

I. Epistolary Prescript

1:1-5

- 1:1a A. Name and title of the principle sender
- 1:1b B. Definition of the title "apostle"
1. Negatively: "not from men, nor through man"
 2. Positively: "but through Jesus Christ and God the Father"
 3. Interpretation of "through" by a christological statement: "who raised him from the dead"
- 1:2a C. Stating of co-senders
- 1:2b D. Naming of the addressees
- 1:3-4 E. Salutation
1. The salutation
 2. Interpretation of "Lord Jesus Christ"
 - a. A christological statement (formula of self-sacrifice): "who gave himself for our sins"
 - b. Two soteriological statements
 - 1) With regard to Christ's death: "to deliver us from the present evil age"
 - 2) With regard to God's will: "according to the will of our God and Father"
- 1:5 F. A doxology, with the concluding "amen"

II. Exordium

1:6-11

- 1:6-7 A. The statement of the *causa*
- 1:6 1. A preliminary, ironic statement of the cause
- 1:7a 2. A self-correction
- 1:7b 3. A corrected restatement of the cause
- 1:8-9 B. The issuing of a double curse
- 1:8 1. Issuing of a conditional curse
- 1:9a 2. Formula of repetition
- 1:9b 3. Reissuing of the curse
- 1:10-11 C. The *transitus* or *transgressio*
- 1:10 1. A denial in form of two rhetorical questions (v 10ab) and a hypothetical conclusion (v 10c)
- 1:11 2. An introduction of the point of contention of the following "statement of facts" (1:12-2:14)
3. Address: "brothers"

III. Narratio

1:12-2:14

- 1:12 A. Thesis to be demonstrated in the "statement of facts"

- 1:12a 1. Negatively: "For I did not receive it [sc. the gospel] from (a) man, nor was I taught it..."
- 1:12b 2. Positively: "but [I received it] through a revelation of Jesus Christ."
- 1:13-24 B. First part: From Paul's birth to the mission in Asia Minor
- 1:13-14 1. Paul's conduct as a Jew before his conversion to the Christian faith
- 1:13a a. Reference to information known to the Galatians: "You have heard..."
- 1:13b b. Reference to Paul's persecution of the Church
- 1:14 c. Reference to Paul's standing in Judaism
- 1:15-17 2. Paul's conduct as a Christian from his conversion to Christianity to his visit with Cephas at Jerusalem
- 1:15a a. Reference to Paul's election by God
- 1:15b-16 b. Reference to Paul's vocation by God
- 1:15b 1) The vocation by God
- 1:16a 2) The revelation of Christ in Paul
- 1:16b 3) The commission
- 1:16c-17 c. Reference to Paul's conduct immediately following his conversion
- 1:16c 1) No conferring "with flesh and blood"
- 1:17a 2) No visiting with the other apostles in Jerusalem
- 1:17b-c 3) The journey to Arabia and the return to Damascus
- 1:18-19 (20) 3. Paul's first visit in Jerusalem
- 1:18a a. Reference to time period prior to the visit in Jerusalem
- 1:18b b. Reference to person visited
- 1:19 c. Reference to length of visit
- d. Additional remark about persons visited
- 1) Denial of visits with other apostles
- 2) Exception: visit with James
- 1:20 e. Oath: affirmation of the truth
- 1:21 4. Paul's conduct after the visit in Jerusalem: the beginning of the mission in Syria and Cilicia
- 1:22-24 5. Evaluation of Paul's relationship with the churches in Judea
- 1:22 a. Statement of the fact that he is unknown to them personally

Introduction

- 1:23a b. Statement of the fact that he is known to them by word of mouth
- 1:23b c. Citation of information concerning Paul which is circulating among the churches of Judea
- 1:24 d. Statement of their positive reaction to Paul's missionary activity
- 2:6c (a) The nature of their status
- (b) The present argumentative value of their status
- 2:6c (2) Theological reason for the previous conclusion: citation of theological "dogma."
- 2:1-10 C. Second part: Paul's second visit in Jerusalem
- 2:1-2a 1. Reference to facts concerning the journey
- 2:1a a. Reference to time period preceding the journey
- 2:1b b. Reference to the members of the delegation
- 2:2a c. Reference to the cause of the journey: a revelation
- 2:2b-10 2. Actions taken by Paul at the meeting in Jerusalem
- 2:2b-d a. Reference to the presentation of his gospel
- 2:2b 1) In a plenary assembly (?)
- 2:2c 2) In a separate meeting with the authorities
- 2:2d 3) Statement of the purpose of the presentation
- 2:3 b. Reference to his confrontation with his opponents
- 1) Statement of the outcome: Paul's victory
- 2) Naming of the evidence: Titus remained uncircumcised
- 2:4-5 c. Digression (anacoluthon)
- 2:4 1) Characteristic of the opponents
- 2:4a a) Paul's name for the opponents ("false brothers")
- 2:4b b) Their activities
- 2:4c c) Their goal
- 2:5 2) Paul's reaction to the opponents
- 2:5a a) Affirmation of his unbending resistance
- 2:5b b) His goal
- 2:6-10 d. Reference to the encounter with the "authorities"
- 2:6 1) Characterization of the "authorities"
- 2:6a a) Paul's name for the "authorities" ("men of eminence")
- 2:6b-c b) his evaluation of the name "men of eminence" (parenthesis)
- 2:6b (1) His evaluation of their status
- 2:6d-10 2) Statement of the results of the encounter
- 2:6d a) Negatively: no demands were made upon Paul
- 2:7-9 b) Positively: the validity of his gospel was officially recognized
- 2:7 (1) Naming of the reason for the recognition
- 2:7a (a) Type of reason: theological insight
- 2:7b (b) Content of the insight
- 2:8 (2) Summary of the agreement of recognition (citation of a quasi-legal formula?)
- 2:9 (3) Formal act concluding the agreement
- 2:9a (a) Statement of the theological reason for the agreement
- 2:9b-c (b) Naming of the persons on the Jerusalem side
- 2:9b a. Their names
- 2:9c β. Their titles
- 2:9d (c) Legal handshake
- 2:9e (d) Naming of the persons on the Gentile Christian side
- 2:9-10 a. Their names
- [β. No titles!]
- (e) summary of the agreement to divide the mission (citation of a quasi-legal formula?)
- 2:10 c) Supplement: an additional agreement
- 2:10a-b (1) Concession that an additional demand was made
- 2:10a (a) Limitation to one such demand
- 2:10b (b) Implicit explanation that the concession is immaterial as far as the present argument is concerned

