replaces πᾶσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου (in LXX) with πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου (in Gal 3.10).

In both LXX and the MT the curse is pronounced on the one who 'does not confirm the words of this law by doing them'. That is, the Dodecalogue points to itself as the standard to be upheld and the measure of offense. Paul generalizes to τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, the entire law or whole written Torah.

The context of the Dodecalogue mentions both blessing on the law-keeper and curse on the law-breaker. But this duality is not Paul's interest in the text and its

65 Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 299-300.


67 Scharbert, *TDOT* 1:410, sees v. 26 as 'a curse against anyone who transgresses the entire Torah corpus of Dt. 6-26'.
context. He in fact overturns the original sense of the text and connects curse not to failure to keep the law but to attempting to live under the law. That 'curse' and 'law' occur in the same text is one of Paul's chief interests in using this quotation. Paul, however, does not diminish the force of the 'all' (πᾶς...πᾶςων) added by LXX, even though he could legitimately have removed it in keeping with the sense of the MT. The presence of 'all' in Paul's use of texts does not make it the main point of his argument. It is not Paul's argument that God has offered the way of faith because the way of law-keeping is impossible. It is central to Paul's theology that faith is the way God has decided people shall be related to God. If the 'allness' of the law-keeping were Paul's point then Lev 18.5 and Deut 27.26 in its original sense would suit

---

68 Lührmann, Galater, p. 55: 'Paulus jedoch interpretiert den Vers, wie beim griechischen Text sprachlich gerade noch möglich, wenn auch logisch schwierig, umgekehrt: das Tun der Gebote, die in diesem Buch geschrieben sind, steht selber unter dem Fluch, und unter diesen Fluch wird der getrieben, der sich nicht an diese Gebote hält.'


70 Wilckens, 'Development', p. 21, argues in a nearly cause and effect manner: because no one can keep the law perfectly, and Torah grants life only to those who do, therefore life can come only by faith, for which reason Paul quotes Hab 2.4. But this ignores the fact that Hab 2.4 is subsidiary to Paul's main argument, based on Gen 15.6, with faith in Christ contrasted to works of law. Faith is not a stop-gap for failure, but the essential factor in divine-human relationship. Law is impotent (Gal 3.21). See Wilckens, p. 22: it is faith that participates in Christ's atoning death.
him well. Paul in fact quotes these verses only to lay them aside.\footnote{71}{Bruce, *Galatians*, p. 160. Regarding Gal 3.6-14, Räisänen, *Paul* (1983), pp. 94-96, agrees with the majority of interpreters who assume that Paul is thinking here of the impossibility of fulfilling the Torah. He rejects the interpretation of v. 10 that understands Paul's main point to be the problem of doing (as over against believing) and not the problem of unfulfillability. Thus he says: 'Had Paul wished merely to emphasize the falsity of the principle of "doing", the best method would have been to omit v. 10 altogether; the idea would then have been clear enough from verses 11-12.' But what if Paul had to deal with Deut 27.26 because (1) his opponents had quoted it against his view, and (2) because the verse is unique for its bringing together the ideas of curse and law? The way of law-keeping may be impossible, and Paul may have had that in mind, but it is not his argument that plan A (the law) has failed, so God has had to fall back on plan B (Christ and faith).}

Why should he bother thus with these verses, and Deut 27.26 in particular? Likely the law-keeping texts were first part of the argument of Paul's opponents. Such texts would have fit well with the tradition against which Paul lays out his apocalyptic gospel from the outset of the epistle. There are three places in Galatians 3 where Paul responds to the exegesis of his opponents and re-interprets their proof texts to serve his side rather than theirs.\footnote{72}{Barrett, 'Allegory', pp. 158-160. See also Stuhlmacher, 'Das Ende', pp. 29-30 (ET, pp. 139-140).} First, in Gal 3.6 Paul quotes Gen 15.6. He follows it with Gen 12.3 (or 18.18) to show the interest of the Gentiles in the promise to Abraham. Their participation in the promise must be due to faith, since they are uncircumcised and not keepers of the law.\footnote{73}{Barrett, 'Allegory', p. 159: Paul uses Gen 15.6 also in Rom 4.3, where he supports it with Ps 32 to show the non-imputation of sin, equivalent to 'the gratuitous
Second, in 3.10 Paul quotes Deut 27.26. His opponents would have supported this text with Lev 18.5, which Paul counters with Hab 2.4. The opponents would have applied Deut 27.26 to Paul himself, who in their estimation failed to keep the law and did not require his Gentile converts to do so either, to whom their quotation would also apply. They are not denying that faith is necessary, but they are asserting that law-keeping is also necessary for membership in the church.74 Third, in Gal 3.16, which is

imputation of righteousness', rather than careful account-keeping of Abraham's good works. See Black, Romans, pp. 75-76: 'The verb logizomai occurs 29 times in Paul (apart from OT quotations) --11 times in Romans alone and only 6 times elsewhere in the New Testament. For a study of the metaphorical use of the word in Paul, see W. H. Griffith Thomas, in ET, XVII (1905-6), pp. 211-14. The view that Abraham's "faith" was "reckoned to him" as equivalent to "righteousness" is less convincing than to take "for righteousness" as meaning that Abraham's faith was counted to his credit "with a view to the receiving of righteousness". (Cf. for this use of eis ["for"], Rom 1.16; 3.22; 10.10.)'

74 Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 19: '... the rival missionaries did not argue against "faith in Christ".... The argument of Galatians 3 is against Christian missionaries, not against Judaism, and it is against the view that Gentiles must accept the law as a condition of or as a basic requirement for membership.' Sanders says that 'faith in Christ' is 'a common Christian formulation'. See Bultmann, TDNT 6:203-19; Sanders, Paul (1977), p. 441 n. 54; p. 445. Hooker, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, pp. 321-342, makes a case for the subj. gen. understanding of such texts as Gal 2.16, 20; 3.22 (see Rom 3.22, 26; Phil 3.9), referring to Christ's faith as the basis for ratification of the promise. Then the faith of believers is really a sharing in Christ's faith. 'Thus even the faith they have is reckoned to them' (p. 331). For the point being made above it is not necessary to settle this question, although it is reasonable to think that if being crucified with Christ (Gal 2.19) means inclusion or participation in the cross of Christ then the faith of Christ (Christ's own faith) might also be the basis of the promise and justification in which one shares by believing. See Hooker, p. 342: 'to believe is to share in the faith of Christ himself.' Aside from this it is a
based on Gen 12.7; 13.15; 17.7; 22.18; and 24.7, Paul first gives a singular sense to the normally collective 'seed' before coming around to a new collectivity (3.28). The singular refers in Paul's argument to Christ, in and through whom the promises are fulfilled. The collective sense refers to the new covenant community, based not on racial, social, or physical divisions but on unity in Christ.75

That Paul uses OT texts which had already been quoted by his opponents, and that these opponents were Christian missionaries who could agree with Paul about the basic principle of 'faith in Christ', may explain why Paul never deals with the ideas of sin-offering or day of atonement, even though such provision was granted by the law itself. 'One reason may be that the sacrificial ritual had not been mentioned by the agitators. Even they knew that this part of the law at least had been rendered obsolete by the death of Christ.'76

2.2.2.2. Paul quotes Deut 21.23 in Gal 3.13. It is not likely that Paul took over this OT text from his opponents in Galatia. Christian opponents would not have attached Deut 21.23 to the crucifixion of Jesus, for Deut

separate question that Paul deals with in making faith, not law, the basis of justification.

75 Barrett, 'Allegory', p. 160.

76 Bruce, Galatians, pp. 160-161. See Harnack, What Is Christianity?, p. 159: 'Those who looked upon this death as a sacrifice soon ceased to offer God any blood-sacrifice at all.'
21.23 is not by itself useful in Christian preaching.\textsuperscript{77} Paul himself introduces the text into the argument for the purpose of showing how the curse of the law has been borne by the innocent Jesus. The curse is nullified for people of faith in Christ. 'It was the cross that put the promise of Gen 18.18 into effect.'\textsuperscript{78}

Deut 21.23 may have been used by Jewish opponents to Christianity and by Paul himself previous to his conversion.\textsuperscript{79} Paul twice mentions his previous law-abiding zeal in Judaism together with his persecution of the church (Gal 1.13; Phil 3.5ff).\textsuperscript{80} This could indicate that one of the main reasons for Paul's persecution of the church was the Christians' criticism of or relaxed attitude towards the law.\textsuperscript{81} It is also likely that Paul

\textsuperscript{77} Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{78} Barrett, 'Allegory', p. 160.

\textsuperscript{79} Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, pp. 37-38; Lindars, Apologetic, p. 233.

\textsuperscript{80} Kim, Origin, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{81} Hultgren, 'Persecutions', pp. 97-111, maintains that Paul did not persecute the church because it taught a way of salvation apart from law, but because the church's faith as a whole, centering on Jesus crucified and raised, was offensive to Paul. A main reason for this view is that Paul, as a Jew, did not see Christianity as a competitor to, but as a movement within, Judaism. Later, from the Christian view of things, Paul saw the church as a new community no longer subject to the parent body' (p. 102). However, a wedge should not be driven between crucifixion and law criticism as causes of Paul's persecuting the church. Belief in a crucified messiah would have been contrary to current interpretations of the law (Deut 21.23), and the two factors of law criticism and crucifixion so closely correspond as to be hardly separable.
would have understood, on the basis of current Jewish interpretations of Deut 21.23, that a crucified man could not be the messiah.\textsuperscript{82} 

By Jesus' time some Jews had already interpreted Deut 21.23 as applying to crucifixion, even though the original sense of the text means hanging after death.\textsuperscript{83} When the Christian church proclaimed the crucified Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah it provoked offence among Jews, who would have interpreted Deut 21.23 to mean that Jesus was cursed, and thus could not be the messiah.

To them the Christian proclamation of the crucified Jesus as the Messiah was a contradiction in terms. The Jewish sentiment about the crucified Jesus is well represented by Trypho when he, pointing to Deut 21.23, rejects the messiahship of Jesus.\textsuperscript{84}

Christians thus from the beginning encountered opposition from Jews, based on Deut 21.23. Law criticism could at least have been inferred from the induction of Gentiles into the church without law observance. This, together

\textsuperscript{82} Dietzfelbinger, \textit{Berufung}, pp. 35-36, 38.


\textsuperscript{84} But it is a separate question whether they chose to interpret Jesus' crucifixion as proof that he was accursed because the fact of being crucified proved it, or because their perception of his attitude toward the law motivated them to choose such an interpretation. Kim, \textit{Origin}, p. 46, citing Justin Martyr, \textit{Dial.}, 39.7; 89.1-90.1. See Dietzfelbinger, \textit{Berufung}, p. 35.
with the proclamation of a crucified Messiah, had likely once made Paul to be part of that opposition. 85

Paul and his opponents would have been cognizant of the history of interpretation of Deut 21.23. Three aspects of that history are to be noted. First, the meaning of the MT in its original context has been interpreted according to either a subjective or an objective genitive. The sub. gen. would indicate a curse coming from God: 'for a hanged man is accursed by God' (RSV). 86 The obj. gen. would indicate an offense against God: 'for a hanged man is offensive in the sight of God' (NEB). The meaning of curse or ridicule 'gegen Gott' seems more probable. 87 Deut 21.23, Josh 8.29 (the battle at Ai), and Josh 10.26-27 (the five fugitive kings) all indicate a great concern that the land not be defiled by the hanging overnight of the criminal's dead body. It would have been this defilement that was an insult against


86 Driver, Deuteronomy, pp. 248-249; Phillips, Deuteronomy, pp. 143-144; Mayes, Deuteronomy, p. 305.

87 Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, p. 35. See Brichto, The Problem of 'Curse' in the Hebrew Bible, p. 194, who argues that this particular use of the noun corresponds to the verb form, which is best understood against its antonym ר競�, 'to fear, to reverence', and indicates 'a mode of behaviour in regard to a fellow human being which constitutes an offense in the eyes of (hence, against) the Deity'.

God, and this corresponds to the sense of curse which is represented by the hanged man, a curse, offense, or sign of disrespect directed against God. This is the objective genitive interpretation, and is that generally adopted by rabbinic readings.\(^{88}\)

Second, LXX adopts a subjective genitive interpretation, indicating a curse coming from God. The phrase θεός εἰς θεός thus indicates a curse generated by God against the accused. In Judaism the association of Deut 21.23 with crucifixion, and the connection of crucifixion to the curse of the law, was first made during the time of the Jewish ruler, Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE). He used crucifixion against Jews.\(^{89}\) He could have justified this by perceiving the victims as traitors who had brought shame upon their own people. The punishment thus intentionally conveyed the greatest shame and dishonour to the one crucified and was fitting for the crime of treason. The victim had thus brought curse upon himself by deserving the punishment in which God's curse was incorporated. It was this subjective genitive interpretation which signified a curse going out from God, with the emphasis on the one being crucified as deserving

\(^{88}\) Barrett, Freedom, p. 30.

this sentence and penalty. Here, the crucified is at fault. By contrast, the Romans used mass crucifixion against Jewish freedom fighters, for whom 'traitors' would not have been an appropriate designation from the Jewish perspective. In this case, the interpretation of Deut 21.23 would be an objective genitive (curse against God), but with the emphasis on the crucifixion itself, and the ones doing the crucifying, as discharging the curse. Their deed of crucifying had discharged a curse against God. Here, the crucifier is at fault.

Any of these interpretations was available, depending on the situation to which and perspective from which one must speak. Finally, however, the horror of a curse from God being pronounced against a crucified man first led to questioning and then rejection of such an interpretation. It was thought to be incompatible with the belief in 'Gottebenbildlichkeit' that the hanged man (crucified man) should be a curse from God. Herein also is grounded the fact that the cross never became a symbol for Jewish suffering, and that a crucified messiah was considered an absurdity in Judaism. In later conflicts between church and synagogue this rejection of a crucified messiah, grounded in Deut 21.23, was strengthened, and no doubt lay behind the Synagogue's reaction to the post-Easter preaching of the early church.  