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | cerned: it was the "collection for the poor." | |
| 2:10c | (2) Affirmation of Paul's present concern to comply with the additional agreement (does he imply that only this part is still in force?) | |
| 2:11-14 | D. Third part: the conflict at Antioch | |
| 2:11 | 1. Reference to the facts concerning the incident | |
| 2:11a | a. Reference to the occasion of the incident | |
| | b. Reference to the name of the person causing the incident | |
| 2:11b | c. Reference to the action taken by Paul | |
| 2:11c | d. Reference to the reason for Paul's action | |
| 2:12-14 | 2. Account and evaluation of the incident | |
| 2:12 | a. Account of Cephas' conduct | |
| 2:12a | 1) Before the arrival of the "men from James" | |
| 2:12b | 2) Change of his conduct after the arrival of the "men from James" | |
| 2:12c | 3) Reason for his change of conduct | |
| 2:13 | b. Account of the other Jews' conduct | |
| 2:13a | 1) Their complicity with Cephas' change of conduct | |
| 2:13b | 2) The effect upon Barnabas, and his change of conduct | |
| | 3) The reason for Barnabas' change of conduct | |
| 2:14 | c. Account of Paul's confrontation with Cephas | |
| 2:14a | 1) Paul's theological evaluation of the conduct of the Jewish Christians opposed to him | |
| 2:14b | 2) Statement of his public opposition to Cephas | |
| 2:14c | 3) Statement of Cephas' self-contradiction (a 'dilemma' in form of a question) | |
| | a) Protasis, stating Cephas' religious status in Judaism and his non-Jewish way of life | |
| | b) Apodosis, stating Cephas' demand upon the Gentile Christians as a contradiction of his own conduct | |
| IV. Propositio | | |
| 2:15-21 | A. The point of agreement: the doctrine of justification by faith | |
| 2:15-16 | 1. A self-definition of Jewish Christians as Jews | |
| 2:15 | a. Self-designation as "Jews" | |
| | b. Stating the basis for being Jews: "birth" | |
| | c. Stating their distinctiveness in contrast to non-Jews ("not 'sinners' from the Gentiles") | |
| 2:16a | 2. A self-definition of Jewish Christians as Christians: Stating the basis for being Christians | |
| | a. Naming the type of basis: "theological conviction" | |
| | b. Stating the content of the theological conviction | |
| | 1) A negative eschatological judgment about man | |
| | 2) An exception to that negative judgment | |
| 2:16b-c | c. Stating the consequence of the theological conviction | |
| 2:16b | 1) Reference of the past act of becoming Christian believers | |
| 2:16c | 2) Statement of the purpose of becoming Christian believers | |
| 2:16d | d. Citation of the theological presupposition, with an allusion to Scripture | |
| 2:17-18 | B. The point of disagreement: the consequence for Gentile Christians | |
| 2:17 | 1. Hypothetical statement of the consequence for the Gentile Christians | |
| 2:17a.1 | a. First (correct) presupposition | |
| 2:17a.2 | b. Second (false) presupposition | |
| 2:17b | c. (False) inference | |
| 2:17c | d. Rejection of the false argument | |
| 2:18 | 2. Critique of the second (false) presupposition | |
| 2:18a | a. Implied presupposition of a legal definition (the definition is cited in Rom 4:15b) | |
| | b. Application of the definition to the present case | |
| | 1) Statement of present hypothetical presuppositions | |
| | a) Reference to previous action: "I have dissolved" | |
| | b) Reference to present reversal of the previous action: "I establish again" | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---------|---|
| 2:18b | 2) Conclusion from the preceding hypothetical presuppositions | 3:8-13 | 3. The proofs of the thesis |
| | | 3:8-9 | a. First proof: an interpretation of the "blessing of Abraham" |
| 2:19-20 | C. The exposition | | 1) Statement of the hermeneutical method |
| 2:19a | 1. First theological thesis | 3:8a | 2) Explanation of the relationship between Abraham and the doctrine of the Gentiles' justification by faith |
| 2:19b | 2. Second theological thesis | | 3) Quotation of the "blessing of Abraham" from "tradition" |
| 2:20a | 3. Third theological thesis | 3:8b | 4) The exegetical conclusion |
| 2:20b | 4. Fourth theological thesis | | b. Second proof: the negative side of the first proof |
| 2:21 | D. The refutation | | 1) Exegetical conclusion |
| 2:21a | 1. Denial of an accusation | 3:8c | 2) Quotation from Scripture |
| 2:21b-c | 2. Stating of the reason why the accusation is false | | a) Quotation formula |
| 2:21b | a. Hypothetical (false) presupposition | 3:9 | b) Quotation of Deut 27:26 |
| 2:21c | b. Hypothetical (false) conclusion | 3:10 | c. Third proof: the Jewish Torah does not lead to justification before God |
| | | 3:10a | 1) Exegetical conclusion |
| | | 3:10b | 2) Quotation of Hab 2:4 |
| | | | d. Fourth proof: the Jewish Torah is not based on faith |
| | | | 1) Exegetical conclusion |
| | | | 2) Quotation of Lev 18:5 |
| | | | e. Fifth proof: an interpretation of the crucifixion of Christ |
| | | | 1) Exegetical conclusion: citation of christological dogma |
| | | | 2) Quotation from Scripture |
| | | | a) Quotation formula |
| | | | b) Quotation of Deut 21:23 |
| | | | 4. The results of the arguments in 3:1-13 |
| | | | a. First result |
| | | | b. Second result |
| | | | C. The third argument: an argument from common human practice |
| | | | 1. Address of the Galatians: "brothers" |
| | | | 2. Statement of method |
| | | | 3. An illustration from the practice of the law |
| | | | 4. Application of the illustration to Scripture: Abraham tradition and Sinai tradition |
| | | | a. Quotation of the Abraham tradition |
| | | | b. Interpretation of the Abraham tradition |
| | | | 1) Explanation of the phrase "and to your seed" as not referring to a plurality but to a |
| V. Probatio | | | |
| 3:1-4:31 | A. The first argument: an argument of undisputable evidence | | |
| 3:1-5 | 1. An ironic <i>captatio benevolentiae</i> | 3:11 | |
| 3:1 | a. An ironic address | | |
| 3:1a | b. An ironic, rhetorical question | 3:11a | |
| 3:1b | 2. An <i>interrogatio</i> of the addressees | 3:11b | |
| 3:2-5 | a. First step: the question of the evidence | 3:12 | |
| 3:2 | 1) An introductory dialogical device | 3:12a | |
| 3:2a | 2) A question eliciting the evidence from the addressees | 3:12b | |
| 3:2b | [3] The answer, because self-evident, is not stated] | 3:13 | |
| | b. An ironic, rhetorical question | 3:13a | |
| 3:3a | c. Second step: the question of theological consistency | 3:13b | |
| 3:3b | 1) A question in the form of a chiasmic antitheton | | |
| | [2] The answer is left open] | 3:14 | |
| | d. A <i>dubitatio</i> | 3:14a | |
| 3:4 | 1) A rhetorical question | 3:14b | |
| 3:4a | 2) An exclamation | 3:15-18 | |
| 3:4b | e. Third step: the question of the Galatians' experience | 3:15a | |
| 3:5 | 1) A question, stating Paul's first argument as a dilemma for the Galatians | 3:15b | |
| | [2] The answer is left open] | 3:16-17 | |
| 3:6-14 | B. The second argument: an argument from Scripture | | |
| 3:6 | 1. Quotation of the authoritative passage from Scripture | 3:16a | |
| 3:6a | a. Quotation formula | 3:16b-c | |
| 3:6b | b. Quotation of Gen 15:6 | | |
| 3:7 | 2. The exegetical thesis | 3:16b | |
| 3:7a | a. Introductory dialogical device | | |
| 3:7b | b. Statement of the thesis | | |

| | | | |
|---------|--|-----------|--|
| 3:16c | unity 2) Identification of the unity with "Christ" | 3:26-4:11 | E. The fourth argument: an argument from Christian tradition |
| 3:17 | c. Quotation of the Sinai tradition | 3:26-28 | 1. A "macarism," probably quoted from the baptismal liturgy and serving here as a "reminder" of the self-understanding of the addressees |
| 3:17a | 1) Statement of intention | | |
| 3:17b | 2) Quotation of the Sinai tradition | 3:26 | a. Declaration and definition of the addressees as "sons of God" (status before God) |
| 3:17c | d. Meaning of the illustration (v 15) for the relationship between the Abraham tradition and the Sinai tradition | 3:27 | b. Explanatory connection with the ritual of baptism, a "reminder" of what the addressees have done at baptism |
| 3:18 | 5. Result: the origin of the "inheritance" | | c. Three "achievements" of Christian existence |
| 3:18a | a. Negatively: the "inheritance" does not originate in the Torah (Sinai) | 3:28a-c | d. Declaration and definition of the addressees as "one in Christ Jesus" (status in the church) |
| 3:18b | b. Positively: the "inheritance" originates in God's grace, shown by his promise to Abraham | 3:28d | |
| 3:19-25 | D. A digression on the (Jewish) Torah | 3:29 | 2. Conclusions |
| 3:19a | 1. Question introducing the digression | 3:29a | a. Presupposition, a restatement of the 'indicative' of salvation (3:26-28) |
| 3:19b-c | 2. A set of four definitions of the Jewish Torah | 3:29b-c | b. Two conclusions to the argument of 3:6-28 |
| 3:19b | a. First definition | | 3. Proofs |
| 3:19c | b. Second definition | 4:1-7 | a. An illustration from the law |
| 3:19d | c. Third definition | 4:1-2 | 1) Introductory formula |
| 3:19e | d. Fourth definition | 4:1a | 2) Description of the common practice of the law |
| 3:20 | 3. A definition of the concept of "mediator" | 4:1b-2 | b. Application of the illustration to the situation of the addressees |
| 3:20a | a. Negatively: the mediator does not represent a unity | 4:3-6 | 1) Interpretation of their pre-Christian situation as that of minors |
| 3:20b | b. By contrast: quotation of the acclamation "God is one" | 4:3 | 2) Interpretation of their Christian situation as that of adults |
| 3:21-25 | 4. The consequences of the definitions | 4:4-6 | a) Quotation of pre-Pauline christological formulae |
| 3:21 | a. Two false consequences | | (1) Reference to the eschatological time-period |
| 3:21a-b | 1) First false consequence | 4:4-5 | (2) Reference to God's sending of his son |
| 3:21a | a) A hypothetical question | | (3) Two definitions of a human being |
| 3:21b | b) A strong denial | 4:4a | (4) Two soteriological benefits |
| 3:21c | 2) Second false hypothesis | 4:4b | b) Reference to the Galatians' experience of the Spirit |
| | a) A seemingly hypothetical statement, representing the Jewish dogma | 4:4c-d | (1) Restatement of the 'indicative' of salvation |
| | [b) A denial is not stated, but implied] | | (2) Reference to God's sending of the "Spirit of his Son" |
| 3:22-25 | b. Paul's own view of the Torah | 4:5 | (3) Reference to the experience of the Spirit |
| 3:22 | 1) A definition of Scripture in the process of divine salvation | 4:6 | |
| 3:23-25 | 2) A definition of the Torah | 4:6a | |
| 3:23 | a) The temporal limitation of the Torah | 4:6b.1 | |
| 3:24 | b) The functional limitation of the Torah | | |
| 3:25 | c) Definition of the Christian's position with regard to the Torah | 4:6b.2 | |

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|--|
| 4:6c | (a) The experience of inspiration (b) The experience of ecstatic prayer, with quotation of the acclamation "Abba, Father" | 4:20a | c. An expression of longing (epistolary motif) |
| | | 4:20b-c | d. An expression of <i>dubitatio</i> (epistolary motif) |
| 4:7 | c. Conclusions | 4:20b | 1) Reference to the rhetorical modulation of voice |
| 4:7a | 1) Conclusion to the argument 4:1-6 | 4:20c | 2) A confession of frustration |
| 4:7b | 2) Conclusion to the argument 3:1-29 | 4:21-31 | G. The sixth argument: an allegorical argument from Scripture |
| 4:8-11 | 4. An <i>interrogatio</i> | 4:21 | 1. Opening dialogical device |
| 4:8-9a | a. A restatement of the 'indicative' of salvation | 4:21a | a. A diatribe-style imperative |
| 4:8 | 1) Description of the pre-Christian situation | 4:21b | b. Identification of the Galatians' intentions |
| 4:9a | 2) Description of the Christian situation | 4:21c | c. The argument, in form of a question addressed to the Galatians [d. The answer is left open, but cf. 4:31] |
| 4:9b | b. A question, stating Paul's fourth argument as a dilemma for the Galatians | 4:22 | 2. Quotation from the Abraham tradition |
| 4:10 | c. A critical test: a description of the Galatians as typically superstitious people | 4:22a | a. Quotation formula |
| 4:11 | d. An expression of <i>dubitatio</i> | 4:22b | b. Summary of the Abraham tradition |
| 4:12-20 | F. The fifth argument: an argument from friendship | 4:23-30 | 3. Allegorical interpretation of the Abraham tradition |
| 4:12a.1 | 1. A paradoxical gnome | 4:23 | a. Interpretation of the two sons |
| 4:12a.2 | 2. An address: "brothers" | | 1) The son of the slave-woman = "born according to the flesh" |
| 4:12b | 3. A petition | 4:24a | 2) The son of the free woman = "born through the promise" |
| 4:13-15 | 4. A reminder of the good friendship in the past | 4:24b-27 | b. A statement of the method |
| 4:13 | a. Paul's situation of need | 4:24b | c. Interpretation of the two women |
| 4:14 | b. The Galatians' proof of true friendship | | 1) As representing "two covenants" |
| 4:15a | c. An embarrassing rhetorical question | 4:25 | 2) The interpretation of Hagar |
| 4:15b | d. An ironic testimony of Paul | | a) As stemming from Mount Sinai |
| 4:16-18 | 5. Complaints about the present alienation | | b) As bearing children into slavery |
| 4:16 | a. An embarrassing rhetorical question, perhaps using a proverb | | c) Verification: geographical information with regard to the name Hagar |
| 4:17 | b. A polemic against the opponents, a caricature of their behavior as typical of "false friends" and "flatterers" | | d) As the "present Jerusalem" (i.e. Judaism) |
| 4:18a | c. A principle of true friendship | 4:26 | e) Verification: historical information with regard to Jerusalem and its inhabitants |
| 4:18b | d. A complaint about the Galatians' betrayal of the principle | 4:26a.1 | 3) The interpretation of Sarah |
| 4:19-20 | 6. A passionate appeal | 4:26a.2 | a) As the "heavenly Jerusalem" |
| 4:19a | a. An address: "my children" | 4:26b | b) As representing freedom |
| 4:19b | b. Paul's description of his pain, comparing it with a mother in birth-pangs | 4:27 | c) As "our mother" (i.e. Gentile Christianity) |
| | | 4:27a | 4) Proof from Scripture |
| | | 4:27b | a) Quotation formula |
| | | | b) Quotation of Isa 54:1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 4:28 | d. Interpretation of the Galatians 1) Address: "brothers" 2) As those "according to Isaac" 3) As "children of promise" | 5:5-6 5:5 5:6 | b. A summary of Paul's soteriology 1) A summary of Paul's doctrine of justification 2) A summary of Paul's doctrine of the church |
| 4:29 | e. Interpretation of the Jewish-Christian opponents of Paul | 5:7-12 | c. An exhortation in the diatribe style |
| 4:29a.1 | 1) As those "according to the flesh" | 5:7 | 1) Introduction of the 'agon motif' |
| 4:29a.2 | 2) As those who are persecuting those "according to the Spirit" | 5:7a | a) A judgment of the Galatians' past performance |
| 4:29b | 3) Verification: historical information | 5:7b | b) A rhetorical question of perplexity |
| 4:30 | f. Order given by Scripture to expel the opponents | 5:8 | 2) A sarcastic suggestion |
| 4:30a | 1) Quotation formula | 5:9 | 3) A proverb |
| 4:30b | 2) Quotation of Gen 21:10 | 5:10 | 4) An expression of confidence |
| 4:31 | 4. Conclusion a. Address: "brothers" b. Summary of the argument of 4:21-30 and of the whole <i>probatio</i> of 3:1-4:30 (31) | 5:10a 5:10b 5:11 | a) With regard to the Galatians' future behavior b) With regard to the eschatological destiny of the opponent(s) 5) A statement by Paul on his own behalf |
| VI. Exhortatio | | | |
| 5:1-6:10 | | 5:11a.1 5:11a.2 5:11b | a) Address: "brothers" b) A rhetorical question c) A conclusion |
| 5:1-12 | A. A warning against acceptance of the Jewish Torah | 5:12 5:13-24 | 4. Conclusion: a sarcastic joke B. A warning against corruption by the "flesh" |
| 5:1a | 1. A restatement of the 'indicative' of salvation | 5:13a.1 | 1. A restatement of the 'indicative' of salvation |
| 5:1b | 2. A definition, in imperative form, of the ethical task a. In general b. In application to the Galatians' present situation | 5:13a.2 5:13b-c 5:13c | 2. Address: "brothers" 3. A definition of the ethical task a. In general b. In application to the Galatians' present situation |
| 5:2-12 | 3. The argument against the Jewish Torah | 5:14-24 | 4. The argument: Paul's theory of ethics |
| 5:2-4 | a. An apostolic testimony about circumcision | 5:14 | a. The concept of the fulfillment of the Torah |
| 5:2 | 1) A theological statement about the implication of acceptance of circumcision for christology and soteriology | 5:14a 5:14b | 1) The formula of <i>reductio in unum</i> 2) A quotation from Scripture (Lev 19:18) |
| 5:2a | a) A solemn introduction | 5:15 | b. A sarcastic warning against the opposite, the behavior of wild beasts (diatribe topos) |
| 5:2b | b) A doctrinal conclusion | 5:16-23 | c. The gift of the Spirit and its implications |
| 5:3 | 2) A theological statement about the meaning of circumcision | 5:16 | 1) The ethical imperative in general |
| 5:3a | a) A formula of oath | 5:16a | a) A statement of emphasis |
| 5:3b | b) A citation of Jewish dogma | 5:16b | b) The ethical imperative |
| 5:4 | 3) Theological conclusions with regard to the Galatians | 5:16c | c) The consequence for the "flesh" |
| 5:4a | a) About their relationship to Christ | | |
| 5:4b | b) About their relationship to the Jewish Torah | | |
| 5:4c | c) About their relationship to grace | | |

| | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| 5:17 | 2) The anthropological presuppositions | 6:3 6:4 6:5 | 6. A maxim about self-deception 7. A maxim about self-examination 8. A maxim about bearing one's own burden of life |
| 5:17a | a) The dualism of "flesh" and "Spirit" | 6:6 | 9. A maxim about the common life of teacher and student |
| 5:17b | b) The incapacity of the human will | 6:7-9 6:7a 6:7b 6:7c 6:8 | 10. An eschatological admonition a. A warning b. A proverb c. A second proverb d. An interpretation of the second proverb |
| 5:18 | 3) The soteriological presuppositions | 6:9 | e. An appeal against ethical weariness |
| 5:18a | a) The empowering by the Spirit | 6:10 | 11. Conclusion: an appeal and summary of the exhortation (5:1-6:10) |
| 5:18b | b) The freedom from the Jewish Torah | | |
| 5:19-23 | 4) The occurrence of unethical and ethical deeds | | |
| 5:19-21 | a) The occurrence of the ethically evil | | |
| 5:19a | (1) A definition of the ethically evil | | |
| 5:19b-21a | (2) A 'list of vices' | | |
| 5:21b | (3) A statement of eschatological law (a) Formula of repetition (b) Citation of a statement of law | | |
| 5:22-23 | b) The occurrence of the ethically good | | |
| 5:22a | (1) A definition of the ethically good | | |
| 5:22b-23a | (2) A 'list of virtues' | | |
| 5:23b | (3) A statement of evaluation | | |
| 5:24 | 4. Conclusion: the definition of the Christian possibility of ethical behavior | | |
| 5:25-6:10 | C. Recommendations in form of <i>sententiae</i> with regard to ethical praxis | | |
| 5:25 | 1. A paradox a. A restatement of the 'indicative' of salvation b. A definition, in form of an appeal, of the ethical task | | |
| 5:26 | 2. An appeal against pretentiousness | | |
| 6:1a | 3. A recommendation in case of failure | | |
| 6:1b | 4. Address: "brothers" | | |
| 6:2 | 5. A maxim about sharing the burdens of life | | |

VII. Epistolary Postscript (Conclusio)

| | |
|---------|--|
| 6:11-18 | |
| 6:11 | A. A formula of epistolary authentication |
| 6:12-17 | B. The <i>peroratio</i> (<i>recapitulatio</i>) |
| 6:12-13 | 1. A sharp polemic against the opponents (<i>indignatio</i>) |
| 6:14 | 2. A restatement of Paul's theological position |
| 6:15 | 3. Paul's parenetical "canon" |
| 6:16 | 4. A conditional blessing |
| 6:16a | a. A specification of the recipients |
| 6:16b-c | b. A citation of a liturgical blessing |
| 6:17 | 5. <i>Conquestio</i> |
| 6:17a | a. An appeal against new troubles |
| 6:17b | b. A reference to Paul's past sufferings |
| 6:18 | C. Final benediction |
| | 1. Benediction |
| | 2. Address: "brothers" |
| | 3. Concluding "amen" |

This formal analysis of the letter to the Galatians also permits us to arrive at some conclusions with regard to its *function*. We must of course distinguish between the general function of the letter as letter,¹¹⁴ and the specific function of the letter to the Galatians. As a

114 Research in the field of epistolography has long been neglected and has only recently regained attention. For an introduction, see William G. Doty, *Letters in Primitive Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973); Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 58-70. The major studies to be mentioned here are: Hermann Peter, *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901; Hildesheim: Olms, 1966); Heikki Koskeniemi,

Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr. (Helsinki, 1956); Gustav Karlsson, *Ideologie et cérémonial dans l'épistolographie byzantine* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962); Klaus Thraede, *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Briefepik* (Munich: Beck, 1970); Gregor Maurach, *Der Bau von Senecas Epistulae Morales* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1970).

We who are Jews by birth and not sinners from [the] Gentiles 16/ know that a human being¹ is not justified by works of [the] Law but [only] through faith in Christ Jesus. So we also have come to believe in Christ Jesus, in order that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the Law,² since it is not by works of [the] Law that all flesh will be justified.³ 17/ If, however, we who are seeking to be justified in Christ are also found to be sinners, is Christ then a servant of sin? This can never be! 18/ For [only] if I establish again what I have dissolved, [do] I set myself up⁴ as a transgressor. 19/ For through [the] Law I died to [the] Law, in order that I might live for God. I have been crucified with Christ; 20/ and, it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and, what⁵ I now live in [the] flesh I live in [the] faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me. 21/ I do not nullify the grace of God. For [only] if justification [came] through [the] Law has Christ died in vain.

Analysis

Since antiquity the question has been discussed whether Paul's account of the episode at Antioch ends with 2:14, or whether it includes 2:15-21 as a summary of the speech he made at Antioch.⁶ Those who assume that 2:14-21 is a restatement of what Paul had said to Cephas and the church at Antioch have also discussed

the question whether it is historically accurate, a summary, a free paraphrase, or simply an invention for rhetorical purposes. Otto Bauernfeind⁷ called attention to the need to consider the literary form, which he thought was that of a "report about a speech" ("Redereferat"). In present New Testament scholarship the whole question is unresolved. Most scholars take a

compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?" The implied answer is, of course, that Cephas cannot do that. In the protasis Paul defines Cephas' present religious status as being a Jew (*Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων*)⁴⁹¹ who has given up his Jewish way of life. He lives like a Gentile (*ἐθνικῶς*),⁴⁹² that is, no longer in observance of Jewish customs and law (*οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς*).⁴⁹³ The present tense of *ζῆς* ("you are living") implies much more than an act of table fellowship with Christian Gentiles.⁴⁹⁴ It suggests that the table fellowship was only the external symbol of Cephas' total emancipation from Judaism. The apodosis presupposes Cephas' recent change of conduct as a self-contradiction: "how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?"