---

90 Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, p. 34.
91 Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, pp. 35-36.
Third, Paul omitted the words ὄνος ἔσορ in his use of Deut 21.23 in Gal 3.13. This serves to distance God from the law. It also serves Paul's own view, which is to negate the idea that God cursed Jesus and Jesus could therefore not be the messiah. Paul implicitly puts the work of cursing Jesus on the law itself, thus emphasizing the fate of those who would live under law. It does not serve Paul's purpose to connect the curse to God, and since he wants to put distance between God and the law (see 3.19) he here omits ὄνος ἔσορ. It is likely that Paul has incorporated the verse from a previously worked out answer to Jewish polemic, and used it here to strengthen his case. Thus, the Christian opponents of Paul in Galatia would not have used Deut 21.23, for exactly the same reason Paul himself once had. They would not have wanted to associate Jesus' death with curse. Paul's post-conversion use of Deut 21.23 likely came from other Christians:

The allusions to Dt 21.23 in Acts 5.30; 10.39; 13.29; 1 Pet 2.24 suggest that from the beginning the Christians encountered Jewish opposition based upon Dt 21.23 to their proclamation of Jesus as the Messiah. The Christians would hardly have applied Dt 21.23 to Jesus on their own initiative. Rather, they must have taken it from their Jewish opponents, and turned it into a weapon of counter-attack.

---

92 Kim, Origin, p. 46. See Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, pp. 36-37: by itself Deut 21.23 is not useful as a Christian argument. It would not have been intelligent for early Christian preaching to have introduced the text in the discussion with the synagogue, as it would have provided a powerful weapon against the message about Jesus. Acts 5.30 and 10.39 may be understood as the answer of early Christian apologetic to the early synagogue polemic which used Deut 21.22-23 against the Jesus-message. The answer in Acts is that God has...
Paul likely had used Deut 21.23 in his own Christian counter-attacks against Jewish opposition before re-using the text and argument in Galatians. If Deut 21.23 had been a catch-phrase for Paul the persecutor, it became a guerilla tactic for Paul the apostle, as he took that weapon from his adversaries and turned it against their anti-Christian Jewish polemic prior to Galatians.

The reason for which Paul uses Deut 21.23 in Gal 3.13 is to get to the pro me nature of the gospel. He does not use it primarily to associate law and curse, as he has done that already in 3.10, using Deut 27.26. Now he must associate curse with cross, having first said that Christ has become a curse ὄναρ ἡμῶν. Paul must therefore make a connection between Deut 21.23 and Deut 27.26. This he does by free association and play on the word 'curse'. In quoting Deut 27.26 and 21.23 Paul modifies the LXX in such ways as to make the texts correspond to the facts of Jesus' case, and serve the connection Paul establishes between law and curse, and curse and cross. The play on the word 'curse' involves two different words in the two texts of MT, two different forms of the same word in both texts of LXX, and the same form of the same word in Paul's two quotations.

overturned and invalidated the curse by the raising of the Crucified One.


Bruce, 'The Curse of the Law', pp. 27-36, here p. 30. See also Bruce, Galatians, pp. 163-167.
The two different words in the MT represent two different senses of 'curse'. Deut 27.26 is the concluding curse pronounced against those who do not live according to the teachings of the Shechemite Dodecalogue. The sense of יִרְאוּ here is 'cursed', that is, it denotes a curse coming from God. It ought really to be followed by a participial construction. In Deut 27.26 certain sins are punished by automatic curses, latent within the threat of the laws themselves. But in Deut 21.23 the reference is either to the individual who has been executed for blasphemy or avoidance of due process, and whose dead body is thereafter hung on a tree as a public sign of ignominy, or it refers to the act of hanging. The sense of the noun מָטֶל here is either (1) accursed, that is, it refers to the object of curse, the person smitten by curse, or the destructive power of curse, or perhaps (2) an offense against God in whose image the hanged man was created. Although it may have been a Jewish objection

95 Scharbert, TDOT 1:408; BDB 5779. The verb is a qal passive participle. See Brichto, 'Curse', pp. 77-96.


97 Scharbert, TDOT 1:415; BDB 57045.

that Jesus' death on the cross rendered him accursed of God, the context of Deut 21.23 did not have to do with the manner of execution but with what happened after execution. 'The man is not accursed because he has been hung, but hung because he is already accursed on account of his crime.'

The LXX enhances the association of these two different senses of curse by rendering both of them from the same root, and giving to both texts the sense of a cursing action which comes from God. This is strengthened by the LXX use of ὁπὸ ἐκεῖ, subjective genitive, in Deut 21.23. Paul goes one step further than LXX by using the same form of the adjective, based on the same root, in both quotations, thus differing from LXX where it has already differed from the MT. But Paul's purpose is to connect the curse of the law in Deut 27.26 with the curse of the cross in Deut 21.23. This serves to attribute Jesus' death on the cross to the cursing power of law. The association is not an exact example of the exegetical device, 'equal category', but Paul depends on the presence of a nearly common term in the two LXX texts which he brings together. Although Paul's word association is dependent on the Greek text, '...Paul probably reveals his awareness that the Hebrew text of Deut 21.23 shows a

99 Lindars, Apologetic, p. 233.
100 Ellis, Use, p. 155.
101 Fitzmyer, 'Crucifixion', p. 138; Bruce, Galatians, pp. 35, 165.
substantive meaning "curse" rather than a participial meaning "cursed" when he speaks of Christ as ἐπικατάρατος κατάρα. 102 'The meaning is thus similar to the idea of the sin-offering, and there is probably an intentional reference to the theory of sacrifice.' 103

When Paul uses ἐπικατάρατος in Gal 3.13 (quoting Deut 21.23), thus using the same verbal adjective as LXX uses in Deut 27.26, which replaces MT ἀπέκτησα, he omits όπο θεοθ, to avoid saying that Christ was cursed by God:

> It was impossible now for Paul the Christian to say that Christ was cursed by God; he was not. Paul (whether he remembered the Hebrew or not) chose to use the word expressing a relation. Christ came to stand in that position in relation to God that was rightly ours. 104

That Christ took the position in relation to God defined by curse, which was rightfully ours, was so that we may stand in the relation to God that is defined by the word righteousness. That is, Christ did this on our behalf, όπο θεοθ. By this strange interchange Christ redeemed us. 105

102 Bruce, 'Curse', p. 30.

103 Lindars, Apologetic, p. 235.

104 Barrett, Freedom, p. 30, points to 2 Cor 5.21 as a similar case of Paul using a word of relation to indicate that 'Christ stood in that position in relation to God that is defined by the word sin'. See Bruce, 'Curse', p. 32. Weder, Kreuz, p. 191, says, 'Paulus muß das όπο θεοθ auslassen, weil die Verbindung von Gesetz und Gott durch die Auferweckung unterbrochen worden ist'. Paul may be thinking of the resurrection at this point in Galatians but he does not speak of it.

105 Barrett, Freedom, pp. 30-31, calls ἐξηνόρασεν the 'verb of freedom'. 
If one were working only with the alternative interpretations that were then currently available regarding Deut 21.23, Paul's statement in Gal 3.13 would be very perplexing indeed. It would seem that his omission of ὕπο θεοῦ would indicate that he had elected the obj. gen. interpretation, wanting to absolve God of having cursed Jesus. But then it would not make sense to say that Jesus had become an offense against God, although it would be understandable to say that the act of crucifying Jesus was an offense or sign of disrespect before God. But in fact Paul's point rests on neither of these alternatives. He removes ὕπο θεοῦ so that in Jesus' case he locates the cursing power within the law, and not within God's activity. Thus for Paul whether the act of crucifying Jesus is an offense to God or Jesus himself has taken the position before God of one who is the object of curse, it is the law that has done this. The law thus retains a place in the plan of salvation, but it is a negative place.

In view of ἐπικατάρατος in 3.10 and 3.13b one might have expected the same word in v. 13a. The original sense of Deut 27.26 is that they are cursed who do not do the whole law. The quotation in 3.10 is therefore a

106 Weder, Kreuz, p. 188, sees the change to the noun as more than mere 'Metonymie'. The change from accursed (ἐπικατάρατος) to curse (κατάρα) conceals within itself the change from the opponents' law-perspective to Paul's gospel-perspective. This change is the christological point of the passage: from the standpoint of law Christ is deservedly accursed by God, but from the standpoint of the gospel he is a curse on our behalf.
statement of the law's real power and true work. Gal 3.13b states that the cursing power of law came upon the Crucified One. But in 3.13a Paul switches to the noun, κατάρα: from the standpoint of the gospel Christ is seen as a curse. Christ has taken the cursing power of the law into himself, and become a curse. The idea of interchange is instrumental here, and so is the idea of the law's participation in its own demise. This does not elevate the law, but makes the law clearly show that it has turned against itself: 'Damit hat sich der Fluch des Gesetzes gegen es selbst gekehrt: es ist nun zu Tode gekommen.' That the law thus runs its course and has its effect in the death of Jesus is the good effect to which the law is put: 'Insofern ist im Kreuz die Reichweite des Gesetzes sowohl angegeben als auch begrenzt: das Kreuz ist der Ort, wo das Gesetz sich

107 Weder, Kreuz, p. 188, again speaks of resurrection: 'Weil aber Gott diesen vom Gesetz verfluchten Gekreuzigten auferweckt hat, hat Christus gleichsam alle verfluchende Macht des Gesetzes in sich aufgenommen und ist zum Fluch selbst geworden.'

108 2 Cor 5.21 is analogous to this: τὸν μὴ γυνώτα ἀμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν. Weder, Kreuz, p. 188 n. 251, says: 'Die ganze Sündemacht erscheint als in Christus so konzentriert, daß Christus zur Sünde selbst geworden ist.' Cf. Schlier, Galater, p. 138; Riesenfeld, TDNT 8:512-513; Betz, Galatians, p. 150. Most to the point is Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, p. 37: '... er nicht nur jenen Fluch trug, sondern zum Fluch wurde, d.h. zum Repräsentanten der vom Fluch des Gesetzes bedrohten Menschheit.'

109 On interchange see the following material on Isaiah 53, and the important work by Hooker, 'Interchange in Christ', pp. 349-361.

110 Weder, Kreuz, p. 189.
That he speaks of Jesus as a curse is the foundation of Paul's use of όπερ ἡμῶν. His use of the 'for us' formula indicates the unique interpretation Paul gives to the texts about curse, as he speaks of redemption from the curse of the law through Christ's coming to be a curse under the law.

2.2.3. The tradition of Isa 53.9b-11 lies behind Paul's speaking of Christ becoming a curse for us. Hoad recognizes a point by point description of the situation portrayed in Isa 53.9b-11 in 2 Cor 5.21. There is a three-fold presentation of Christ: (1) τὸν μὴ γυνώσα ἄμαρτίαν, corresponding to Isa 53.9b; (2) όπερ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, corresponding to 53.10; (3) ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαίους θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, corresponding to 53.11. In Rom 8.3-4 the three-fold pattern underlies the plan of redemption: (1) ἐν δομολώματι σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας; (2) περὶ ἀμαρτίας; (3) ἵνα δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν. Two characteristics are in both texts. There is a final ἵνα of redemptive purpose which describes the effects of the death of the sinless Christ for sinners. There is a re-application of the 'many' of the Servant song to

111 Weder, Kreuz, p. 191.


113 Hooker, 'Interchange', p. 349, points out that 'for sin' ought to be understood as in the comparable texts in Gal 3.13 and 2 Cor 5.21. That is, the language is of becoming or being made sin or a curse. This is different from the idea of a sin offering.
present readers: ὅπερ ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς (2 Cor 5.21), ἐν ἡμῖν (Rom 8.4).

The primary pattern may be described as, (1) Christ who had done no wrong, (2) entered into our experience, (3) in order that we might enter into Christ's experience and through him be in a right relationship with God. ¹¹⁴ This is a pattern similar to what occurs in Gal 3.13-14. Here Paul uses other proof texts from Scripture and is dependent on Isaiah 53 only for ὅπερ ἡμῶν. ¹¹⁵ The Servant who had done no wrong (Isa 53.9b) yet suffered in the same way as one who had committed a crime which was punishable by death (Deut 21.23). Therefore, the death was not for his own, but for others' sin. Vicarious atonement is thus...

¹¹⁴ Hooker, 'Interchange', p. 349, thus sees a similarity in language, form, and theme, between Gal 3.13 and 2 Cor 5.21, and a similar form in Gal 4.4 and 2 Cor 8.9.

¹¹⁵ Deut 21.23 also influenced 1 Peter's description of Christ based on Isaiah 53: ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον in 2.24 (cf. Acts 5.30; 10.39). Cullmann, Christology, pp. 76-77, sees ebed Yahweh Christology extending back to the earliest period of Christian faith, its first exponent was Peter, and the christological use of ὅπερ ἡμῶν goes back to Jesus himself. Riesenfeld, TDNT 8:510 points out that the prepositional phrase also appears in the Last Supper logia, which Paul has in common with 2 Synoptics; see TDNT 2:133.12f; 5:716 n. 484; Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 101, 165, 171. The texts involved are 1 Cor 11.24; Lk 22.19; Mk 14.24. This statement (Hoad, p. 254) needs qualification. The word ὅπερ does not occur in Isa 53 (i.e. v. 5) where περί is used. Paul's use of ὅπερ came from early Christian formulæ which spoke of the vicarious death of Jesus, of benefit for the many, based on Christian interpretations of Isa 53.11-12. Statements using ὅπερ came to show this salvation for humankind. There was some flexibility in the use of prepositions to signify this death. The thought of Isa 53.11-12 is represented by Paul's use of ὅπερ.
indicated. Although the concept of substitution is near Paul's view of atonement in Galatians 3, his understanding of Christ is that he suffered as humanity's representative, rather than as substitute.

In keeping with the characteristic re-application of the Servant Song's 'many' concept Paul asserts that the curse rests on all who are under the law. Christ comes under this curse in order to set people free. As in Deut 21.23 the hanging on the tree of a criminal's dead body was the public display of one on whom the curse already rested, so also Paul may mean that Christ was already under curse by entering the human situation: '...we ought not drive a wedge between the incarnation and the crucifixion in Paul's thought.' For Christ to enter the experience of the human condition meant for him to be born under law (Gal 4.4).

The atoning significance of the cross is also explained in statements about the justice of God. This concept is present in Gal 3.10 and Paul's use of Deut 27.15-26. Paul saw that all people who lived under the law's order of retribution (everybody: Rom 2.6) were

---


118 Hooker, 'Interchange', p. 351. Käsemann, 'Saving Significance', pp. 47-48, cautions that we ought not turn the story of salvation into a chain of events, in which the cross always becomes secondary either to incarnation or resurrection.
under curse. To this thought Paul added Gal 3.13: Christ became a curse (came into that relation to God of one who is accursed), although not as one who was deservedly accursed. This is in accord with 2 Cor 5.21: Christ became marked by sin, but did not become a sinner. Sin separates a person from God, and delivers one over to dying. Christ suffered this separation, and was delivered over to dying representatively and atoningly.