This formulation, however, presents several problems. In itself, the dilemma does not expressly state Cephas' return to Judaism, nor are we prepared for Cephas' demand that the Gentiles submit to circumcision and Jewish law.⁴⁹⁵ Paul's evaluation was made *post factum* and assumes a number of intermediate considerations. By changing back to the observance of Jewish custom and law, the Jewish Christians have not only reversed their emancipation from Judaism. When they gave up the observance of the Torah, they also admitted that as a Christian one can be saved without

the Torah. Returning to the Torah cannot simply eliminate that first step of denying the necessity of Torah observance. In addition, the return to the observance of the Torah expresses the judgment that living outside the Torah even for Christians is the same as living like "sinners from the heathen" (see 2:15-16). Therefore, Cephas had explicitly or implicitly made a demand upon the Gentiles to become partakers of the Torah covenant. In effect, Cephas had done the same as the "false brothers" at Jerusalem (2:4-5). The term "compel" (*ἀναγκάζω*)⁴⁹⁶ must be seen in parallelism with 2:3, the demand to circumcise Titus, and the demand of the present agitators in Galatia to accept Torah and circumcision (see 6:13). In Paul's view, *Ἰουδαῖζειν* ("judaize")⁴⁹⁷ includes more than submitting to Jewish dietary laws; it describes forcing one to become a Jewish convert obliged to keep the whole Torah (cf. 5:3). Ironically, therefore, by attempting to preserve the integrity of the Jewish Christians as Jews, Cephas destroys the integrity of the Gentile Christians as believers in Christ. Instead of welcoming them as converts to Christianity, he wants to make them into converts of Judaism. This contradicts the principles of the doctrine of justification by faith, which had been the basis of the faith thus far (see 2:15-16).

491 See also Gal 2:13, 15; Rom 11:1; 2 Cor 11:22; Phil 3:5. On *ὑπάρχων* cf. Bauer, *s.v.* *ὑπάρχω*, 2.

492 The term is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT. Cf. the adjective *ἐθνικός* Matt 5:47; 6:7; 18:17; 3 John 7. See Bauer, *s.v.* *ἐθνικός*, *ἐθνικῶς*; Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *TDNT* 2.72, *s.v.*; *PGL*, *s.v.*

493 The words *καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς* are textually uncertain: *A* D vg^{cl}, have another word-order; P⁴⁶ 917 d Ambrosiaster Marius Victorinus omit the first three words; a minor matter is the change between *οὐκ*, *οὐχ* or *οὐχί*. For a detailed discussion see Sieffert, pp. 133f n.; Burton, pp. 114f. The adverb *Ἰουδαϊκῶς* ("according to Jewish custom") is a NT *hapax legomenon*. See Bauer, *s.v.*; Walter Gutbrod, "Ἰουδαῖα," *TDNT* 3.381; *PGL*, *s.v.*

494 So correctly Burton, p. 112; Schlier, p. 86.

495 See Lagrange; Schlier, p. 86 n. 6.; Mussner, p. 145 n. 52.

496 In Maccabees the term plays a significant role in the Jewish struggle against compulsory hellenization (cf. e.g., 1 Macc 2:25; 2 Macc 6:1, 7, 18; 4 Macc 5:2, 27; 8:1; 18:5; Josephus *Bj* 1.34; etc.; Philo *Leg.* 293). See also Justin *Dial.* 47.1 (see Appendix 4).

pendix 4).

497 The term is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT; it is not quite synonymous with *Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆν* ("live as a Jew"), but it seems to describe the somewhat artificial behavior of new converts. Cf. Esth 8:17 LXX: "... and many of the people had themselves circumcised and practiced Judaism because of their fear of the Jews" (*καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν περιετέμνοντο Ἰουδαῖζον διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων*). According to Josephus *Bj* 2.454, the Roman officer Metilius saved his life by promising to become a Jew and even to submit to circumcision (*καὶ μέχρι περιτομῆς Ἰουδαῖσεν*). Josephus *Bj* 2.463, seems to distinguish between *οἱ Ἰουδαῖζοντες* ("the Judaizers") and *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* ("the Jews"); similarly, the term is used by Plutarch *Cicero* 7.5, 864C, of a freedman who is suspected of practicing Judaism. In Christian literature, the term characterizes Christians engaged in Jewish practices, e.g., Ign. *Mag.* 10.3: "It is absurd to say 'Jesus Christ' and to practice Judaism" (*ἀτοπὸν ἔστιν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ Ἰουδαῖζειν*). For further material, see *PGL*, *s.v.*

1 *RSV*, *NEB*, *JB* render *ἄνθρωπος* ("a human being") as "man."

2 *NEB* is slightly misleading: "... not through deeds dictated by law."

3 Usually translations turn the sentence positive: "because of works of the law shall no one be justified" (*RSV*).

4 Cf. *RSV*: "prove myself;" *NEB*: "show myself up." *JB* here as well as in the entire passage has a very free but, as far as the meaning is concerned, correct paraphrase.

5 *RSV*, *NEB*, *JB* supplement: "the life I now live. ..."

6 On the positions taken by older commentators, see Friedrich Zimmer, "Paulus gegen Petrus," *ZWTh* 25 (1882) 129-88; Sieffert, pp. 139f; Zahn, pp. 119f; Franz Overbeck, *Über die Auffassung des Streits des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochen (Gal. 2, 11ff) bei den Kirchenvätern* (Basel 1877; rep.: Darmstadt: Wissen-

schaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968). For modern positions see the commentaries, and Otto Bauernfeind, "Der Schluss der antiochenischen Paulusrede," in *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis, Festschrift für Karl Heim* (Hamburg: Furche-Verlag, 1954) 64-78; Rudolf Bultmann, "Zur Auslegung von Galater 2:15-18," in his *Exegetica*, 394-99; Gaechter, *Petrus und seine Zeit*, 251-54; Schmithals, *Paul and James*, 72-78; Klein, *Rekonstruktion*, 181-202; Werner Georg Kümmel, "'Individualgeschichte' und 'Weltgeschichte' in Galater 2, 15-21," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, In Honour of C. F. D. Moule* (eds. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973) 157-73.

7 Bauernfeind (see n. 6 above), 71.

middle position, saying that Paul addresses Cephas formally, and the Galatians materially.⁸

Between the *narratio* and the *probatio*⁹ ancient rhetoricians insert the *propositio* (the name Quintilian uses).¹⁰ Quintilian has the fullest account of this part of the speech, but again he takes a special position in applying it. We find the general view in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and in Cicero's *De inventione*, although there is also considerable difference between them. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* provides for two kinds of statements after the *narratio*: "the division of the cause falls into two parts. When the statement of facts has been brought to an end, we ought first to make clear what we and our opponents agree upon, if there is agreement on the points useful to us, and what remains contested...."¹¹ Then comes the *distributio* in two parts, the *enumeratio* and the *expositio*, the former announcing the number of points to be discussed, the latter setting forth these points briefly and completely.¹² The function of the *propositio* is two-fold: it sums up the legal content of the *narratio* by this outline of the case and provides an easy transition to the *probatio*.¹³

Gal 2:15–21 conforms to the form, function, and

requirements of the *propositio*. Placed at the end of the last episode of the *narratio* (2:11–14), it sums up the *narratio*'s material content. But it is not part of the *narratio*,¹⁴ and it sets up the arguments to be discussed later in the *probatio* (chapters 3 and 4).¹⁵ The points of presumed agreement are set forth first (2:15–16). This passage is a summary of the doctrine of justification by faith. It is thoroughly Pauline, but Paul's claim that he shares this doctrine with Jewish Christianity should be taken seriously. The summary is made to appear as the logical conclusion one would draw from the *narratio* as a whole. Verses 17–18 contain the point of disagreement. Here especially, language from the opposition is borrowed. Verses 19–20 contain the exposition in form of four theological theses, to be elaborated upon later. Verse 21 concludes with a *refutatio*, a sharp denial of a charge.¹⁶ Paul does not use *partitio* or *enumeratio* because there is only one¹⁷ point against which the whole defense has to be made (2:17).¹⁸ The *propositio* is extremely concise and consists largely of dogmatic abbreviations, i.e., very short formulaic summaries of doctrines.

Interpretation

■15 Paul begins the *propositio* by stating what he assumes is common ground between him and Jewish Christianity. He sets forth a "self-definition" of Jewish Christians,¹⁹ beginning by considering them, including Paul himself,²⁰ as Jews:²¹ "we who are Jews by birth." Here Jewishness is determined by birth.²² This also separates the Jews from the Gentiles²³ who are called in Jewish terms "sinners from [the] Gentiles." At this point we find the first of Paul's doctrinal abbreviations: the expression "sinners from [the] Gentiles"²⁴ presupposes the Jewish concept of human sinfulness,²⁵ according to which sinners within Judaism must be distinguished from sinners who come from the non-Jewish population and who wish to partake of salvation.²⁶ Jews commit sins when they transgress the Torah, and they can obtain forgiveness by various cultic means or by vicarious suffering, that is, by the Torah. Gentiles, however, are "sinners" as Gentiles, and outside of the Torah covenant there is no salvation.²⁷

■16 The second part of the "self-definition" defines the status before God which Jewish Christians claim as Christians. This part contains what is traditionally called Paul's doctrine of justification by faith: "(we) know that a human being is not justified by works of [the] Law but only through faith in Christ Jesus." There are two important considerations which one must bear in mind when one approaches this famous doctrine. First of all, in this context the doctrine of justification by faith is part of a Jewish-Christian theology.²⁸ It is based upon the self-definition of Jewish Christians as Jews (see v 15), and v 16 is an addition to what is stated in v 15.²⁹

The second consideration relates to the entire *propositio* and other parts of the letter: it is composed of a great deal of doctrinal "abbreviations." These abbreviations are difficult to translate. Commenting upon them means that they must be dissolved into the doctrinal statements which they intend to abbreviate (see the Introduction, §6. 4).

- 8 So Oepke; Lietzmann; Lightfoot; Burton; Schlier, pp. 87f, 104.
- 9 See above, on Gal 3:1–4:31, and the Introduction, § 5.
- 10 Quint. treats the forms and possibilities of the *propositio* in 4.4.1–4.5.28 (see also 3.9.2, 5; 3.11.27). See Cicero *De inv.* 1.22.31–23.33, who calls it *partitio*, while the *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.10.17 uses *divisio*. See Volkmann, *Rhetorik*, § 15; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, § 346; Joachim Adamietz, *Ciceros de inventione und die Rhetorik ad Herennium* (Marburg: Mauersberger, 1960) 36ff; Martin, *Rhetorik*, 91–95.
- 11 *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.10.17: "Causarum divisio in duas partes distributa est. Primum perorata narratione debemus aperire quid nobis conveniat cum adversariis, si ea quae utilia sunt nobis convenient, quid in controversia relictum sit. . . ." Cf. Cicero *De inv.* 1.22.31.
- 12 The *propositio* should have the following characteristics: *brevitas*, *absolutio*, *paucitas* ("brevity, completeness, conciseness"). So Cicero *De inv.* 1.22.32; similarly *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.10.17; Quint. 4.5.26–28. See Lausberg, *Handbuch*, § 671, 1; Martin, *Rhetorik*, 94.
- 13 Quint. 4.4.1: "Mihi autem propositio videtur omnis confirmationis initium, quod non modo in ostendenda quaestione principali sed nonnunquam etiam in

- singulis argumentis poni solet . . ." ("But it seems to me that the beginning of every *proof* is a *propositio*, such as often occurs in the demonstration of the main question and sometimes even in the enunciation of individual arguments . . ."). See Lausberg, *Handbuch*, § 343–45.
- 14 This formal argument would then also decide the old controversy whether or not vv 15–21 must be regarded as part of Paul's speech at Antioch. See above, n. 6.
- 15 This was recognized, without the formal considerations, by Schlier, pp. 87f.
- 16 For examples of such refutations in a *propositio*, see Quint. 4.4.6–8; 4.5.11–13. Cf. the connections with the *exordium* (1:6f), and the *recapitulatio* (6:12–16).
- 17 See Quint. 4.5.8: "Itaque si plura vel obicienda sunt vel diluenda, et utilis et iucunda partitio est ut, quid quaque de re dicturi simus, ordine appareat; at si unum crimen varie defendemus, supervacua." ("Consequently if we have to prove or refute a number of points *partition* will be both useful and attractive, since it will indicate in order what we propose to say on each subject. On the other hand, if we are defending one point on various grounds *partition* will be unnecessary"). See Lausberg, *Handbuch*, § 347.
- 18 See below, on 2:17.

- 19 Cf. the self-definition 2 Cor 6:16b: "For we are the temple of the living God." See Appendix 2, below; also Betz, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1," 92. See also Rom 2:17ff; 3:1ff; 9:4f; Phil 3:5f. Cf. Oepke (p. 58) who emphasizes the "thetical" character of the statement; Schlier (p. 88) believes it to be a *captatio benevolentiae*.
- 20 The "we" (*ἡμεῖς*) which we find in vv 15–17 includes all Jewish Christians. Cf. Oepke, Schlier.
- 21 *Ἰουδαῖοι* ("Jews"); see on 2:13, 14; 3:28.
- 22 On the meaning of *φύσει* see Rom 2:27; Eph 2:3; also Gal 1:13f. See Bauer, *s.v. φύσις*, 1; Helmut Koester, "φύσις κτλ.," *TDNT* 9.272; Schlier, p. 88 n. 2.
- 23 See Gal 1:16; 2:2, 8, 9, 12, 14; 3:8, 14 for other occurrences of *τὰ ἔθνη* ("the Gentiles"), a name which of course includes the Galatian churches.
- 24 The phrase *ἐξ ἔθνων* ("from [the] Gentiles") also occurs Rom 9:24; 2 Cor 11:26.
- 25 The concept of sin here is Jewish. See Str-B. 3.537. The reason why the Gentiles are sinners is that they do not possess the Torah (cf. Rom 2:14) and that because of this defect they cannot achieve righteousness (cf. Rom 9:30, 31; 3:1f; 1 Cor 6:1; 9:21; 12:2; 1 Thess 1:9f; 4:5; Phil 3:6). See also Str-B. 3.36ff; Lightfoot, p. 115; Oepke, p. 90; Schlier, pp. 88f; Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, "ἀμαρτωλός," *TDNT* 1.332–33; differently Burton, p. 119. For

- Paul's own concept, see Rom 5:12ff and Walter Grundmann, "ἀμαρτάνω," *TDNT* 1.308–13.
- 26 Cf. the term "judaize" in Gal 2:14.
- 27 2 Macc 6:12–17 states the Jewish position with regard to the sinfulness of Jews in distinction to non-Jews. The sins of the Gentiles are punished with the goal of destruction (*πρὸς ὀλεθρον*), while Jewish sinners are merely disciplined (*πρὸς παιδείαν*).
- 28 The doctrine of justification by faith was not only a doctrine of Paul, but was to an extent shared by Jewish Christianity. Reflections of non-Pauline, Jewish-Christian presentations of the doctrine are to be found in Jas 2:14–26; ps.-Clem. *Hom.* 8.5–7; probably also Heb and Justin *Dial.* 116. See also Rom 3:21–31; Acts 15:10f; Matt 12:37; Luke 15:11–32; 16:15; 18:11–14; Acts 13:39; Justin *Dial.* 46.1; 47.1 (see below, Appendix 4). See Georg Strecker, "Befreiung und Rechtfertigung. Zur Stellung der Rechtfertigungslehre in der Theologie des Paulus," in *Rechtfertigung, Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr, Siebeck; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976) 479–508.
- 29 *δέ* points to the contrast between *φύσει* ("by birth" v 15) and *εἰδότες* ("we know" v 16). It is not attested by P⁴⁶ A⁹ al syr. Nestle-Aland, 26th edition, doubts its authenticity. See also Sieffert, p. 142 n.

The first word of v 16 states the basis for being a Christian in distinction from being a Jew. This basis is "theological conviction" (εἰδότες ["we know"]) ³⁰ over against birth (v 15).

Next we are given the content of that conviction, again in the form of doctrinal principles. It is the denial of the orthodox Jewish (Pharisaic) doctrine of salvation. ³¹ This doctrine states that ἄνθρωπος ("a [=any]

human being") ³² is in need of δικαιόσθαι ("being justified") ³³ at the eschatological judgment of God, and that this "justification" can be obtained by doing and thus fulfilling the ordinances of the Torah. ³⁴ This is the full meaning of the abbreviation ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ("on the basis of [the] works of [the] Torah"). ³⁵ This Jewish (Pharisaic) doctrine is denied by Paul (as he assumes, in conformity with Jewish Christianity). ³⁶ Instead,

justification before God can be obtained ³⁷ "only" (ἐὰν μὴ) ³⁸—and now follows another abbreviation—"through [the] faith of [=in] Christ Jesus." This abbreviation must be old, and it is easy to interpret it in pre-Pauline, Jewish-Christian terms. "Faith" is not "the basis" like meritorious works of the Torah ³⁹ which then "earn" eschatological justification, but such justification is mediated "through [the] faith" (διὰ πίστεως). ⁴⁰ This "faith" ⁴¹ has a distinct content: it is πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ("[the] faith of [=in] Christ Jesus"). ⁴² Also this strange abbreviation must be dissolved: it is the faith (*fides quae creditur*) the content of which is "Christ Jesus," or better: "The Christ is Jesus." This abbreviation seems to be old and retains the character of Χριστός as a messianic title. ⁴³ Believing (*fides qua creditur*) that the Messiah is Jesus becomes the channel which mediates "justification" before the throne of God, instead of "doing" the works of the Torah. This understanding, to be sure, would be pre-Pauline. For the Apostle, "faith in Christ Jesus" is faith in the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ (see

Gal 1:1, 4; 2:20; 3:1, 13; 4:4-6), that is, "being in Christ" (see Gal 2:19-21; 3:26-28; 5:5-6, 24; 6:14). In view of the controversy in Galatia, it should be noted that the denial does not imply that "the works of the Torah" do not need to be done. Denied is only that they produce justification before God.

For the Jewish Christians, this "theological conviction" has had consequences. It was the reason why Jews had come to believe in Christ (v 16b). Paul of course refers to the fact that all Jewish Christians, including himself, had at one point become Christian believers: "also we have come to believe in Christ Jesus." The reason was—Paul now applies the previous statement—"in order that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of [the] Law." ⁴⁴ Paul uses the same doctrinal abbreviations as in the beginning of v 16, but the shift towards polemic is obvious. 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). This interpreta-

30 See the use of this concept in Gal. 4:8, 13; Rom 2:2; 3:19; 5:3; 6:9, 16; 7:15; etc. See Justin *Dial.* 46.20 (see below, Appendix 4). For the relationship of "faith" and "knowledge" in Paul's theology, see Wilhelm Mundle, *Der Glaubensbegriff bei Paulus* (Leipzig: Heinsius, 1932) 18f; Bultmann, *Theology*, § 36, 2; Günther Bornkamm, "Glaube und Vernunft bei Paulus," in his *Studien*, 119-37; idem, "Faith and Reason in Paul," in his *Early Christian Experience* (tr. Paul L. Hammer; London: SCM; New York: Harper & Row, 1969) 29-46.

31 Principle formulations of a similar kind are to be found also in Rom 3:20: ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ("by works of [the] law all flesh will not be justified before him"). Gal 3:11: ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιόσθαι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ("by [the] law nobody is justified before God"). For similar statements see Rom 3:28; 4:5; 10:5f; 11:6; Phil 3:6-9. Cf. Gal 2:21; 5:4; and contrast Jas 2:24-26.