The group of statements that came from the concept of Old Testament justice emphasized more the representative aspect, while those that came from the rites of atonement emphasized more the atonement. Both were nevertheless always found together....Because this representative bearing of the curse was at the same time atonement it 'redeemed us', as it says in Gal 3.13. It brought freedom from the curse of the Law and---according to Gal 4.5---at the same time from its claim by having placed us in the relationship of sonship to God. 119

In keeping with the characteristic ἵνα of redemptive purpose, there is a purposive, means-to-an-end pattern in this aspect of Paul's thought in Galatians. The pattern is similar in 4.4 and 3.13. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law (3.13a), having become a curse for us (3.13b), so that (ἵνα) the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles (3.14a), and that (ἵνα) we might receive the promise of the Spirit (3.14b). '...Christ became what we are, in order that we might become what he is...not a straightforward exchange. Christ does not cease to be Son of God, and we receive the Spirit of the Son.' 120

119 Goppelt, Theology 1:96-97.

120 Hooker, 'Interchange', p. 352. See Dahl, 'Preaching', p. 35: there is a teleological pattern common to preaching and hymnic texts, characterized by
Paul's view of the law is a uniquely Christian understanding of the role of the Torah:

Paul's doctrine of the Law deviates radically from common Jewish view... He does not give a historical, objective description of the Jewish view of the Law; that was clearly not his intention. On the contrary, in Galatians 3 and elsewhere he constructs a specifically Christian view of the Law and of its function as part of Scripture...it persuades only when approached with specific Christian assumptions. 121

Paul the Apostle and Paul the persecutor did have something in common regarding the law. This was the conviction that the Law of Moses and faith in Christ mutually exclude one another as grounds for righteousness. 122 This conviction lies behind the contrast of Hab 2.4 with Lev 18.5, as well as the material

christological statements with a יִוָא clause, as in Gal 3.13ff. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, p. 343, observes a paradox: '...the protasis speaks of "the burden of the unencumbered", and the apodosis of the "unburdening of the encumbered".' The purpose clauses show that the pattern confirms to the goals of Christ's saving act, thus: 'Christ...for us---so that we....' This is one of several patterns that characterized 'community' preaching, as over against 'missionary' preaching. See Bultmann, Theology 1:105ff; Reicke, 'A Synopsis of Early Christian Preaching', in The Root of the Vine, pp. 128-160. Dahl, 'The Atonement--An Adequate Reward For The Akedah?', pp. 146-160, especially p. 153-154, suggests that the Akedah tradition of Genesis 22 lies behind this representation or substitution; Gal 3.13-14, along with Rom 3.24ff; 4.25; 8.32; 1 Cor 5.7; Eph 1.3, 6ff; cf. John 1.29; 1 Pet 1.19ff; Rev 5.6. Although such texts may be reminiscent of the Akedah, they are not explicit references. See Dahl, 'Promise and Fulfillment', pp. 121-136; here p. 131. Betz, Galatians, p. 151 n. 126, rightly disagrees with Dahl's thesis. See Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul, p. 183 n.1.


122 Dahl, 'Contradictions', p. 170. And yet righteousness and law do have a relationship, according to Rom 3.21.
regarding curse in Gal 3.10, 13. Paul's use of early Christian traditions which stem from Isaiah 53 serve this same contrast, and make gospel proclamation out of texts which had been used to promote law observance and which pronounced a curse on the crucified.

2.3. Gal 3.15-29 continues Paul's exposition and arrives at his concluding statement.

2.3.1. In 3.15-18 Paul moves to a new stage in his series of proofs, as he uses legal terminology to support his theological point. The argument is cast in the negative, as Paul says that the law does not annul God's covenant of promise (v. 17b, corresponding to v. 15), does not add a codicil to it (v. 15b), nor does it secure the inheritance (v. 18).

In 3.15 Paul speaks κατὰ ἀνθρώπου. The phrase is usually used in contrast to God's will, as in 1.11 Paul was emphatic that the gospel which he preached was not κατὰ ἀνθρώπου. But in 3.15 it refers to Paul's analogy from human life (see Rom 6.19) and judicial practice, as Paul speaks of the will or covenant. Whether ἐκαθήκη

123 The first argument, 3.1-5, is the appeal to experience. The second argument, commencing in 3.6 and recapitulated in 3.29, is the appeal to Scripture. Compare Betz, Galatians, pp. 20-21, and Fitzmyer, JBC, p. 241.

124 Bruce, Galatians, p. 169; Betz, Galatians, pp. 154-155 (note the reference to the Bammel essay in his n. 20), distinguishes between ἐγνώκας and ἐγνώκας: the former cannot be changed and is immediately effective, independent of the donor's death, the latter, in Greek and Roman law, can be changed at any time. Paul may have the former in mind here. But see Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 129, and nn. 126, 127, and 132 below.
should be rendered in v. 15 according to the secular sense\(^{125}\) ('will' or 'testament') and in v. 17 according to the biblical sense of 'covenant'.\(^{126}\) Paul clearly uses the legal example in a specific way: (1) he applies it to the argument about the ἐπαγγελίας to Abraham; (2) both senses of διαθήκη are concerned with κληρονομία (v. 18);\(^{127}\) (3) the διαθήκη is not changeable;\(^{128}\) (4) the covenant is

\(^{125}\) Bruce, Galatians, p. 169; Betz, Galatians, p. 157; Schlier, Galater, p. 146 n. 4.

\(^{126}\) Burton, Galatians, p. 182. Behm and Quell, TDNT 2:129 translate 'testament': Paul uses the term in the sense of Hellenistic law, but his religious understanding of it is shaped by the LXX.

\(^{127}\) The term is introduced in v. 18 and plays a major role through 4.8. Foerster and Herrmann, TDNT 3:784: in 3.18 the κληρονομία 'is the portion assigned to Abraham and his seed....' But the promise to Abraham and his seed, given as a testament, was in force long before the law was given. It is in force because God uttered it and does not add to it. Paul is not thinking of a prohibition against adding to a testament in Hellenistic law, which defines no age of majority. Although his illustration is legal his thinking about covenant is theological.

\(^{128}\) See Betz, Galatians, p. 156. It is not clear whether the hapax legomenon ἐπιδιαθήκασσα refers to the action of the donor or another. The simpler form of the compound verb occurs in 3.19. See Schlier, Galater, pp. 143-144; Delling, TDNT 8:34-36: the law was not just mediated by angels. They ordained or decreed it. And yet it remains God's law. Bruce, Galatians, p. 170, notes that not even the original owner can change it (οὐδεὶς διετέτει), and that Paul's concern with διαθήκη relates to the unilateral covenant which graciously bestows blessing. See Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East, and his 'Covenant', IDB 1:714-723; Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, pp. 95-106. Hübner, Law, pp. 26-30, argues that the angels are demonic beings who authored the law with the evil intention of causing sin in humankind, and the phrase 'ordained by angels' indicates God's lack of involvement in the giving of the law. But see Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 131.
related to σπέρμα in Gen 17.1-11, and in v. 16 by way of the middle term, 'promises'.

Paul first used promise in 3.14, connecting it there with the blessings given to Abraham, which, through Christ, are intended for the Gentiles. In 3.16 Paul again picks up the term, but ignores the content of the promises (multiplication of offspring, gift of land) in order to move immediately to the phrase, 'and his seed'. He insists that the biblical texts use the singular, and in fact they may be interpreted as using a collective singular. Traditional Jewish exegesis usually refers γῆ τοῦ to a plurality of descendants. Paul's taking it as a singular excludes the traditional Jewish interpretation and reserves the role of heir for Christ. Paul's point is that the promised blessing has been fulfilled in a single descendant, Christ, and through him it comes to all who belong to him and so also are Abraham's offspring.

In 3.17 Paul emphasizes the absolute priority of the promise over the law: the promises were made (implied: by God) to Abraham (v. 16), but the law 'came' (γεγονός)

129 References to καὶ τῷ σπέρματι include Gen 12.7; 13.15; 17.7; 24.7.
130 Betz, Galatians, p. 157.
430 years later. Thus, with the participle ἔγονως, when speaking of the law, Paul 'gives the impression that the law had come on the scene independently, on its own initiative, unlike the covenant-will based on promise which was "confirmed by God" (v. 17).... Gal 3.17 serves to create a distance between God and the law'.

Paul thus distances the law from God, even as he separates the law from promise. It was the normative Jewish position that both law and promise belong together. The promise to Abraham and the Sinai Torah were held together because Abraham knew the law either, (1) out of himself; (2) from secret writings; (3) by special revelation from God. In Paul's argument, however, the promise was complete in itself, was validated long before the law was given, and the law cannot annul the covenant or void the promise. If the law could annul the promise ἀκυρότως would result as would καταργέω.

132 Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 128-129, notes a 'correspondingly "active" expression' in Rom 5.20: the law came between, παρεερήθευσεν; cf. Gal 2.4. Hübner, Law, pp. 17, 87-8, wants διαθήκη in 3.17 ('will' or 'testament' but not 'covenant') interpreted as promises and set against the Mosaic law, which cannot annul God's will made 430 years earlier: 'Thus the promises to Abraham acquire temporal and therefore substantive priority over against the nomos. It is therefore not Moses but Abraham who has relevance for salvation!'

133 Betz, Galatians, p. 159 n. 57; Schlier, Galater, p. 147 n. 1. See Rom 4.13: the promise to Abraham was not διὰ νόμου, but, διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως.

134 On ἀκυρότως see Behm, TDNT 3:1098-1099; on καταργέω see Delling, TDNT 1:453-454; Schlier, Galater, p. 148 n. 2; Bruce, Galatians, p. 173; Betz, Galatians, p. 158; Duncan, Galatians, pp. 109-110.
There may in fact be an OT antecedent to Paul's contrast. The Deuteronomistic emphasis on the covenant of Horeb-Sinai, in contrast to the Priestly interpretation which gave primacy to the Abrahamic covenant and its permanent validity, represent a juxtaposition of the conditional and unconditional views of covenant within the OT. The difference is represented by the 'if you obey... (then) your God will set you high above all the nations of the earth' (Deut 28.1-2), as over against the unconditioned 'I will bless' of Gen 12.2-3, and 'I will make....I will establish.... I will give....' in Gen 17.1-8.

In 3.18 a juxtaposition of ἐκ νόμου and ἐκ ἐπαγγελίας leaves no room for compromise: 'Paul polemically separates what Judaism tries to hold together.' Paul speaks of the present situation: if the inheritance is by law, it is no longer by promise. With the use of χαρίζωμαι he correlates the promise made to Abraham with God's present work of salvation also of the Galatians. The continuity is implied by the perfect tense. The law and the promise

---

135 Clements, Abraham and David, p. 57ff; Anderson, Understanding, pp. 357-358.

136 Anderson, Old Testament, p. 460: 'The covenant with Abraham, like that with Noah, is also an "everlasting covenant", unconditional in character.... circumcision is not a condition of this covenant but is a physical sign of membership in the covenant community.' He notes, p. 462, that P has no independent account of the Sinai covenant.

137 Betz, Galatians, p. 159. There is an even sharper rejection in Rom 4.13-15.
are conflicting principles. If the inheritance is not \( \varepsilon \kappa \nu \delta \mu \omicron \upsilon \nu \) then it excludes those who are \( \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \rho \gamma \omega \nu \nu \delta \mu \omicron \upsilon \nu \).138

2.3.2. Gal 3.19-20 is part of the concise digression which Paul lays out in 3.19-25. The whole section of seven verses is not a new argument, but is intended to prevent the wrong conclusion that Paul is an enemy of the law.139 Paul defends himself against the accusation which may be inferred from Gal 2.17; 5.23; Rom 3.5-8; 6.1f; 1 Cor 9.19-23. Luke also defends Paul against such accusations: Acts 18.13; 21.21, 24; 24.5, 13f; 25.7f.140

Having made the negative statements about what the law does not and cannot do (v. 15-18; cf. 2.16; 3.10) Paul poses the question, \( \tau \iota \omicron \sigma \delta \nu \delta \mu \omicron \omicron \zeta \); In response to, 'Why then the law?'141 (that is, why was it given?)142 he gives two answers about the law's purpose: (1) it was added to multiply and stimulate transgressions (v. 19a; see discussion below); (2) it confines and restrains (v. 23).


139 Betz, Galatians, p. 163.

140 See 3.1 of this study; Linton, 'Third Aspect', p. 83, points out that Paul is not merely defended but is corrected in Acts, and this corrected view of Paul is that which has prevailed in the church. See Betz, Galatians, p. 163 n. 13 and on Gal 2.17.

141 BDF §480:5.

The use of ἐπαγγελία is one of the connecting links in the progression of Paul's thought, appearing in 3.14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22. And yet within that progression, there is a distinct reference to the law in 3.19-20, expressed in specific arguments: (1) it was a late addition, it was for the purpose of (χάριν) transgressions, and it was temporary and intended to last only until (ἀπὸ) the offspring would come; (2) it was inferior because of having been ordained by angels, and because of being given through an intermediary.

2.3.2.1. Paul's use of προσετέθη in v. 19b does not indicate the addition of law to the promise for the sake of making the promise effective.\(^{143}\) The whole argument about the validity and sufficiency of promise-covenant precludes that meaning. He means the law was added to the human situation for a purpose different from that of the promise. The abiding validity of promise is emphasized by the perfect ἐπαγγελταὶ in v. 19c.\(^{144}\) That the law was added (later) corresponds to v. 17. The context preceding v. 19, especially v. 15, suggests that the law is 'an invalid addition not willed by the testator; ὁδὲ ἔστις in v. 15 makes one think of someone other than the testator

\(^{143}\) Hübner, Law, pp. 32-33, points out that the idea of the law being 'added (to, i.e. later)' would have been particularly offensive to the Jewish notion of the pre-existence of the law.

\(^{144}\) Bruce, Galatians, p. 176.
himself—of an outsider'. The question of who gave the law is not explicitly answered, as Paul affirms that it was given as an addition even though such is against the will of the testator behind διαθήκη. Paul's point does not hinge on the logic of his application of the legal argument. He wants to assert the inferiority of the law: '...the logic which impelled him to the conviction that Christ had displaced the Torah was the logic of the Damascus-road experience.'

It is an untraditional position for Paul to say that the law was added for the purpose of stimulating transgressions. The Jewish view was that the Torah

---

145 Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 129. Hübner, Law, pp. 26-31, says: '...the nomos is a Law negotiated between the angels and Israel and not between God and Israel....That God did not institute the nomos is a constitutive element in Paul's proof.' Hübner distinguishes between the life-giving intention of the law itself, the evil intention of the angels to provoke human transgression of the law, and the intention of God to save, which is accomplished by God's taking up all intentions into justification by faith. Hübner is committed to showing that there are no contradictions in Paul's argument in Galatians 3, and his notion of a three-fold intention makes this possible. But as we have seen, consistency is not Paul's best suit, and his message springs more freely to life when this is recognized.