32 For the meaning of ἄνθρωπος ("human being") see Gal 1:1, 10, 11, 12; 2:6, 16; 3:15; 5:3; 6:1, 7.

33 In Gal the verb δικαιόω ("justify") is found also in 2:17; 3:8, 11, 24; 5:4; cf. Rom 2:13; 3:4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9; 6:7; 8:30, 33; 1 Cor 6:11. See J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul* (SNTSMS 20; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1972) esp. 172-74.

The noun δικαιοσύνη ("righteousness") occurs in Gal 2:21; 3:6, 21; 5:5; Rom 1:17; 3:5, 21, 22, 26, and often. The literature is vast: see Gottlob Schrenk, "δικαιοσύνη," *TDNT* 2.202-10; Bultmann, *Theology*, §§ 28-30; Conzelmann, *Outline*, § 25 (II); Peter Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (FRLANT 87; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965); Karl Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (NTAbh NF 3; Münster: Aschendorff, 1967); idem, "Zur Deutung des Rechtfertigungsbegriffs im Galaterbrief," *BZ* 12 (1968) 211-22; Hans Conzelmann, *Theologie als Schriftauslegung: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (Munich: Kaiser, 1974) 200ff; Dieter Zeller, *Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus* (Forschung zur Bibel, 1; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973) 163ff; Günter

Klein, "Gerechtigkeit Gottes als Thema der neuesten Paulusforschung," *VF* 12 (1967) 1-11; Georg Eichholz, *Glaube und Werk bei Paulus und Jakobus* (Munich: Kaiser, 1961) 215-36; Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (tr. John R. de Witt; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 159-81; Ernst Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul* (tr. Margaret Kohl; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) *passim*; idem, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen: Mohr, Siebeck, 1973, ³1974) esp. 18ff. The *Käsemann Festschrift* contains a number of articles dealing with a wide range of implications of the doctrine: *Rechtfertigung, Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Johannes Friedrich, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr, Siebeck; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976).

34 On the doctrine of justification in Rabbinic theology, see Str-B 3.160-64; Ferdinand Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und Verwandter Schriften* (eds. Franz Delitsch and Georg Schredermann; Leipzig: Dörffling, ²1897) §§ 55-72; Solomon Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (New York: Schocken, 1961 [rep. of the 1909 edition]); Moore, *Judaism* 1.445ff, 2.180; Schoeps, *Paul*, 168ff.

35 This abbreviation occurs only in Pauline theology (Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20; 4:2; 9:11f, 32; 11:6; for the Pauline tradition, see Eph 2:9; Tit 3:5; Pol. Phil. 1.13). On the notion of "works of the Torah" see Str-B 3.160-62; Georg Bertram, "ἔργον," *TDNT* 2.643-48; Ernst Lohmeyer, "Gesetzeswerke," in his *Probleme paulinischer Theologie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, n.d.) 31-74; Schlier, pp. 91f; Joseph B. Tyson, "'Works of Law' in Galatians," *JBL* 92 (1973) 423-31. On Paul's understanding of νόμος ("law"), see 3:19-25.

36 Also implicitly anti-Pharisaic is the Jewish-Christian doctrine of works and faith in James (see esp. Jas 2:14-26). See Martin Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (rev. Heinrich Greeven, tr. Michael A. Williams; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 149-80; Franz Mussner, *Der Jakobusbrief* (HThK 13.1; Freiburg: Herder, ²1967) 127-57. The same is true in a different way of the Qumran community, which has a doctrine of justification by grace remarkably similar to Paul. See Her-

bert Braun, "Römer 7, 7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumranfrommen," in his *Studien*, 100-19; Siegfried Schulz, "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Glauben in Qumran und bei Paulus," *ZThK* 56 (1959) 155-85; Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung," § 3; Ziesler, *Righteousness*, 93ff; Otto Betz, "Rechtfertigung in Qumran," in the *Käsemann Festschrift* (see above, n. 33) 17-36. A special problem is that of the relationship between the Pauline doctrine and the OT: see D. H. van Daalen, "Paul's Doctrine of Justification and its OT Roots," *Studia Evangelica* 6 (TU 112; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973) 556-70; Rafael Gyllenberg, *Rechtfertigung und Altes Testament bei Paulus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973).

37 So with Schlier, p. 92 n. 6.

38 See εἰ μὴ in Gal 1:7. On the grammatical problems, see BDF, § 376; BDR, § 376.

39 Cf. the expression χωρὶς νόμου ("without [the] Torah") in Rom 3:21; χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου ("without works of [the] Torah") in Rom 3:28; cf. 4:6.

40 The expression occurs as διὰ πίστεως ("through faith") Gal 2:16; Rom 3:22, 30; Phil 3:9; cf. Eph 2:8; ἐκ πίστεως ("out of, on the basis of faith") Gal 2:16; 3:8, 22, 24; Rom 3:26, 30; 5:1; 9:30; 10:6; πίστει ("by faith") Rom 3:28. Still other forms are used in Rom 4:5, 9, 11, 13; 10:11; Phil 3:9. See Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung," 161f.

41 On the concept of "faith" in Paul, see Rudolf Bultmann, "πιστεύω κτλ.," *TDNT* 6.209-28, 217ff;

idem, *Theology*, § 35-37; Conzelmann, *Outline*, § 20; idem, *Theologie als Schriftauslegung*, 191-206, 215-28; Henrik Ljungman, *Pistis* (Lund: Gleerup, 1964); Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung," 162ff; Dieter Lührmann, *Glaube im frühen Christentum* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976).

42 The abbreviation occurs in slightly different forms (πίστις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [so now Nestle-Aland]; the order of the names varies, see the *apparatus criticus*) in Gal 2:16; 3:22; Rom 3:22; with Ἰησοῦ ("Jesus") Rom 3:26; with Χριστοῦ ("Christ") in Phil 3:9; with τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ("the son of God") Gal 2:20. See Bultmann, "πιστεύω κτλ.," *TDNT* 6.210 n. 267. The interpretation of the doctrine is still disputed. See the older literature in Erwin Wissemann, *Das Verhältnis von ΠΙΣΤΙΣ und Christusfrömmigkeit bei Paulus* (FRLANT NF 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926); Rudolf Bultmann, "πιστεύω κτλ.," *TDNT* 6.209ff; Fritz Neugebauer, *In Christus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961) 150ff; Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung," 162ff.

43 See on this problem Walter Grundmann, "χρῖς κτλ.," *TDNT* 9.540-80.

44 For parallels in Gal 2:16, see Rom 3:20, 28; 4:5; 11:6; Phil 3:7-10; Eph 2:8; the verb πιστεύω with the preposition εἰς occurs also Rom 10:10, 14; Phil 1:29; cf. Rom 6:8; 1 Thess 4:14. See Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung," 172.

tion rules out the often-proposed but false idea that the genitive refers to the faith which Jesus himself had.⁴⁵ The preposition εἰς ("in") stands for an entire christology and soteriology which explains why the Christian can expect justification through his faith relationship with God "through Christ." The sentence v 16c, beginning with ἵνα ("so that"), reveals that becoming a Christian was a step done for theological purposes. Jews who believed they needed justification before God, but did not accept the doctrine of meritorious works of the Torah, became believers in Christ⁴⁶ because they believed that in this way they could obtain what they needed. The contrast between the abbreviations ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ ("on the basis of [the] faith of [=in] Christ") and ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ("on the basis of [the] works of [the] Torah") is emphasized by Paul polemically, because in a non-Pauline context both do not necessarily exclude each other; in Paul's formulation, however, the first abbreviation is taken to exclude the second. The clause also indicates that justification remains a matter of hope, and is not in any way a present guarantee.⁴⁷

The final clause (v 16d) cites the theological presupposition which undergirds the whole rejection of the doctrine of meritorious "works of the Torah." "Because all flesh shall not be justified by works of [the] Law." The statement consists of a Pauline interpretation of Scripture, Ps 143:2 (= 142:2 LXX).⁴⁸ It is introduced by what appears to be a quotation formula (ὅτι ["that"]).⁴⁹ The statement itself contains both a quotation from Scripture and Paul's interpretation which is made part of the quotation, so that the whole forms a statement of theological doctrine.⁵⁰ A comparison of the elements shows the composition of the statement: MT: כִּי לֹא יִצְדָּק לִפְנֵיךְ כָּל-חַי; LXX: ὅτι οὐ δικαιοθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν ("For every living being will not be justified before you"); Gal 2:16: ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ("For all flesh will not be justified on the basis of works of [the] Law").

Paul's exegesis⁵¹ points out that "every living being" (πᾶς ζῶν) means "all flesh" (πᾶσα σὰρξ),⁵² for "the works of the Torah" are "done" by "the human being" (ἄνθρωπος [v 16a]) who is "flesh" (σὰρξ). Paul then

interprets the phrase "justified before you" of the Psalm verse. The future of δικαιοθήσεται ("will be justified") is taken to refer to the eschatological judgment, an interpretation which renders "before you" a redundancy.⁵³ More important is that the question why there is no justification for the "flesh" is answered. Justification of the "flesh" can only mean justification "by works of the Torah" (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου), so that Paul has added this abbreviation. The flesh cannot be justified on its own terms and through its own efforts, because that would be "through works of the Torah."⁵⁴

Finally, it should be noted that Paul has succinctly introduced the two major types of evidence he is going to use in the *probatio* section (3:1-4:31): eye-witness evidence ("we have come to believe" [v 16b]) and proof from Scripture.

■ 17 From the statement of the assumed agreement (v 15-16) we now move on to the disagreement. The disagreement does not pertain to the doctrine of justification by faith for Jewish Christians, but to the implications of that doctrine for Gentile Christians. This means, of course, that the entire doctrine of justification by faith in Christ Jesus is at stake. In Paul's view, the implications of this doctrine show what the doctrine itself means. His statement is extremely complicated and raises a number of questions, a fact that no com-

mentator fails to mention.⁵⁵ Is the entire sentence a question⁵⁶ or a factual statement,⁵⁷ answered by the μὴ γένοιτο ("by no means!")? Is the first conditional clause an *irrealis*⁵⁸ or a *realis*? In what sense can Christ be misunderstood as "a servant of sin"? Does v 17 contain a charge made by opponents, which Paul takes up and disproves?

Paul's statement of the disagreement has two parts. First, he constructs a false argument. This argument seems hypothetical, but in fact it contains the real argument of the opponents. The false argument is, of course, constructed only to be criticized and refuted (vv 18, 21). Paul builds the false argument upon two presuppositions, the first of which is correct and the second false: "if, however, we who are seeking to be justified in Christ..." and: "are also found sinners...." The first, correct presupposition takes up the statement of definition in v 16, now emphasizing that "justification by faith" is an eschatological hope of "seeking to be justified (ζητεῖν δικαιοθῆναι)"⁵⁹ and that this "seeking to be justified" (which is the same as "believing in Christ Jesus" [v 16b]) takes place "in Christ" (ἐν Χριστῷ).

This last phrase is another abbreviation, which says that this "seeking to be justified" is done by participation in the "body of Christ."⁶⁰ For this reason the

45 The older literature is discussed by Kertelge, "Recht-fertigung," 164-66. Recently, this interpretation has been revived by Erwin R. Goodenough, "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity," in *Religion in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough* (Leiden: Brill, 1967) 47ff; Greer M. Taylor, "The Function of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ in Galatians," *JBL* 85 (1966) 58-76; George Howard, "On the 'Faith of Christ,'" *HTR* 60 (1967) 459-65. Because of the grammatical ambiguity the problem must be decided by context analysis, a methodical principle which these authors violate.

46 What becoming a believer meant, is spelled out in Rom 10:9-10: ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ ("If you confess with your mouth 'Lord [is] Jesus,' and if you believe with your heart 'God raised him from the dead,' you will be saved"). For the interpretation of this passage, see Conzelmann, *Theologie als Schriftauslegung*, 109-14, 120-30; idem, *Outline*, § 9; Klaus Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (StNT 7; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972) 27ff; Martin Rese, "Formeln und Lieder im Neuen Testament," *VF* 15 (1970) 75-96, 87ff.

47 See the eschatological passages in Gal 5:6; 6:7-9; also 1:8-9.

48 The same quotation is found in a similar context in Rom 3:20. The positive counterpart is Gal 3:11; Rom 1:17 (Hab 2:4); Gal 3:6; Rom 4:3 (Gen 15:6).

49 ὅτι, cf. Rom 3:20: διότι.

50 For this type of Scripture exegesis, see Otto Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (BFCTh 2.18; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929; rep. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972) 73ff; Betz, "2 Cor 6:14-7:1," 92ff.

51 See also Ulrich Wilckens, "Was heisst bei Paulus: 'Aus Werken wird kein Mensch gerecht'?" *EKKV* 1 (1969) 51-77; idem, *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit: Paulusstudien* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974) 77-109.

52 The phrase "all flesh" is Jewish. It occurs also in Rom 3:20; 1 Cor 1:29. On the concept of σὰρξ ("flesh") see Gal 1:16; 2:16, 20; 3:3; 4:13, 14, 23, 29; 5:13, 16, 17, 19, 24; 6:8, 12, 13. See Bultmann, *Theology*, § 22; Conzelmann, *Outline*, 178ff; Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 49f; Eduard Schweizer et al., *TDNT* 8, s.v. σὰρξ; Egon Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist: Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit* (WMANT 29; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968) 42; Alexander Sand, *Der Begriff "Fleisch" in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1967) 125, 149ff, 232.

53 It is kept in Rom 3:20, however.

54 This amounts to "boasting in the flesh" (see on this concept Gal 6:13f and further passages there). Paul's rejection of boasting is shared by parts of Judaism. See Str-B 3.156f, 162; 4/2.1108; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 11 n. 3; for Qumran, see IQS 11.2ff, 9ff; 1QH 4.29-31; and Braun, *Qumran* 1.173, 209.

55 For detailed analysis of the various positions which were taken by scholars in the past, see the commentaries, esp. Sieffert, pp. 146ff; Burton, pp. 125ff; Schlier, pp. 95f; and the studies by Wilhelm Mundle, "Zur Auslegung von Gal 2:17, 18," *ZNW* 23 (1924) 152f; Rudolf Bultmann, "Zur Auslegung von Galater 2, 15-18," in his *Exegetica*, 394-99; Klein, *Rekonstruktion*, 185ff.

56 This understanding is present in Nestle-Aland, and Aland, *Greek New Testament*. Oepke (p. 92) points out that the following denial (μὴ γένοιτο) is usually preceded by a question (cf. Rom 3:3f, 5f; Gal 3:21; Rom 3:31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11; 1 Cor 6:15). On the whole question, see Klein, *Rekonstruk-*

tion, 186-89; BDF, § 440, 2; BDR, § 440 n. 3.

57 So Bultmann (*Exegetica*, 394f), who interprets v 17a in parallelism with Gal 2:21 and 1 Cor 15:17 ("If however, Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile, [for] you are still in your sins"). The statements construct, in Bultmann's view, theological "absurdities." Against Bultmann, Klein argues that v 17 and v 21 cannot be parallel.

58 So Bultmann (*Exegetica*, 395f), following many older commentaries.

59 The "seeking" (ζητέω) is a conclusion from v 16. See for this term also 1 Thess 2:6; Rom 2:7; 3:11; 1 Cor 1:22; Col 3:1. Cf. Bauer, s.v.

60 The question is whether Paul refers to the formula "in Christ" (for which see on Gal 1:22; 2:4; 3:14, 26-28; 5:6; etc.) or whether he formulates in contrast to ἐν νόμῳ ("through [the] law"), thereby making the phrase instrumental ("through Christ"). The latter option is preferred by Oepke (p. 92 n. 228), who sees the phrase in analogy to Gal 3:11; Rom 5:9. Cf. also 1 Cor 6:11: ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ("through the name of Jesus Christ").

second presupposition must be false: those⁶¹ who are members of the "body of Christ" cannot be regarded⁶² as "sinners" in the Jewish sense of the term, i.e., as living outside of the realm of God's salvation.⁶³ For Paul there is no possibility of conceiving of Christians as living outside of the realm of God's grace. This must then be applied to v 15 and the concept of "sinners from the Gentiles." If Jewish Christians are not "sinners from the Gentiles," which of course they are not, the same must be true of the Gentile Christians because they, in the same way, are "seeking to be justified 'in Christ'." The fact that one is a Jew or a Gentile is irrelevant, if salvation comes through faith in Christ. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision means anything . . ." (5:6; 6:15). Gentile Christians, therefore, can no longer be regarded as existing in the situation of "sinners from the Gentiles," even though they are not circumcised and have not become part of the Torah covenant (in the Jewish sense of the term).

On this basis, Paul raises a strange question (v 17b): *Χριστὸς ἀμαρτίας διάκονος*; ("Is Christ then a servant of sin?") The statement is presented as a conclusion from the preceding two presuppositions, one correct and one false, so that for this logical reason alone it must be false. Being false, however, does not simply mean that the conclusion is absurd. If the Gentile Christians—as the opposition maintains—are as Christians

still sinners until they come under the Torah, then Christ has in fact become "a servant of sin."

The question is whether Paul himself has merely invented this idea or whether he has adopted a slogan from his opponents.⁶⁴ A decision is difficult, but the phrase itself has the appearance of a kind of slogan, to be sure a polemical one: *Χριστὸς ἀμαρτίας διάκονος* ("Christ servant of sin").⁶⁵ The slogan contains an absurd antithesis to similar formulations like "Christ servant of circumcision" (*Χριστὸς διάκονος περιτομῆς*) in Rom 15:8, or "the service of righteousness" (*ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης*) in 2 Cor 3:9. The parallel in v 21c poses a similar problem. It is quite conceivable and even probable that the absurd christological formulation in 2:17b comes from the opponents. But Paul himself has taken it up and has turned it into a self-caricature which sums up what the opponents think of his christology.⁶⁶ Whether or not this explanation is correct, one thing should be clear: "this can never be!" (*μὴ γένοιτο*).⁶⁷

■18 Paul supplies an explicit legal critique of the previous false argument (v 17). The critique shows that the entire problem was recognized and treated by Paul as one of religious law.⁶⁸ His critique presupposes a legal principle which he explicitly cites in Rom 4:15b: "where there is no law, there is no transgression."⁶⁹ Applied to the present context, this principle calls for

two hypothetical presuppositions: "I have dissolved"⁷⁰ the Torah in the sense that, for Paul, the difference between a "sinner" and a "righteous" is not determined by the existence or non-existence of "works of the Torah." Consequently, nobody can be regarded as a transgressor of a law⁷¹ which he is not required to obey. Turned the other way around, the other presupposition is presented: "only if I again institute"⁷² the law, I can become a transgressor⁷³ of that law. In other words: if I⁷⁴ want to regard the Gentile Christians as "transgressors" of the Torah and "sinners" in the Jewish sense of the term, I have to first reinstate the Torah as the law which then the Gentiles would be obliged to obey. Why, however, should anyone make such a demand, if not for the reason that the Gentile Christians need "the works of the Torah" for their justification at the last judgment?⁷⁵ If this should be the reason, the point of agreement, i.e., the doctrine of

justification by faith (v 15f), collapses (cf. v 21b-c).

■19 In vv 19-20 Paul presents the basic elements of his own theological position. Rhetorically this passage conforms to the "exposition" (*expositio*). The elements are set forth as four "theses." These theses are not only Paul's answers to the question raised in vv 17-18: how can the Christian who seeks to be justified before God by faith in Christ and not by "works of the Torah" escape being "a sinner"? They are also to be elaborated in the rest of the letter. But the form in which the theses are presented is peculiar; Paul uses the first person singular, i.e., himself as the prototypical example of what applies to all Pauline Christians.⁷⁶ Rhetorically there is no difficulty with this form,⁷⁷ but the analogy to the aretalogical statements⁷⁸ and even to the *synthemata*⁷⁹ of the mystery cults is remarkable. The four statements are as follows:

19a] 1. ἐγὼ διὰ νόμον νόμῳ ἀπέθανον ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω

61 αὐτοί ("they themselves") does not refer to v 15, but to those who seek to be justified in Christ.