146 Bruce, Galatians, p. 176. Paul emphasizes the temporary nature of law. See Maurer, TDNT 8:167-168: law 'is only a temporally restricted interlude which began after the promise'; Burton, Galatians, p. 188; Schlier, Galater, p. 151 n. 4.

147 Hübner, Law, pp. 32-33: 'there was already in the first century A.D. a belief in the pre-existence of the Torah'. Paul counters this belief. Müßner, Galaterbrief, p. 245, indicates that the verb 'added to', in Paul's question at the beginning of v. 19, should be understood adverbially: 'Why was the law added?', rather than as a predicative which inquires about the nature of the law.
provides an impenetrable fence of protection around Israel, to prevent transgressions, and the un-Jewishness of Paul's position is to be noted.\textsuperscript{146} Paul does not use \textit{ἀμαρτία} here, but \textit{τῶν παραβάσεων}. 'Transgressions' refers to 'the conscious disobeying of definite commandments'.\textsuperscript{149} There are three alternatives for what Paul means by \textit{τῶν παραβάσεων} \textit{χάριν}:\textsuperscript{150} (1) the revelatory or cognitive interpretation would mean that in the light of the law one learns what is sin and that one is a sinner; (2) the definitional interpretation would mean that the law defines sin as transgression, specifying it as conscious and wilful action; (3) the causative interpretation would mean that the law brings about sinning. This third view is most in line with what Paul says in Rom 7.5, 8, 9; 1 Cor 15.56; 2 Cor 3.6. There is a causative sense of \textit{χάριν}, and Paul's concept of the law as not being able to give life (v. 21, \textit{ζωοποιησάς}) but rather bringing death (Rom 7.10) parallels Paul's concept of the law as bringing curse (Gal 3.10) rather than blessing. Similarly, the death of Christ may in turn be echoed in Paul's own death \textit{διὰ νόμου} (2.19).\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{146} Betz, \textit{Galatians}, p. 165; Schoeps, \textit{Paul}, p. 182.

\textsuperscript{149} Cranfield, 'St. Paul and the Law', p. 46; Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, p. 175; Schneider, \textit{TDNT} 5:739-740; BAG, p. 617.


\textsuperscript{151} Räisänen, \textit{Paul} (1983), pp. 140, 144.
Even so this transgression-producing law ruled only until Christ, 'der eschatologische "Same" Abrahams'\textsuperscript{152} came. The reign of law is temporary by design, and was not the fulfillment of the promise anymore than were the material blessings of land and nationhood.\textsuperscript{153} This counters the orthodox Jewish view of the law as eternal.\textsuperscript{154} Paul's view that the death and resurrection of Christ mark the end of the old aeon and the rule of law is extended back into the time before Christ's coming, wherein Paul devalues the law in terms of purpose and function.\textsuperscript{155} His reference in 3.19b, a statement relating to the time of the giving of the law, is consistent with his view that to be under law until (i.e., before) Christ came (v. 24) was a negative, confining, and restraining state of existence.\textsuperscript{156}

2.3.2.2. But if the law is subsidiary and temporary it is also inferior: it has not been given by direct revelation, but only indirectly through angels, by way of

\textsuperscript{152} Mußner, \textit{Galaterbrief}, p. 246.

\textsuperscript{153} Duncan, \textit{Galatians}, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{154} Betz, \textit{Galatians}, p. 168, discusses the possible pre-Pauline tradition at work here.


\textsuperscript{156} Callan, 'Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal 3.19b', pp. 549-567, sees this text as one of only two (see 2 Cor 3.7-18) wherein Paul mentions the circumstances of the giving of the law in his argument against imposition of the law on Gentiles. Callan refers to the reference to angels in particular; however the implicit references to the giving of law in προσετέθη (v. 19) and γεγονός (v. 17) are also devaluing comments.
a mediator. Thus, 3.19d,e is in sharp contrast to 3.18c: God gave the promise to Abraham.

The tradition that angels attended the giving of the law is preserved in the LXX (but not in MT) version of Deut 33.2.\footnote{Duncan, Galatians, p. 114: it occurs also in Stephen's speech in Acts 7.38, 53; Heb 2.2; Jub 1; Josephus, Ant XV.136. See Betz, Galatians, p. 169 n. 63.} God would normally be the subject of διατάδωσεν,\footnote{Dahl, 'Contradictions', p. 173, especially n. 22.} but here Paul avoids speaking of God as law-giver or the law as revelation, and instead indicates the law as a mere ordinance,\footnote{Duncan, Galatians, pp. 113-114, also points out that in accord with Deut 8.3, only by the word of the Lord could one live, and so of the law: 'Had it been a direct communication from God, it would have brought life, as experience showed that it did not.' On διατάδωσεν as 'anordnen' see Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 247.} in contrast to the gospel which was a revelation of Jesus Christ (1.12), and in contrast to the promise with which Abraham was 'graced' (v. 18). It is also difficult not to see in the passive εδόθη of v. 21b a reference to God as law-giver, and it is God's overarching plan in which an answer must be found for the place of the law (v. 21).\footnote{Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 132.} Paul does not say that the angels authored the law, that it was they who added it, nor that the angels were of either good or bad character.\footnote{Hübner, Law, pp. 26-31, asserts that the demonic angels act with evil intention, contrary to God's will, and it was in the giving of the law, not in law as such, that evil intention was expressed. But see criticism of this by Räisänen, Paul, (1983), pp. 131-133, and Bruce, Galatians, p. 175. Lührmann, Galater, p. 63, recalls}
disparaging the origin of law by denying divine authorship, but rather to contrast its inferior nature to the direct gift and revelation of gospel-promise.\textsuperscript{162}

The second way in which Paul here speaks of the inferior nature of the law is with the tradition of \(\delta\nu \chiε\rho\iota\nu \mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\nu\). The phrase may be an allusion to Ex 34.29. There Moses came down from Mt. Sinai, for the second time, after the incident of the golden calf, 'with the two tables of the testimony in his hand....' Although Moses is never spoken of as a mediator in the OT, there were midrashic developments which spoke of him as such.\textsuperscript{163} Paul here assumes knowledge of such tradition.\textsuperscript{164}

---

Paul's earlier reference: 'Und nicht einmal ein Engel vom Himmel könnte ja das Evangelium verändern, das Paulus in Galatien verkündigt hat (vgl. 1.8), ebensowenig die Abraham gegebene Verheißung.' Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 67, notes that for Paul to deny divine authorship of the law would mean he must deny what he had been taught and believed all his life, 'that God gave the law....'

\textsuperscript{162} Sanders, Paul (1977), p. 550, suggests that Paul has here made an extreme statement in the heat of argument, but gives 'soberer reflection' in Romans and Philippians 3; see also Paul (1983), p. 67. Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 133, speaks of this as an ad hoc adaptation of Jewish tradition about angels at Sinai (see references in his n. 29), but which was an idea to which he did not return.

\textsuperscript{163} Callan, 'Midrash', pp. 550, 555-564.

\textsuperscript{164} Dahl, 'Atonement', pp. 153-154; 'Contradictions', pp. 169-174; Str-B 3:554-556; Schlier, Galater, pp. 159-160; Callan, 'Midrash', pp. 555-564.
The mediator to whom Paul refers is Moses.\textsuperscript{165} Paul's use of δν κερη μεσίτου corresponds to the Hebrew יְלָל, 'through', or 'through the hand of',\textsuperscript{166} as in the נַעְדַ תַּל of Ex 34.29.\textsuperscript{167} But interpretation also depends on grammatical structure, as 'meaning and structure are conditioned by one another'.\textsuperscript{168} What may be working in v. 20a is an example of 'the stylistic figure of ellipse... a dominating word, which appears only once in a clause, will sometimes have to be supplied once more especially when the predicate has to be supplied from the subject or the subject from the predicate'.\textsuperscript{169} This text would then have to be analyzed as though it read: δ δε μεσίτης [μεσίτης] ουκ ἔνος ἐστιν. Thus, v. 20a is an assertion about Moses. It is not a general statement about

\textsuperscript{165} Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 248. Lührmann, Galater, p. 63, also refers to, 'Mose, der hier mit dem "Mittler" gemeint ist....'; Betz, Galatians, p. 170; Jeremias, TDNT 4:870; Oepke, TDNT 4:618-619.

\textsuperscript{166} Lohse, TDNT 9:430-431; Burton, Galatians, p. 189; Schlier, Galater, pp. 155, 158-161; BAG, p. 888; Betz, Galatians, p. 170.

\textsuperscript{167} Callan, 'Midrash', p. 561, notes that on Ex 34.29 the midrashic literature speaks of Moses as μεσίτης/νησίτης. If Paul is alluding to Ex 34.29, he is speaking of נַעְדַ תַּל instrumentally, not locally, he is thinking of the Hebrew text (see Dahl, 'Contradictions', p. 172), and he equates Moses' second coming down the mountain with the giving of the law, as also in 2 Cor 3.7-18.


\textsuperscript{169} Riesenfeld, 'Mediator', p. 407; for other examples of ellipse in Paul see pp. 410-412.
mediators.\textsuperscript{170} Then the definite article of v. 20a corresponds to Moses, who is the mediator of v. 19. The adverseeive particle δὲ marks a limitation in the mediating role of Moses. But Moses' role as mediator is depreciated because he is a mediator not of one, that is, he does not represent a single individual but a plurality of angels. A missing link in the argument must therefore be supplied from the preceding διαταγέως δὲ άγγέλων. We thus understand the sentence to say: the intermediary (i.e. Moses) is an intermediary not of one single person but of a plurality of angels.\textsuperscript{171}

Paul's purpose is to focus on the contrast between law and promise: the promise was given to Abraham directly from God; the law was given indirectly by way of angels and an intermediary. This, not that Moses acted as a mediator, is the focus of thought here, and while Paul uses common Jewish tradition about angels attending the giving of the law, he 'dissimulates the fact' that God gave the law to angels to give to Moses.\textsuperscript{172}

The argument also uses the concept of oneness as expressing perfection, and plurality as expressing imperfection: 'anything that stands in contrast to the

\textsuperscript{170} On this interpretation Riesenfeld (p. 405) cites Lightfoot, Zahn, Burton, Oepke, Schlier, Müsner.

\textsuperscript{171} Riesenfeld, 'Mediator', p. 407.

\textsuperscript{172} Riesenfeld, 'Mediator', p. 408.
oneness of God is inferior'. 173 Paul has taken material that his opponents knew and accepted, by which their positive attitude towards the law could be supported, and he has turned it against them to speak of the inferior nature of the law as contrasted to the promise given to Abraham and fulfilled in Christ, the Offspring. 174

2.3.3. In 3.21-22 Paul denies that the law and the promises are truly opposed, because they serve different functions in different spheres. An affirmative answer might have been expected from 3.10 and on. 175 But the affirmative answer could only come if it were accepted that the law is able to do what Paul maintains is only the gospel's power and purview. Of the law Paul has said that it: does not grant the Spirit (v. 5); brings curse (v. 10); does not justify (v. 11; cf. 2.16); does not rest on faith (v. 12); is that from which Christ redeemed us (v. 13); came 430 years after the promise (v. 17); does not annul the covenant of promise (v. 17); does not convey the inheritance (v. 18); was added to the human situation to produce transgressions (v. 19); lasted in rule only until Christ came (v. 19, 24); is inferior by virtue of not

173 Betz, Galatians, pp. 171-2; see Betz' n. 85 regarding the 'no intercessor' tradition of 1QH 6.13f; Riesenfeld, 'Mediator', p. 407; Stauffer, TDNT 2:434-442; Deut 6.4; Eph 4.3-6; 1 Cor 8.6; BAG, p. 230.

174 Moses was regarded as a divine man, especially in Hellenistic Judaism, because of his role as mediator. See Betz, Galatians, p. 170; Tiede, The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker, especially pp. 101-137; Riesenfeld, 'Mediator', p. 409.

175 Burton, Galatians, p. 192.
being direct revelation from God (v. 19d) and because of being mediated by Moses (v. 19e, 20).

The covenant of promise, on the other hand, reckoned righteousness to Abraham (v. 6), was the preaching of the gospel (v. 8), brought faith and blessing (v. 9), was fulfilled in Christ (v. 14, 16), includes the Gentiles (v. 14), was the vehicle of inheritance (v. 18). Thus, law and promise do entirely different things. Paul summarizes this thought in v. 21b: the law cannot make alive. If it could, then it would compete with the promise. It was never the purpose of the Torah to give life, according to Paul.\textsuperscript{176}

In v. 22 Paul shifts to speak of ή γραφή. The logic for this shift lies in the contrast just mentioned: blessing, Spirit, life, righteousness all belong to the side of faith, while curse, flesh, and death all are related to the law.\textsuperscript{177} The law, therefore, cannot be regarded as a positive subject in the process of salvation, and the role of law, here spoken of as

\textsuperscript{176} Bultmann, TDNT 2:855, 874, notes that Paul's view contradicts that of Judaism, which is that one lives by law, and the Torah is the tree of life; Lührmann, Galater, p. 64: 'Nach jüdischer Tradition ist das Gesetz dazu da, einen Zaun um Israel zu bilden, der die Sünde abhält und den Fluchzusammenhang verhindert. Für Paulus aber hat der Fluchzusammenhang seine Ursache nicht im Ungehorsam gegenüber dem Gesetz, sondern im Gesetz selber, das gar nicht Gerechtigkeit bewirken kann, wie es vorgibt.' And yet, as noted by Räisänen, Paul (1983), pp. 128-154, Paul oscillates also on the question of why God gave the law: was it meant to save or was it not?

\textsuperscript{177} Lührmann, Galater, p. 64.
Scripture, is to shut everything up under sin.\(^{178}\) That this consignment ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν is a means to an end, subject to the rule of promise, is shown by the ἃνα clause in v. 22b, the end of which (ἡ ἐπαγγελία...δοθή) is in sharp contrast (ἀλλά) to 'the unreal hypothesis of v. 21'.\(^{179}\) The recipients of the promise, who are thus members of the new age, are represented by τοῖς πιστεύοσιν.\(^{180}\)

2.3.4. Gal 3.23-29 is characterized by: before (v. 23); but now (v. 25); you are (v. 26, 29). There is here a clear before and after: 'Die Fluchzeit des Gesetzes ist zuende seit der Offenbarung des Glaubens (v. 23).'\(^{181}\) Two periods of time are thus to be distinguished.\(^{182}\) The former time was ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν (v. 22); ὑπὸ νόμου (v. 23; 23).

\(^{178}\) Michel, TDNT 7:746; Schlier, Galater, 164 n. 2. Paul often speaks of law and Scripture as interchangeable or at least overlapping terms (Räisänen, Paul, p. 16; Bruce, Galatians, p. 180) and that the two are identified here is indicated by his assertion that Scripture (law) did not make alive. See Rom 3.19.

\(^{179}\) Burton, Galatians, p. 195. Compare the parallel ἃνα clause in v. 24.

\(^{180}\) There is thus a similarity to Rom 10.4, if τέλος there is understood as end (termination), because that is also παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, in contrast to the old aeon's ἄνυστής γὰρ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοδοσίας. Badenas, Christ the End of the Law, especially pp. 118-120, asserts that Paul's view in Rom 10.4 and its context is that 'the law led to Christ and Christ was the true τέλος of the law'. It is conceivable that Paul could assert this in Romans, if law were not the focus of the contest for Gentile membership in the church, but it is not a correct or appropriate scheme for interpreting Galatians.

\(^{181}\) Lührmann, Galater, p. 65.

\(^{182}\) Betz, Galatians, p. 175 n. 119.
Although ἄρομα in itself may be understood as a protective guarding, its proximity to v. 19 and to συνκλείσεως in v. 23, as well as its belonging to the former time which was characterized by negative statements about the law (see 2.3.3 above), give it here a restrictive sense. There is a temporal meaning for εἰς, similar to εἰς Χειρότεν in v. 24. The law’s restrictive, rather than educational, nature is emphasized by παιδαγωγός, as the term speaks of the negative experience of being under the custodian. The custodianship was a means, the end of which is parallel to that in the ἱμα clause of v. 22, even as the thought of the respective means is similar in both clauses. The ἱμα clause of v. 24, and the implicitly limited role of the παιδαγωγός who functions only until the child reaches the age of majority, beyond the time of νήπιος (4.1), speaks of the limited duration of the law’s role. It ends with the

183 Bruce, Galatians, p. 181.
184 Burton, Galatians, p. 199.
185 BAG, p. 875.
186 Burton, Galatians, p. 200; BDF §474:5.
187 Burton, Galatians, pp. 200-201; Betz, Galatians, p. 177; Bertram, TDNT 5:620-621; Oepke, Galater, pp. 120-122; Schlier, Galater, pp. 168-170; Lührmann, Galater, p. 65, points out that the pedagogue was not such in our modern sense, but was a slave who was responsible for discipline and constraint of a child for the sake of instruction, ‘ohne selbst Lehrer zu sein’.
coming of faith (v. 25). But is this an end for believers or for the cosmos?\textsuperscript{188} The answer lies in the τοῖς πιστεύονταῖς of v. 22 and in the ἐγένετο of v. 25, for whom faith has come.\textsuperscript{189}

In 3.27 Paul uses the only explicit reference to baptism that occurs in the entire epistle.\textsuperscript{190} The two verses, 27-28, could have been lifted from an early Christian baptismal liturgy.\textsuperscript{191} Paul uses the statement to remind the Galatians of their standing before God as members of the new age in which the old contraries no longer prevail.\textsuperscript{192} The reference also corresponds to 3.1-5, as Paul there reminds them of their experience of beginning in the faith, and here (3.27-28) of the 'decisive ceremony which made them members of the Christian Church'.\textsuperscript{193} Their oneness in Christ is particularly pertinent in view of the division which the law would sustain if imposed on the Gentile converts.

Gal 3.29 recapitulates and closes the argument about Abraham which was begun in 3.6.\textsuperscript{194} Having mentioned the

\textsuperscript{188} Betz, Galatians, p. 179.
\textsuperscript{189} Stuhlmacher, 'End', p. 143; Luz, Geschichtsverständnis, p. 157; Betz, Galatians, p. 179.
\textsuperscript{190} Betz, Galatians, p. 181.
\textsuperscript{191} Meeks, 'The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity', pp. 165-208, here p.180, calls it a 'baptismal reunification formula'.
\textsuperscript{192} See 4.2 below.
\textsuperscript{193} Betz, Galatians, p.185.
\textsuperscript{194} Borgen, Bread, p. 48; see 3.2.2 above.
Paul now returns to that idea in the closing statement of the scriptural argument, and thus prepares us for the themes of inheritance and sonship which occur in ch. 4, and which come about with the end of the rule of law.
Summary

Sanders makes three comments about Galatians 3 that are pertinent to this discussion.\textsuperscript{195}

1. Regarding the way in which 'Paul chooses the quotations in Galatians 3', Sanders points out that the argument is terminological, and therefore it depends on finding proof texts for Paul's view that Gentiles are justified by faith. Sanders sees Paul choosing the Abraham story for the purpose of linking 'Gentiles' and 'faith'. In that link Abraham is the middle term, connected to Gentiles in one proof-text (Gal 3.6: Gen 15.6) and righteousness by faith in another (Gal 3.8: Gen 18.18).\textsuperscript{196} Deut 27.26 is the only LXX passage in which νόμος and curse are connected, in the sense that νόμος brings a curse.\textsuperscript{197}

It is questionable, however, whether Paul 'chose' all of these texts. They likely were chosen for him. In fact, as Räisänen has pointed out, Deut 27.26 taken at

\textsuperscript{195} Sanders, Paul (1983), pp. 21-23.

\textsuperscript{196} Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 21, says that Paul's major intention is to include Gentiles, and since the term ethnē does not appear in Gen 12.3, Paul uses 18.18, even though by so doing he must settle for the presence of blessed in 18.18 when the presence of dikaioun would have been better. See Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 53 nn. 24, 25.

\textsuperscript{197} Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 21, says that because of this connection and the priority for which Paul chose the text, the thrust of Gal 3.10 is borne by 'law' and 'cursed', not by 'all'.
face value is against Paul's point of view: cursed is every one who does not abide, would imply not cursed is everyone who does abide.\textsuperscript{198} Paul does make use of the law-curse association, but he gives it his own theological interpretation: law and faith are exclusive of one another (3.12), and Christ has redeemed us by becoming a curse for us (3.13).\textsuperscript{199}

2. Regarding the relationship of the argument of 3.10-12 and the proof-texts, Sanders rightly holds that Paul's theological position governs the use and interpretation of the texts.\textsuperscript{200}

3. Sanders regards 3.10-13 as subsidiary to 3.8. The choice of 18.18 to prove the justification by faith of the Gentiles includes the presence of 'blessed'. This 'naturally leads to its opposite: cursed. Gal 3.10, then announces the negative proof of the positive statement of

\textsuperscript{198} Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 95 n. 13.

\textsuperscript{199} Paul's Christian Judaizer opponents could have argued that it is necessary to do the law in order to avoid curse. In response to this Paul interprets Deut 27.26. But Christian opponents would not have used Deut 21.23. Paul's interpretation in Gal 3.13 may thus be a carry-over from established arguments against Jewish polemic. See Kim, Origin, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{200} Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 54 n. 28; see Betz, Galatians, p. 144, who points out that Paul 'states his conclusions first'; the meaning 'is simply that exclusion from "blessing" (cf. 6.16) equals "curse"'; Schlier, Galater, p. 133, says, 'Die Schriftstelle soll vielmehr nur bekräftigen, daß die Gesetzeshunde unter dem Fluch stehen'. Again, Sanders (p. 22) sees this priority of Paul's viewpoint as a sign that Paul's emphasis is not on the word 'all'. But the law for Paul does seem to be indivisible. The 'allness' of Gal 3.10 can be present and true without being the decisive factor, as Sanders points out, pp. 27-29.
Then to prove that no one can be made righteous by the law Paul quotes Hab 2.4. Faith excludes the law. Gal 3.13 explains how God has provided for the removal of the curse. Gal 3.14 summarizes the argument in chiastic fashion: the first Ἰνα clause reiterates the positive part of 3.8, and the second Ἰνα clause the positive assertion of 3.1-5. Paul makes Christ central as the one who became the curse in order to bestow the blessing upon the Gentiles (3.13-14). Paul does not speak of God as having generated the curse. He omits ἐν τῷ ἐγένετο and thus attributes curse to the inherent power of the law itself. He also uses common terminology to connect curse of the law and curse of the cross, thus attributing the death of Jesus on the cross to the cursing power of the law. To be under law is to be under curse. Paul thus links Gentiles and faith (Gen 15.6; 18.18) and law and curse (Deut 27.26).

Paul does not explicitly say that the law caused the death of Christ. But he does lay the power to curse exclusively on the law. Even as he makes the law responsible for producing transgressions he also indicates law as the origin or cause of curse, and hence of Jesus' death. Law in Galatians is not the agent of sin, as it is in Romans, but is its source, even as law in Galatians is also the origin or source of curse. Since law, sin, and curse are aligned by Paul on the same side, we may

---

understand him to indicate law as a cause of death, even as it is of curse and sin. In order to deal with the power sphere in which sin, curse, and death are members, Christ entered into that sphere, in order to die under the law, and dying, to redeem those who were under the law.

What then is the relation of this material to 2.19? We saw that Paul's statement about being crucified with Christ points to his being with Christ and dying with Christ when Christ died on his cross. Christ's death was through the curse-bringing/death-bringing power of the law, even as Paul also says of himself that he died 'through law'. We could thus paraphrase Paul's thought, 'I died to the law, through the law, inasmuch as I am united with Christ who also died under or because of the law'. But Christ died under the law, having been under the law's curse, not because he deserved to be cursed for failure to keep the law, nor because he was in need of being redeemed from the law. Rather, Christ became like us although he was unlike us, so that we might become like him. The final part of this thought pattern therefore relates to Christ's own coming to be under the law, as Paul speaks of that in Gal 4.4. This verse is in the context of Paul's argument about inheritance and sonship, which become ours in Christ. These Paul places in contrast to infancy and slavery, which come to an end with the end of the rule of law. The end of that rule allows for the new community.
PART IV

4.1 SONS, NOT SLAVES

Paul's two-aeon theology is the proper context for interpreting his view of the law in Galatians. Gal 6.14-15 represents Paul's two-aeon position, as the new creation is in contrast to the circumcision-uncircumcision distinction. The cruciform life is in contrast to Torah-based existence. Gal 6.14-15 explicates Paul's previous statements in 4.1-11 about his understanding of all people together in the old aeon under law, and the sending of God's Son to be under law for the purpose of redemption and adoption into sonship. It is Christ's coming to be under law for this very purpose which is the turning point of the ages. In this final part we will first examine Paul's statements in 4.1-7, and then conclude by examining his summary statement in 6.14-15.

In Gal 4.1-7 Paul discusses what he has set forth in 3.26-28. He first uses an illustration from the practice of law (4.1-2), and then he applies that comparison to the Galatians' present situation (4.3-7). His conclusion in 4.7 connects this section to 3.29, which in turn connects 4.1-6 with 3.1-28.¹

1. Paul changes analogies in 4.1, from the prison-warden and custodian of 3.22-26, to the guardian and trustee of 4.2. The theme of καθορισμός was used in 3.29,

and is carried forward in 4.1. The contrast in 4.1 is between two times or states of being, that of infancy (the 'before') and that of heir (the 'after'). The key words in 4.1 are thus heir, child, slave, and owner, with καιροῦμος corresponding to κύρος, and νήπιος corresponding to δοθάν, in an A-B-B-A pattern. The passing role of law is represented by the three terms ἐπιτρόπος, οἰκονόμος, and, corresponding to them, καθαγιώς (3.24), a role which held sway until (αντί) the time fixed (προθεσμία) by the Father.

The pre-Christian situation of minority applies to all believers. The application in 4.3 of the comparison made in 4.1-2 fits both Jewish and Gentile Christians, as indicated by Paul's shift to the emphatic ἡμεῖς. Paul

2 Bruce, Galatians, p. 192. Duncan, Galatians, p. 125, says, 'His new point is the positive one that even tutelage suggests a future period of emancipation....'; Lührmann, Galater, p. 68, points out that in 4.1f Paul reaches back one more time to the example of inheritance in 3.15-17, a legal order of more Hellenistic than Jewish form, and yet one he assumed had convincing power for the Galatians. Paul's point is, 'Der Erbe hat in dieser Zeit keine Verfügungsgewalt über sich selbst und über seinen zukünftigen Besitz. Er ist also fast in der Position eines Sklaven'.


4 For νήπιος see Bertram, TDNT 4:917-920: the concept of childhood as something to be left behind, which according to 4.1, 3 has already been left behind, is somewhat in tension with sonship as the supreme gift of the Spirit. We should note that Paul's point is as likely to be obscured as secured by the imposition of inclusive language for 'sonship', which is granted to all, male and female (3.28) in the new age, while childhood is that which has been left in the past order. On the hapax legomenon, προθεσμία, see Betz, Galatians, p. 204 n. 20; Schlier, Galater, p. 189 n. 6.
thus switches to the first person plural. The juxtaposition of ἡμεῖς to the imperfects ἡμεν and ἡμέθα and to the pluperfect δεδομένων contrasts the time in which 'we were' to the time now indicated in v. 4. The former time was characterized by νήπιος, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. The fullness of time (v. 4) is characterized by τὴν ἀποθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. To be under the custodianship (3.24) of the law, during the period of infancy (4.1, 3) meant enslavement to the στοιχεῖα. Thus, law and στοιχεῖα are lumped together as part of the old aeon, and the use of ὑπὸ νόμου in 3.23 corresponds to ὑπὸ στοιχεῖα in 4.3. This contrasts to the freedom through Christ, a theme implicitly introduced in 4.3, 5, 7. The common denominator of slavery under στοιχεῖα was the pre-Christian condition of all believers, a time ended by the time of faith in the Christ-event, which corresponds to the revelation of 1.12, 16 and 3.23.

2. The word στοιχεῖα occurs in the NT only at Gal 4.3, 9; Col 2.8, 20; Heb 5.12; 2 Pet 3.10. Only the three

---

5 Bruce, Galatians, p. 193; Davies, Jewish and Pauline Studies, p. 237; Lührmann, Galater, p. 69, also draws attention to the surprising replacement of the expected confinement under law (3.23), with confinement under the elements (4.3), with no middle step in the argument, since, although it is an idea which Paul has not clarified for his readers, 'sie wissen, was gemeint ist'.

6 Betz, Galatians, pp. 202, 204.

7 Oepke, Galater, p. 129; Lührmann, Galater, p. 69.

8 Carr, Angels and Principalities, p. 72.
references in Galatians and Colossians use the word together with ἔοδε κόσμου.⁹

Of the various meanings which elements of the world could have, Burton considers four as worthy of consideration here: (1) physical elements of the universe; (2) heavenly bodies; (3) spirits or angels; (4) elements of religious knowledge. Because the phrase is used in connection with the law, Burton concludes that it is to be understood as, 'the rudimentary religious teachings possessed by the race'.¹⁰ But this interpretation does not adequately understand the elements as belonging to the pairs of opposites which make up all things, which are in opposition to the new being in Christ, and which no longer define life in the world for the believer, who now lives life in the flesh by faith in the Son of God (Gal 2.20).¹¹ Only so can the elements be inclusive enough to be the elements of the world, against which Paul sets the new age, new creation, and life of faith.

The interpretation of στοιχεῖα in this passage should conform to the context, in which κόσμος is spoken of negatively, as that to which Paul has been crucified, and in which both Jew and Gentile were in bondage in their pre-Christian existence. The slavery of v. 3 refers to Jews under law, and the slavery of v. 9 refers to idol

⁹ Burton, Galatians, p. 514; Delling, TDNT 7:683-687.
¹⁰ Burton, Galatians, pp. 510-515.
¹¹ See 4.2 n. 5 below.
worshippers who had been enslaved (v. 8) to beings who were no gods. The στοιχεία in both v. 3 and v. 9 refer to that to which both groups were enslaved. That Paul does not refer only to Gentiles and the former paganism of the Galatians is indicated by his connection of life ὧπὸ στοιχεία and life ὧπὸ νόμου. The elements to which the Gentile Galatians are in danger of returning are not the same as those to which they were formerly in bondage. The phrase is descriptive, and 'denotes a category inclusive of those things to which the Galatians were enslaved and those to which they are now in danger of returning'.

The actual situation in the pre-Christian existence of both groups was that Jews were under the law and Gentiles were under the beings that were not real gods:

Paul cannot be thinking here in terms of explicit identification. Although paralleled with both, the stoicheia cannot simultaneously be the law and the beings....The point of the parallel between the stoicheia and the law is perceived when one focuses on Paul's conviction that the plight of Jew and Gentile must be the same, since Christ saves all on the same basis. The common denominator is bondage and the equation of law and stoicheia is material. Thus Paul can go back and forth from 'we' to 'you' and also from pagan deities to the law. Everyone needs to be liberated from bondage by Christ. The

12 Burton, Galatians, p. 516; Betz, Galatians, pp. 213-215: of the Galatians' past paganism Paul says they 'did not know God', a phrase likely to be from missionary language and rooted in the OT and in Hellenistic Judaism. See Betz' discussion and bibliography in his nn. 7 and 8.

13 Bruce, Galatians, p. 194.

14 Burton, Galatians, p. 517; Köster, TDNT 9:272: '...Paul uses the typical vocabulary of mission here....' As ignorance of God was equal to bondage to beings that were no gods so now acceptance of law would become as a return to slavery under the elements. See Bultmann, Theology 1:67.
argument that being under the law is the same as being under the ςτοιχεία is driven home by the statement that both require the observation of special times: accepting the law is materially the same as resuming worship of beings which are not gods (4.10).  

And so the situations of Jew and Gentile, although different, melt together. Even though by his use of νόμος Paul means the Mosaic Law of Sinai, and parts of his argument are based on dating that law from the time of Moses (3.17, 19), he is thinking of something that concerns all people, and the law thus assumes much wider dimensions.  

Gal 4.5-6 shows that Paul's thought places the Gentiles under the law. Here Paul says that God sent the Son to redeem those who were under the law, seeming to refer to Jewish Christians. But he continues by saying that this happened so that we might receive adoption as sons. 'Because you are children, we have received the Spirit.' 'We' here clearly includes Gentile Christians. The whole force of Paul's argument is that the blessing of Abraham has come upon the Gentiles (3.14), this status is by faith in Christ (3.7), the blessing of Abraham was

---

15 Sanders, Paul (1983), p. 69; see Fitzmyer, 'Paul and the Law', p. 27. Thus, both Jews and Gentiles were subject to the law and to στοιχεία. See Reicke, 'The Law and This World', p. 273; Howard, Crisis, p. 78. By 'no gods' Paul does not mean that they have no existence, but that they are demons rather than gods. See Deut 32.17. The demonological interpretation is supported by the identification of these beings with the elements. See Duncan, Galatians, p. 133; Betz, Galatians, p. 215.


bestowed so that we might receive the promise of the Spirit (3.14), and both 4.5b and 4.6b correspond to that argument of inclusiveness. Paul thus works with a double sense of law, as 'a historical and particularist Torah and... a universal force'.

As the Gentiles are under law, so Jews are under στοιχεία. Paul includes himself in the plight of his readers when he says that we were enslaved under the elements (4.3), and we became sons when redeemed from under the law (4.5b). The Galatians (Gentile Christians) who as pagans had been under the στοιχεία would turn again (πάλιν) to bondage under στοιχεία by submission to the Jewish law (4.9). Once having been slaves to the beings which were no gods, they would now become slaves to the elements by becoming slaves of the law. Subjection to Jewish law, represented also by calendar piety (4.10), is the same as a return to former bondage.

Paul thus associates the Galatians' pre-Christian pagan existence and subjection to the elements with turning to the Torah. Paul's identification of being under the law with being subject to the elements corresponds to his aligning the law and the flesh. Paul has played on the word flesh, meaning at one time the physical flesh that was cut in circumcision, and at another time the power of evil and sin. He has played on

the word law, as when he speaks of law as such, after
generalizing from the specific practices of circumcision,
table regulations, and calendar piety as conditions of
life in the world under law. So when he speaks of the
elements, which he aligns with law, the physical world is
thus included, but the inclusion also of his reference to
the beings to which the Gentiles were once subject
indicates a realm greater than but including the physical.
It is a demonized physical world. 20 The elements were in
contention, and their 'mighty strife' threatened the
existence of the world and the soul after death. People
thus lived in fear of the elements. 21

The Jewish submission to Torah is associated with
bondage to the elements. 22 A clue to this merging of
Jewish and Gentile bondage may be seen in Gal 3.28. As in
Christ the distinctness of the two groups has been
eliminated, so also there was a previous common need: all
were under bondage. Gal 3.28 corresponds to what Paul

---

20 This interpretation is supported by Schweizer,
'Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4.3,
9 and Col 2.8, 18, 20', pp. 455-468, here p. 455, who
argues that philological evidence from the literature of
Paul's time indicates that στοιχεῖα when used with τοῦ
κόσμου refers to the basic four elements: earth, water,
air, and fire.

21 Schweizer, 'Slaves', p. 466.

22 Hübner, Law, p. 33, correctly points out: 'A
demonic and pagan character or power may be attributed to
the elements of the world...for the Jews something
monstrous is being said: the function of the Torah is
identical with that of the pagan deities.'
says about the crucifixion of the world in 6.14. 23 And yet Paul does not identify Torah with the elements:

Paul's point in Gal 4 is probably only the polemical one of suggesting that man's plight under the law is identical with his plight under the elements.... Paul's 'description of the human plight varies, remaining constant only in the assertion of its universality'. 24

The pre-Christian situation of Jew and Gentile, actually different with respect to the powers that controlled each group respectively, is viewed the same way from Paul's Christian law-free perspective: deliverance is for all, therefore all were under bondage, and to return to the law is to return to bondage. 25

---

23 See the discussion in 4.2 below pertaining to the threefold crucifixion and pairs of opposites.


25 Does the close connection in v. 3 of 'when we were children' with subjection 'to the elements' suggest the meaning of 'elementary teachings'? The adjectives ἀθενή and πτωχά are appropriate when used of a religious system, but not of heavenly bodies. Thus, Burton, Galatians, p. 517, says that the contrast in v. 9 is to 'the full truth of the revelation in Christ'. What is common to both the uses of 'elements' in Colossians and in Galatians is that very application of the word to an imperfect type of teaching, to a relapse into a dogmatic system, as contrasted to the completeness found in Christ. According to Carr, Angels, pp. 75-76, Paul may thus be thinking of a contrast between στοιχεία and πληρωμα. The πληρωμα τοῦ χρόνου of 4.4 corresponds to the προσευμία of 4.2. Burton, Galatians, pp. 515, 518, suggests that in view of the way Paul uses στοιχεία to apply to both Jews and Gentiles before faith in Christ, and speaks in ways indicating a two aeon thought pattern, the word is best understood as 'elements of religious knowledge....the rudimentary religious teachings possessed by the race'. Similarly, see Carr, Angels, p. 75. However, this definition of 'elements' as religious teaching is too restrictive, as it does not adequately take into account that these are elements of the world. See nn. 15, 20, 22 above. By the term στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου the normal citizen of the Graeco-Roman world must have understood something
3. What makes the χρόνος of v. 4 complete, in contrast to the inadequate and rudimentary στροφεία, is the coming of Christ. Deliverance from the rule of law and assumption of the role of sons marks the end of the age of being νάσος, a purpose indicated by the double ἵνα clauses in v. 5. The double ends of τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἔξαγοράσῃ and τὴν νόσεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν are achieved by the means of ἔξαπέστελεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. Paul has used ἔξαγοράσω in 3.13 to describe Christ's redemptive work. In 4.5a the first ἵνα clause could, by itself, be taken to refer to Jewish Christians. And yet in 4.5b the second ἵνα clause includes all Christians. In the context of the letter's argument, the two ἵνα clauses summarize the sequence of Gal 2.15-3.25, and 3.26-29.26 'There is here the same sense of a pivotal event in history as there was in the statement about Christ's ransoming work in iii.13.'27 Of the relation between 4.4 and 3.13 four things are worthy of note.

26 Betz, Galatians, p. 208. Compare the double ἵνα clauses in Gal 3.14. See also Lührmann, Galater, p. 69: the first clause (in 4.5) repeats the expression of a slave's redemption from slavery to law (3.13), and the second clause corresponds to the comparison of the heir and sonship (3.26).

27 Duncan, Galatians, p. 128.
3.1. In connection with διὰ παρέκκλησιν the emphasis is on the sending of the Son and the help from God which this sending brings. Here Paul points to the true humanity of the Son, with terminology about birth by a woman which is applicable to any human. The birth coincides with the sending for a mission, and this is reminiscent of Isa 49.1,5; Jer 1.5,7; Gal 1.15.

3.2. That Jesus was sent to be ὑπὸ νόμου indicates that he was not only born a man amidst humanity, but was also born as a Jew who was obligated to observe the law: 'Eine Frau gab Jesus das Leben, und das Gesetz war sein Herr.' The purpose of this sending was that he might then win law-true Jews. But being under the law meant

---

28 Betz, Galatians p. 207; Schlier, Galater, p. 196; Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 270; see Bruce, Galatians, pp. 194-195, regarding both pre-existence and virginal conception of Christ. Paul indicates neither knowledge nor denial of a tradition of virginal conception of Jesus.

29 Oepke, Galater, pp. 132-133. On the pre-Pauline tradition about the sending of the Son, see Mußner, Galaterbrief, pp. 271-273; Bruce, Galatians, pp. 194-196.

30 Schlier, Galater, p. 196; Bruce, Galatians, p. 195.

31 Bruce, Galatians, p. 196. The sending likely refers to the pre-existent state. See Burton, Galatians, p. 217; Phil 2.6.

32 Mußner, Galaterbrief, p. 270; Schlier, Galater, p. 196: 'Zu seiner Menschheit gehört nicht nur seine Natur, sondern auch seine Geschichte.' The phrase 'under law' may be Paul's addition to the pre-Pauline formula about the sending of the Son. See Bruce, Galatians, p. 196.

33 Schlatter, Galater, p. 106.

34 Borse, Galater, p. 143.
that he was also under the elements of the world,\textsuperscript{35} and was thus in solidarity with all human life. Paul indicates that birth by a human mother\textsuperscript{36} and being put under law\textsuperscript{37} form 'a definition of human life'.\textsuperscript{38} 'The nomos has the function of serving as the sphere of enslavement for man. Man's existence before Christ is a state of "being under the Law".'\textsuperscript{39} Into this existence under the law the Son has been sent, born, therefore, into slavery.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{35} Schlatter, \textit{Galater}, p. 106; Mußner, \textit{Galaterbrief}, p. 270.

\textsuperscript{36} Schweizer, TDNT 8:383: the term, 'born of woman', was used traditionally for all men. See Mußner, \textit{Galaterbrief}, p. 269.

\textsuperscript{37} Betz, \textit{Galatians}, p. 207: \textit{γίνεσθαι ἐκ} refers to birth of a human from a human mother; \textit{γίνεσθαι ὑπό} defines the conditions of a human being's existence.

\textsuperscript{38} Duncan, \textit{Galatians}, p. 129, rightly points out that the assumption of human nature meant coming under law. In connection with 3.13 does 4.4 support viewing the law as a cause of the curse? Schweizer, TDNT 8:383, sees 4.4 as a development of 3.13. Betz reads Schweizer to say that 3.13 is a development of 4.4, and does not think this plausible. In fact, Schweizer speaks of 3.13 as the outgrowth of an earlier tradition which thought of the sending of Jesus in terms of the incarnation, here developed by Paul into a statement about the sending in terms of substitutionary, death on the cross (3.13b). This thought was then further developed in 4.4. See Harvey, \textit{Constraints}, pp. 11-35, especially pp. 21-25. The key point is that Paul presses the traditions of the sending of the Son and redemption into the service of his argument against the law.

\textsuperscript{39} Mußner, \textit{Galaterbrief}, p. 255, points out that the phrase 'under law', with the accusative rather than the genitive, means the sphere or dominion of law. See Lightfoot, \textit{Galatians}, p. 168.

\textsuperscript{40} Borse, \textit{Galater}, p. 143. See Phil 2.7.
3.3. This being born under the law is here the same as becoming a curse,\textsuperscript{41} for with the mention of Christ's placement under law, Paul makes a connection with the context of his entire argument, in which promise is contrasted to law, blessing is contrasted to curse, and law and curse are placed together on the same side of things.\textsuperscript{42} What it meant for Jesus to be under the law Paul has already spelled out in Gal 3.13.\textsuperscript{43}

The similarity of thought between 3.13-14 and 4.4-5 is paralleled by the similarities in structure.\textsuperscript{44} The aor. part. \textit{γενέμενος} occurs in both 3.13 and 4.4, relating to Christ's becoming a curse, becoming human, and becoming (or getting) under law.\textsuperscript{45} The aor. verb \textit{ἐξαπορᾶω} speaks of Christ's redeeming from the curse (3.13) those under law (4.5).\textsuperscript{46} Parallel dependent purpose clauses show the results of Christ's becoming curse, human, and under law.\textsuperscript{47}

The Spirit is mentioned, the promise of which is received by faith (3.14), just as righteousness is by

\textsuperscript{41} Betz, Galatians, p. 151; Kramer, Christ, p. 25; Bruce, Galatians, p. 196.

\textsuperscript{42} Müßner, Galaterbrief, p. 270.

\textsuperscript{43} Lührmann, Galater, p. 69; Schlier, Galater, p. 196; Schlatter, Galater, p. 106; Oepke, Galater, p. 133.

\textsuperscript{44} Hooker, 'Interchange', p. 352.

\textsuperscript{45} Betz, Galatians, p. 150 n. 121, cites analogous formulations.

\textsuperscript{46} Büchsel, TDNT 1:126-128.

\textsuperscript{47} Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 140, 168.
faith (3.11; 2.16). The Spirit is sent by God (4.6), even as God sent the Son (4.4).\textsuperscript{48}

3.4. To be redeemed from under the law is to be redeemed from the curse of the law and bondage to the elements.\textsuperscript{49} Christ frees all people for whom sonship is effective by faith in him.\textsuperscript{50} Here Paul develops a traditional line of thought about the sending of the Son for the purpose of redemption.\textsuperscript{51} The sending of the Son is the arrival of the new age, 'the nodal point of salvation history...the divinely ordained epoch for the people of God to enter into their inheritance'.\textsuperscript{52}

The contrast between the old and the new is emphasized in 4.7: those who have received the status of sonship and the Spirit are no longer slaves but sons, and if sons then heirs. This status of sonship, or inheritance, is not by law but by promise (3.18). The contrast is sharpened by Paul's use of στοιχέω to indicate the new life: let us also walk (στοιχώμεν) by the Spirit (5.25); peace and mercy be upon all who walk (στοιχησομεν) by this rule (6.15). Being subject and in bondage to the elements

\textsuperscript{48} Barrett, Freedom, p. 113 n. 29, p. 114 n. 38.

\textsuperscript{49} Bruce, Galatians, p. 196.

\textsuperscript{50} Borse, Galater, p. 144.

\textsuperscript{51} Schweizer, TDNT, 8: 374; Rom 8.3f; Jn 3.16, 17; 1 Jn 4.9.

\textsuperscript{52} Bruce, Galatians, p. 194. Hooker, 'Interchange', pp. 351-352, sees this as an instance of interchange, as Christ enters into our experience in order that we might enter into his. The structure of 4.4 is parallel to 3.13.
(στοιχεῖα) is in opposition to living, walking, or corresponding (στοιχέω) to the characteristics of the new age.53

53 The present Jerusalem corresponds (συστοιχέω) to Hagar and Mt. Sinai in Arabia (4.25). The Hagar-Sarah contrast in 4.21-31 serves the same pattern of pairs of opposites and the theme of two aeons, discontinuous with one another. See Martyn, 'Antinomies', p. 418; Minear, 'World', p. 399; Barrett, 'Allegory', p. 164: Paul places Hagar, the slave woman, in the same category as Mt. Sinai, the place of the giving of the law. Both are in contrast to law-free Christian Isaacs.
4.2 PAUL'S SUMMATION

Gal 6.14-15 comes within the postscript of the letter, which 'serves as the peroratio or conclusio....It contains the interpretive clues to the understanding of Paul's major concerns in the letter as a whole and should be employed as the hermeneutical key to the intentions of the Apostle'.¹ V. 14 may thus be seen as a summary of Paul's position, and v. 15 states the consequences of v. 14. Paul speaks of 2 different worlds in Gal 6.14-15. The old world is that from which Paul has been separated by a three-fold crucifixion (6.14). The new world is that of which Paul speaks when he refers to the new creation (6.15b).²

1. The three crucifixions to which Paul alludes are those of Christ, the world, and Paul's own self.³ The latter two proceed from the first, and the first rules out glorying in either the world or the self. Paul glories only in the cross of Christ (6.14a).

By crucifixion of the world Paul does not mean: (1) the heavens, earth, or physical universe; (2) the earth as the stage of human history or the home of humankind; (3) outsiders to a religious community; (4) the realm of sin,

---

¹ Betz, Galatians, p. 313.
² Martyn, 'Antinomies' p. 412.
³ Minear, 'World', p. 396.
death, or unredeemed creation. What he does mean is 'etwa dasselbe wie σάρξ...'.

By crucifixion of his own self Paul seems to assert that the same is true for every believer. Paul's experience is a paradigm for all believers, and here he speaks to those who have not yet realized that crucifixion of their world and of self are realities derived from the crucifixion of Christ, even though they had expressed faith in Christ. The derivation of the crucifixions of

---

4 Minear, 'World', pp. 403-404.

5 Oepke, Galater, p. 203. Luther, Galatians, p. 249, took this crucifixion to the world to mean 'hatred of the world'. This is inadequate, as it does not explain what 'world' means. See Minear, 'World', pp. 395 and 397: '...the crucifixion of the world is an event that marks the total devaluation of both circumcision and uncircumcision. Kosmos is a realm where people set a high value on those distinctions. It is in the destruction of those distinctions that the new creation emerges. Where kosmos ends, καθενή κτίσις begins. The two are mutually exclusive realities.' On σάρξ see Jewett, Terms, p. 101, and 1.2 of this study. Sasse, TDNT 3:885-893, points out that because κόσμος refers not just to the universe as the sum of all created things, but to the world now estranged from its creator, the early Church did not use the word for the eternal world of eschatological hope. In Paul it is identified with αἰών ὁστος. In Gal 6.14 it is the epitome of unredeemed creation. Burton, Galatians, p. 514, refers to the κόσμος as, 'The mode of life which is characterized by earthly advantages, viewed as obstacles to righteousness: Gal 6.14...' For Paul, the advantages to which he was crucified included Israelite descent, circumcision, rank and dignity as a Pharisee, righteousness that is in the law. In 6.14 ἔμοι is emphatic by position: Paul's ground for καυχάσθαι was in 'the central fact of his gospel', the cross, in contrast to his Judaizer opponents, whose basis was in the flesh. Thus, flesh and world inform one another in 6.12-14, and 'world' as described above informs the use of στοιχεῖα.

6 On Paul as a paradigm see Eichholz, Paulus, p. 224; Betz, Galatians, p. 122.

7 Minear, 'World', p. 396.
the world and the self from the crucifixion of Christ is implicit in the use of the verb ἐσταθρωτα in 6.14b:

The tense of the verb is perfect: though occurring in the past, presumably at the time of Christ's death, that past action still determines the present situation. The voice of the verb is passive: the two entities (the kosmos, I) have been acted upon. Neither the world nor the self has initiated its own crucifixion.⁸

Gal 6.12-13 shows that for people to whom the world has not yet been crucified, circumcision retains its earlier significance. 6.11-16 provides a composite profile of the cosmos which has been crucified to Paul: (1) this cosmos is characterized positively by a reliance on circumcision, the flesh, the law, and the covenant community which was bound by those standards; (2) this cosmos is constituted negatively by its opposition to new creation, avoidance of persecution for the sake of Christ, rejection of 'the Israel of God' which walks by this rule.⁹

The Israel of which Paul speaks in 6.16 is to be identified with the new creation. It is not continuous, but is discontinuous, with the Israel of Judaism.¹⁰ Thus,

---

⁸ Minear, 'World', p. 396. We note the similarity to the verb in 2.19. See Cousar, Galatians, p. 61. Minear, by relating ἐσταθρωτα to 'the time of Christ's death', gives the death of Christ a representative quality, similar to that expressed in 2 Cor 5.14: 'one has died for all, therefore all have died.' This interpretation sheds light on συνανταθρωμα in 2.19.

⁹ Minear, 'World', p. 398.

¹⁰ Davies, Paul (1948), p. 119, shows that the concept of new creation is rooted in Judaism and rabbinic thought, where it refers to making a proselyte for Judaism. Although this may be the source of Paul's terminology, he uses it in Gal 6.16 as the antithesis of circumcision, and hence not for the sake of continuity with old Israel.
'...in the new creation the boundary between Jew and Gentile has been obliterated. We can safely infer that wherever that boundary becomes obsolete, the sovereignty of that kosmos has been terminated'.

2. Between his references to the old cosmos (6.14b) and the new creation (6.15b) Paul places a statement about circumcision, 'the sign par excellence of observance of the Law'. The neither-nor statement in v. 15a is of the same form as Gal 5.6 and 1 Cor 7.19, both of which references negate any significance to either περιτομή or ἀκροβυτισμός. Since there is no necessary validity to either of these categories, '...that to which Paul denies real existence is, in the technical sense of the expression, a pair of opposites, what Aristotle might have called an instance of ῥάμαντια'. It was a widely held belief in the ancient world that such pairs of opposites were the fundamental building blocks of the cosmos. This is the pattern of thought that Paul seems to presuppose in these verses. This pattern was likely known in some form by the Galatians. The use which Paul makes of this theory is to deny real existence to a pair of opposites in order to emphasize that the old cosmos has suffered its death. Paul has frequently spoken of pairs of opposites

11 Minear, 'World', p. 399.

12 Martyn, 'Antinomies', p. 413. The key issue in 6.13-16 is the Galatians' willingness to accept circumcision.

13 Martyn, 'Antinomies', p. 413.
throughout the letter. These include the God-human pair in 1.1 and 1.10, flesh-cross in 6.13-14, flesh-Spirit in 3.3 and 5.16-24, law-faith in 3.2-4 (see 2.16), opposing adverbs (ἐθνικός-Ἰουδαϊκός) in 2.14, opposing datives in 2.19. In 6.13-16, however, Paul asserts that the world defined by the pair, circumcision-uncircumcision, has been crucified to Paul and Paul to it. Three other examples of literature may be cited to show reference to pairs of opposites as fundamental to ancient world cosmology.

2.1. Aristotle spoke of the ῥανανγία, the contraries, in describing the polarities which constitute existence. This Pythagorean theory holds that these contraries are both (1) the first or fundamental principle, by which life is governed, and (2) the matter of which things are made. Aristotle lists ten principles, recognized by the Pythagorean philosophers as a series of corresponding pairs (κατὰ συστολίαν). Heraclitus had also spoken of opposites, which in their combinations formed the world’s unity. Because of cosmic justice dominating all things,

14 Martyn, ‘Antinomies’, pp. 414, 423 n. 15. On the opposition of dying to-living to in 2.19 see 2.1 of the present study.

15 Aristotle, Metaphysics I:986a.

16 Ross, Aristotle I:142. This same double nuance could be important for Paul’s use of στοιχεῖα in Gal 4.3, 9. The key factor is that they are the elements of the world.

17 The list of ten paired opposites includes: limit-unlimited; odd-even; one-plurality; right-left; male-female; at rest-in motion; straight-crooked; light-darkness; good-evil; square-oblong.
the strife between the opposites never issues in the complete victory of one over the other. The world's unity results from this diversity, as opposites continue in tension. 18 These contraries (τάναντια) are first principles, the principles of everything, that upon which the nature of all other things is modelled. First among such principles are numbers. The elements (στοιχεῖα) of the numbers are thus assumed to be the elements of everything: τὰ τῶν ἄριστων στοιχεία τῶν οὐσιῶν στοιχεία πάντων ὑπέλαβον εἰναὶ. 19 The στοιχεῖα are the particular sides of the contraries and a series of corresponding pairs was called συστοιχίαν. 20

2.2. Philo of Alexandria also speaks of both human nature and the nature of the universe as being mixed and constituted of opposing powers. In the case of the human soul the opposites vie with one another for control, and the soul that attains to the characteristics of the positive side gains immortality:

Into every soul at its birth there enter two powers, the salutary and the destructive.... These powers are not to be identified with the two chief powers or attributes of God.... They correspond more closely to the good and evil cosmic powers, identified with good and bad angels (or demons) respectively.... But the nation is a mixture of both (these powers), from


19 Aristotle, Metaphysics I: 986a, 1-3.

20 Aristotle, Metaphysics I: 986a, 24.
which the heavens and the entire world as a whole have received this mixture....

Furthermore, Philo comments on Gen 15.10, and maintains that Scripture teaches this theory of the composition of the world:

... the Scripture leads us on to the knowledge of opposites, by telling us that 'He placed the sections facing opposite each other' (Gen xv.10). For in truth we may take it that everything in the world is by nature opposite to something else.

Philo then lists some of the opposites, including corporeal-incorporeal; living-lifeless; mortal-immortal; beginning-end; life-death; justice-injustice; law-lawlessness. Then he explains: '... the two opposites together form a single whole, by the division of which the opposites are known.' Philo also asserts the priority of Moses to Heraclitus on this teaching, as he states: '... it was Moses who long ago discovered the truth that opposites are formed from the same whole, to which they stand in the relation of sections or divisions.' Finally, Philo relates the positive side of moral opposites to life, the negative side to death:

'Befold, I have given before thy face life and death, good and evil (Deut XXX.15). Accordingly, thou wisest of Teachers, goodness and virtue is life, evil and wickedness is death. Again, elsewhere: 'This is thy life and length of days, to love the Lord thy God (Deut XXX.20). ' This is a most noble definition of deathless life, to be possessed by a love of God and

21 Philo, Questions and Answers on Exodus, 23.
22 Philo, Who Is the Heir?, 207.
23 Philo, Who Is the Heir?, 213.
a friendship for God with which flesh and body have no concern.\textsuperscript{25}

Philo thus makes use of the Pythagorean tradition of opposites, ascribes it to Moses, and uses it in the exposition of Scripture.\textsuperscript{26}

2.3. The same cognizance of opposites is also found in the Old Testament. The light and darkness of Gen 1.3-5 are both the results of God's creative work (see Amos 5.18-20). Amos 3.6 ascribes evil to God's doing and a similar thought occurs in Job's response to his wife's advice to curse God and die: 'Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?' (2.10b; see also 42.11). These two pairs occur together in Isa 45.7: 'I form light and create darkness, I make weal and create woe, I am the Lord, who do all these things.' The verse is within a section (44.24-45.13) which tells of the commission of Cyrus, the Lord's 'anointed' (45.1), who although not a member of the covenant people, is an instrument in God's hands, whom God will accordingly give success: 'I gird you, though you do not know me' (45.56). Cyrus, a non-believer, as well as both good and evil, are seen here by the prophet as subject to God's supremacy: 'In Israelite thought nothing, not even evil and darkness, could be removed from the dominion of Yahweh.'\textsuperscript{27} The work of Cyrus is thus a manifestation of God's power, and

\textsuperscript{25} Philo, \textit{On Flight and Finding}, 58.

\textsuperscript{26} See Wolfson, \textit{Philo}, 1:334ff.

\textsuperscript{27} McKenzie, \textit{Second Isaiah}, p. 77.
history itself is a mingling of light and darkness, good and evil, all reflecting God's creative power and God's will. Israel's view of life and life's mixture of opposites are lodged in Israel's thoroughgoing monotheism. Thus, for Israel the pairs of opposites are real and under God's rule.

3. This theory of pairs of opposites, widespread in the ancient world, is that of which Paul makes use in a very specific way: the old cosmos has been crucified; life can no longer be defined in terms of the old pairs of opposites. New pairs now prevail. Paul's teaching at this point is not about the failure of Judaism, but about the death of the world, whose old structures are gone for believers in Christ. Among the Galatian churches the old definitional structure whose demise Paul asserts is the particular pair of opposites, circumcision-uncircumcision. Gal 3.27-28 and the pairs contained there is also to be seen in this same way: the old world had pairs of opposites, but the New Creation, marked by anthropological unity in Christ, is not defined in the same way. That is, the new world does not have the same pairs of opposites.

28 Bright, *Kingdom of God*, p. 24: 'Whether the Israelite... denied that other gods existed is a point that has occasioned much debate.' For our purposes the question need not be settled. No pantheon surrounded Yahweh. Yahweh created without assistance or intermediary, and alone rules over all things. See McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, p. 78, and Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, pp. 161-162.

And yet there are certain pairs of opposites that not only have not departed, but which were established by God's new creative act in Christ. In Gal 5.16-17 Paul speaks of Spirit and flesh as corresponding to the new aeon and old aeon, respectively. In 5.17 Paul uses ἀντίκειται following ταύτα (emphatic): these are opposed to one another. That is, Spirit and flesh are opposed, not law and flesh. ③ It may be conjectured that Paul's opponents had been teaching that the evil impulse must be opposed and checked by the law. For them the fleshly impulse and the law would have constituted a pair of opposites, with the law being the antidote to the evil impulse. ③¹

Not every branch of early Christianity came under influence by Paul, and subsequent to him there were

③ Schweizer, TDNT 6:424-431, notes that πνεῦμα signifies the new existence, the new existence is that which is related to the Redeemer, and it is not merely the preliminary sign of that which is to come but is new existence as such. He also notes that: (1) πνεῦμα is in contrast to σάρξ, 3.3; (2) σάρξ is parallel to ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου, 3.2,5, while πνεῦμα parallels ἐξ ἀκοής πίστεως; (3) ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννήθεις is opposed to ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα, 4.23, 29; (4) the person is the battlefield of the two powers, 5.17; (5) ἀγάπη is life in the Spirit, which is life freed from the σάρξ; it is faith at work, 5.6; (6) to live according to the Spirit is to live in freedom from νόμος, and wholly by Χριστός, χάρις, σταυρός, 5.19-23; (7) σάρξ (5.13,16ff), νόμος (5.2-4, 18), περιτομή (5.6, 11), δούλεια (5.1), interpret one another on one side, while πνεῦμα (5.5, 16-18), Χριστός (5.2-4), χάρις (5.4), σταυρός (5.11) ἀγάπη (5.6, 13) ἐλευθερία (5.1, 13) interpret one another on the other side. Therefore, Schweizer, p. 424, says: '... the event which had been the decisive stumbling-block for Paul could now be regarded as the decisive event of salvation. This was the cross.' See also Schlier, Galater, p. 250.

③¹ Martyn, 'Antinomies', p. 416.
churches that had not done away with works, did not trust their salvation to faith alone with the same energy as he had, and had not undergone a radical break with Judaism. The letter of James originated on such soil, and in such thought and literature the law is seen as the means for overcoming the evil impulse or the flesh. James belongs in the broad category of wisdom teaching for which the person who attains wisdom is the person who observes the law. Such a person is the one who overcomes the fleshly impulse, or evil inclination. The person who overcomes the \( \pi\nu\varepsilon\theta\mu\alpha \) is 'above all a doer of the law, which is the law of freedom from the yeser (1.22-25)'.

For Paul it is the Holy Spirit that is opposed to the flesh. There is nothing distinctively Christian about the usage here (nor throughout the NT) of \( \pi\nu\varepsilon\theta\mu\alpha \), except that it is related to Jesus Christ, and the pattern of death and resurrection. As such the Spirit becomes the instrumentality of right conduct and of life, and to walk by the Spirit (Gal 5.16) or to be led by the Spirit (5.18) stands in opposition to walking, living, or being according to the flesh. Orientation to the flesh is signified by circumcision (5.3). It is to be 'under the

---

32 Dibelius, James, pp. 118-119.

33 Marcus, 'The Evil Inclination in the Epistle of James', pp. 606-621; here, p. 620. See Martyn, 'Mission'. The roots of this concept are in Rabbinic theology, which speaks both of God as having created the evil impulse and then giving the law as an antidote to it, so that the words of the law are likened to a medicine of life. See Baba Batra 16a, and Kiddushin 30b, in Montefiore and Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology, pp. 295-296.
law' (5.18). Flesh and spirit are contrasting powers, demonic and divine, respectively. The fleshly impulse is opposed not by the law, but by the Spirit. The flesh and the law are a pair of opposites of the old order, not a pair which has totally disappeared but which has been realigned so as to stand together opposed by the Spirit.

For Paul the new age is characterized by the three connected realities of the Son, the Spirit, and faith. When the time of the rule of law had come to its completion, according to God's discretion, then God sent the Son: ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεός τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (4.4). Corresponding to this decision of God is ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεός τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (4.6), with the double action of God and the relation of Spirit to the Son signified by the repeated use of the verb. The role of the law was only 'until faith should be revealed' (3.23), and the revealing of faith corresponds to the coming of Christ. This again indicates that by 'faith' Paul means faith in Christ.

The presence of the Spirit and of faith are connected to the coming of Christ, that is, to God's new creative

---


35 Martyn, 'Antinomies', p. 416.

36 Burton, Galatians, pp. 216-217, 221; Rengstorff, TDNT 1:406.

37 Gal 3.24 reads εἰς Χριστόν, the sense of which is governed by πρὸ in v. 23 and οὐκέτι in v. 25. See Räisänen, Paul (1983), p. 57; Betz, Galatians, p. 178.
act in the Son. The opposition of Spirit to flesh is grounded in this new creative act, not in God's creative act at the beginning. Paul shows a discontinuity with what has gone before, as Christ is 'the God-given alternative to everything that has gone wrong since Adam'. Paul's thinking at this point is of a piece with apocalyptic theology, wherein God's future could only be discontinuous with the present (i.e., old) order. The theme of two aeons therefore becomes fundamental, as the present order is not hospitable to divine presence, God is radically transcendent, and knowledge of God and the true situation depends on apocalypse, on revelation as alternative and disjuncture. Paul can therefore say that for Gentiles to accept circumcision, and so be obligated to obey the whole law (5.3), amounts to a relapse to the former situation of bondage which was characteristic of the human situation 'before faith came' (3.23).

Beker contends that Paul's gospel is apocalyptic 'because it looks forward to the final triumph of God in Christ over all those powers...that resist his redemptive purpose'. Keck rightly responds,

40 Keck, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Theology', p. 234.
41 Keck, 'Apocalyptic', pp. 234-237.
Suffice it to say that Paul's theology... is apocalyptic not because it includes 'vindication, universalism, dualism and imminence' - some of these categories apply also to other theologies - but because it shares with apocalyptic theology the perspective of discontinuity. Over against all theologies which see continuity between God and world (whether focused on nature or on the history of a people) Paul sees disjunction. God and the redemptive future stand over against the world and its history, including the history of Israel (Rom 9-11) and the future of the church (1 Cor 10.1-22).\textsuperscript{43}

Paul's unique and creative grasp of the meaning of the Christ event transformed Christian tradition and experience, as well as former apocalyptic theologies. He saw the dawn of the new creation in God's sending of the Son. In Gal 3.23 Paul connects the coming of faith with the revealing of faith, even as he previously spoke of the revealing of the Son (1.16) in contrast to his own former life (1.13-14). Even so the cosmos in which Paul previously lived met its end in the apocalypse of Jesus Christ (1.12, 16; 6.14). This apocalypse was also the birth of Paul's gospel mission (1.16), in which he asserted that flesh, law, and bondage are aligned together, in opposition to Spirit, the Son, and faith.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{43} Keck, 'Apocalyptic', p. 241. Beker, Apocalyptic, pp. 30-53, speaks of vindication, universalism, dualism, and imminence as, 'The Basic Structure of Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel'. But none of these categories distinguish the new era from the present age, as Keck's view more appropriately does.

\textsuperscript{44} Martyn, 'Antinomies', p. 417; Keck, 'Apocalyptic', p. 241; Minear, 'World', p. 406.
The law is not arraigned against the flesh, but is aligned with it, and therefore also with death. This is the context and summary for what Paul means when he says in Gal 4.4 that Christ was born under law. It was bound to bring death to him, even as the law brought death to Paul (2.19).
Summary

In 4.1-11 Paul uses guardian and trustee terminology, parallel to the custodian and prison warden of 3.22-26, to speak of that from which the believer is free. The believer, or heir, has now come of age and with the sending of Christ and giving of the Spirit has received the full inheritance. The common situation of Gentiles under the elementary teachings and Jews under the law has thus ended with the old aeon's passage. Believers now know God in Christ and have gained the status of sonship through him. Paul's argument is that we were slaves to the elements as long as we were children, and such slavery was dependent on being children. We were children until the time set by the father. That time has now been fulfilled. With the fulfillment God sent the Son to be under the condition of law.

Gal 4.4 and 3.13 must be understood together. The law brings curse to those who would live by it (3.10) even as it brought curse to Jesus, who became a curse (3.13). For Jesus to be born as a human being meant for him to be under the condition of law (4.4). To be under the law meant for him to become a curse. This three-fold description (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμου, γενόμενος κατάρα) indicates both the nature of human life in the world and the nature of the work of the law. When Christ redeemed us from the curse it was redemption from
the law and freedom from the elements to which we were formerly subject. The elements have to do with the world. To that world Paul has been crucified, and therefore he is dead to it and free from it. The era of the rule of the law is over for those who have died to the law (2.19).

In Gal 6:14-15 Paul speaks of the crucifixion of the world to him, and of himself to the world, as realities proceeding from the crucifixion of Christ. By crucifixion of the world Paul means the old world as characterized by circumcision and the flesh. Behind Paul's neither-nor statement in 6.15a lies his short list of pairs of opposites in 5.6. This common ancient view of defining the world by pairs of opposites is a device Paul uses to explicate his view that the old aeon has ended in the Christ-event, and with it has thus also ended all necessity of imposing the law on those who are in Christ. Paul thus points to a radical discontinuity between the old world and the new creation, and between law, flesh, circumcision on the one side, and Christ, faith, and freedom on the other. In the sense of this discontinuity between old and new, Paul's gospel is apocalyptic.

Paul's crucifixion to the world (6.14) corresponds to his dying to the law (2.19). His dying to the world happened on the cross of Christ, through which (6ε' ὁ ἄνωθεν, 6ε' ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἄνωθε

1 Reicke, 'Law', pp. 259-265. Reicke, p. 262, would identify the elements of 4.3, 9 with the angels of 3.19. It is likely, however, that Paul simply wants to establish distance between God's giving the promise directly and the law being given indirectly.
6.14) Paul's crucifixion to the world also occurred, and in which Paul's death was also included. Christ's cross, by which the old world, law and flesh came to an end, was an inclusive event: in it, or by it, Paul also died to the law and to the world. Gal 6.14 thus informs our understanding of 'crucified with' and 'to the law' in 2.19.
CONCLUSION

The saying, 'I died through the law', in Gal 2.19 is best understood as asserting that death with Christ occurred when Christ died on the cross, under law, and law is the source or originator of such death. It is death in a particular relationship, namely, that to the law. Three essential elements of Paul's argument in Galatians support this understanding.

1. What has motivated Paul's argument in the first place is the move by his opponents in Galatia to impose certain conditions of the law on Gentile converts to faith in Christ. These conditions include circumcision, table rules, and calendar piety. But from these specific conditions, or works of the law, Paul generalizes to argue against the whole law or the law as such. And yet what is constant in his argument is the sense of law as the condition(s) which his opponents would impose. The question thus relates directly to the daily life of the individual and to the life of the church. Under what condition can the life of faith be lived? That is, on what grounds is one justified in relation to God? Or to put it another way, what is it that defines the identity of the person of faith and of the church? Paul's answer is, 'Not by (works or condition of) law, but by faith in Jesus Christ'.
2. Paul identifies being under the law as being under curse. Christ's was an accursed death, as Christ became a curse for us. Law cannot grant life. Only the redemptive death of Christ grants life. Christ's death under the curse of law is the result of the law's work on Christ. It strengthens Paul's argument that the curse of law brings death when he omits the phrase, 'by God', from the Deut 21.23 quotation. This he understands in relation to Jesus' death on the cross. This omission distances God from the cursing power of law, and lays the power to curse, and the resulting death, on the law itself.

3. Paul connects this sense of law as curse-bringer and as death-bringer with the idea of slavery under the elements of the world to speak of the inclusive situation of all people. He connects the situation of all people (in need of redemption) with the birth of Jesus under the law. As there was the purposive statement regarding Christ's becoming a curse so that the blessing might come upon the Gentiles, so also there is a purposive redemption statement attached to the idea of Christ's birth under law so that he might save those who are under law. The same christological structure governs both the statement about death under curse and birth under law.

In Galatians Paul does not make law simply an agent of sin, as he does in Romans. In fact, in Galatians the law produces transgressions. The law in Galatians is therefore related in a somewhat reverse way to sin, in contrast to Romans. In Romans death is the effect of
which sin is the cause, and law is in the service of the power of sin. In Galatians sin is the effect of which law is the cause. The same is true for death in Galatians, as there it is caused by the law. Christ's death under law is the paradigm for death to and through the law, that is, under law, for Paul and for every believer.

So Paul holds before us the cross of Christ as God's all-sufficient and final act of redemption. The cross has superseded the law, and all other conditions of which it is a representative, and by which it might be thought that life is granted and defined. 'The new does not appear from a collection of the elements of the old which are still alive....The new is created not out of the old, not out of the best of the old, but out of the death of the old.'

New life in the new age comes only by this supersession, through participation and inclusion in the cross of Christ. His life, death, and faithfulness are the turning point of the ages and are paradigms of Christian existence. Another who lived four centuries after Jesus and Paul understood faith in this way, and prayed as Christians today may also pray to the God who is both sender and mitigator of the cross:

δ θεός τῶν παρακελμένων σταυρῶν,
βοήθησον τὸν δολού σου.  


2 'O God of the crosses that are at hand, Come to the aid of your servant.' Fourth century Christian prayer, P Oxy VII. 1058, in Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p. 586.
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