62 For the meaning of εὕρισκω ("find"), see Rom 7:10; 1 Cor 4:2; 15:15; 2 Cor 5:3; 11:12; Phil 2:8; 3:9. See Bauer, *s.v.*, 2.

63 The meaning of ἀμαρτωλός ("sinful") is the same as in 2:15. See also Rom 6:1 ("Shall we remain in sin?").

64 Cf. the anti-Pauline designations of Paul as ἄνομος ("lawless"), ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἀνθρώπου ("the inimical man") in the ps.-Clem. literature (*Ep. Petr.* 2.3; *Recog.* 1.70.1; *Hom.* 2.15.5: "collaborator of the weak left"). Cf. also Matt 5:17-20; Jas 2:9f; 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 (see Appendix 2, below). Interestingly, the accusation "This man is the enemy of our law" (οὗτ[ος] ἐστίν ὁ ἐχθρὸς τοῦ νόμου ἡμῶν) was used by the Baptists against Mani (see Henrichs and Koenen, "Mani-Codex," 139; cf. the Introduction, § 2. C).

65 Cf. also Helmut Feld ("Christus Diener der Sünde"; Zum Ausgang des Streites zwischen Petrus und

Paulus," *ThQ* 153 [1973] 119-31) who believes that v 17 is what Cephas said in Antioch.

66 For a parallel, see Philo *Spec.* 2.10f. Cf. Paul's own self-understanding in 2 Cor 5:18: ἡ διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς ("the ministry of reconciliation"). Remarkable is also the parallel in *Odes Sol.* 10.5, where Christ says: "And the Gentiles who had been dispersed were gathered together, but I was not defiled by my love (for them) . . ." (tr. Charlesworth).

67 The expression is common in Hellenistic diatribe literature. In Paul it is found, apart from Gal 2:17, in 3:21; Rom 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11; 1 Cor 6:15. See Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (FRLANT 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910) 33, 68; BDF, § 384; BDR, § 384; Bauer, *s.v.* γίνομαι, I. 3. a.

68 So Bultmann, *Exegetica*, 397f; Schlier, pp. 96-98.

69 Cf. also Gal 4:1-2; Rom 3:20; 7:1-3, 7.

70 The term καταλύω ("do away with, annul, make invalid, repeal" [Bauer, *s.v.*]) is used here in the legal sense. See LSJ, *s.v.*; Bauer, *s.v.*, 1.c; Friedrich Büchsel, "λύω," *TDNT* 4.335-36; idem, "καταλύω, κατάλυμα," *TDNT* 4.338; Str-B 1.241, 3.537f. In the NT the term is used in this sense only in Matt 5:17. If the term is not used in this sense already in Matt 5:17, it became a catchword in the accusations against Paul (cf. Rom 3:31; Acts 18:13; 21:28; *Ep. Petr.* 2.4 [see Appendix 3, below]). Paul defends himself against this charge in Rom 3:31; 6-8; cf. also Acts 21:24-26; 22:3; 24:14; 25:8.

71 The term παραβάτης ("transgressor") is also a legal term, here with special application to the Jewish Torah. Cf. Rom 2:25, 27; Jas 2:9-11; Luke 6:5 D. See Johannes Schneider, "παραβάτης," *TDNT* 5.740-41; Schlier, pp. 97f; differently Oepke, p. 93.

72 οἰκοδομέω ("build") is of course a metaphor. Cf. Philo *Somn.* 2.284f: οἰκοδομεῖν δόγμα ("build up doctrine"); see also Otto Michel, "οἰκοδομέω," *TDNT* 5.138-44; cf. the legal overtones in the use of ἐνοικοδομέω in Plutarch *Cup. div.* 526C. For rabbinic parallels, see Str-B 3.537f; Michel, "οἰκοδομέω," *TDNT* 5.140-41, 146-47.

73 The rendering of συνιστάνω is difficult. Bauer (*s.v.*, *l.c.*) translates: "I demonstrate that I am a wrongdoer." Schlier (p. 97 n. 3) suggests that it comes close to "institute myself as someone." The legal meaning is obvious. See also LSJ, *s.v.*; Wilhelm Kasch, "συνίστημι κτλ.," *TDNT* 7.896-98. Cf. the simplex ἵστημι Rom 3:31.

74 In v 18 Paul changes from the first person plural to

the first person singular. This shift has caused much discussion, for which see esp. Burton, pp. 130f; Oepke, p. 93; Schlier, pp. 96f; Mussner, pp. 177f; Klein, *Rekonstruktion*, 195ff. One should not deny that it is a rhetorical feature, by which Paul uses himself as the example. The change also indicates that this and the following were not shared by Jewish Christianity.

75 Cf. the Galatians' present plan to accept Torah and circumcision (see Gal 4:21).

76 Cf. Gal 6:14, 17b; 1:10, 11, 12ff; 4:12-20; 5:2, 10, 11; 1 Cor 15:10; 2 Cor 10:1; 12:1-10; etc.

77 See Betz, *Paulus*, 64, 73ff, and *passim*; also idem, "Eine Christus-Aretalogie bei Paulus (2 Kor 12, 7-10)" *ZThK* 66 (1969) 288-305.

78 See, e.g., *Corp. Herm.* 1.30; 13.11. Cf. the commentary in William Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature* (Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1977 [unpubl.]). Other parallels are found in the presentations of themselves by the philosophers in Lucian's "Philosophies for Sale" (*Vit. auct.*).

79 For a collection of the synthemata see Albrecht Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966) 213ff. See furthermore, Günter Zuntz's new edition and commentary of the Orphic Gold Tablets in his *Persephone* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1971); John G. Griffiths, *Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses Book XI)* (EPRO 39; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 294ff.

- 19b] 2. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι
 20a] 3. ζῶ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός
 20b] 4. δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ
 τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ
 τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με
 καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ
 19a] 1. "through [the] Law I died to [the] Law, in
 order that I might live for God"
 19b] 2. "I have been crucified with Christ"
 20a] 3. "it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in
 me"
 20b] 4. "what I now live in [the] flesh, I live in [the]
 faith
 in the Son of God
 who loved me and gave himself up for me"

(1) Verse 19a contains the first thesis: "through the Torah I died to the Torah, in order that I might live for God." The difficulty of interpreting this *crux interpretum* comes from its nature of "abbreviation," which must be "decoded." The "I" (ἐγώ) to which Paul refers is not so much the personal "I" but the paradigmatic "I," which had occurred already in v 18. The

content of the statement is expanded in the *probatio* section, especially 3:19–25. "Through the Torah" is explained in 3:19–25 by attributing to the Torah an active role in salvation (3:22), while "I died to the Torah" refers to the end of that role of the Torah (3:25; cf. Rom 7:4; 10:4).⁸⁰ The aorist ἀπέθανον ("I have died") in a metaphorical way points to some kind of death experience, which is clarified by the following thesis: "I have been crucified together with Christ." The purpose and goal is stated in this sentence: ἵνα θεῶ ζήσω ("in order that I might live for God").⁸¹ "Death to the Torah" is the presupposition for the "life for God," but as the parenesis (5:1–6:10) shows, "life for God" does not happen automatically. "To live for God" sums up Paul's concept of Christian existence, soteriology as well as ethics.⁸² Perhaps one may call it Paul's "telos formula," analogous to those found in the philosophical literature.⁸³

(2) The second thesis (v 19b) is also very concise: Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι ("I have been crucified together with Christ"). A similar statement occurs in the *exhortatio* (5:24) and in the *peroratio* (6:14).⁸⁴ But the main

passage to compare is 3:26–28. A more detailed interpretation is found in Rom 6:1–10. At this point, however, the methodological problem arises, whether or not Gal 2:19–20 should be interpreted on the basis of Romans 6. Is Gal 2:19–20 a condensation of Romans 6?⁸⁵ Most interpreters answer affirmatively and, therefore, interpret Romans 6 into Gal 2:19–20.⁸⁶ To be sure, Paul mentions baptism only once, in Gal 3:27, where it may be part of a pre-Pauline baptismal formula. Strangely, in 3:27 Paul does not mention the dying together with Christ, while in 5:24; 6:14, when he speaks of the death together with Christ he does not mention baptism. In none of the passages does he mention Christ's resurrection, or any of the other concepts of Romans 6. This difference cannot be accidental. Galatians seems to express a similar restraint with regard to baptism as we find in 1 Cor 1:13–17. It is only in Romans 6 that Paul interprets the ritual of baptism in terms of death and resurrection together with Christ. That interpretation must be secondary and cannot be tied entirely to baptism in the way Schlier does. In fact, it may be just the other way around; Gal 2:19 may contain the theological principle

by which Paul interprets the ritual of baptism in Romans 6.

■ 20 The (3) third of the four "theses" (see v 19) follows in v 20a, connected by δέ ("but"): "it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me." In terms of content, there are of course many connections between this statement and the rest of the letter. Surprisingly, Paul declares the "I"⁸⁷ to be dead; if he speaks of "living for God" as the goal of Christian existence, that "life" must be different from the "life" of the "I". "Crucifixion together with Christ" implies not only "death to the Law" (2:19), but also "death to the 'I'." The "I" belongs to the sinful "flesh with its passions and desires" (5:24), and thus to "the world." For Paul, "crucifixion together with Christ" also means "crucifixion to the world" (6:14), and for that reason he can declare the "I" to be "dead."

One should not confuse this doctrine about the "I" with the more elaborate and different treatment of the subject in Rom 7:9–25:⁸⁸ before the "coming" of the Torah the "I" lived (Rom 7:9), but when Torah and sin entered into human existence, the "I" died (7:10); pre-Christian humans have an "I," but it is defunct

80 The "I" stands in juxtaposition to the "we are found" in v 17, but Paul has more in mind than his "own experiences" (Burton, p. 132). See also C. F. D. Moule, "Death 'to Sin', 'to Law,' and 'to the World': A Note on Certain Datives," in *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970) 367–75.

81 On the soteriological meaning of ἵνα ("in order that") see Gal 2:16; 3:22, 24; 4:5; Rom 5:20; 6:1, 4, 6; 7:4; 8:17; 11:32; 2 Cor 5:15; Phil 3:8; 1 Thess 5:10. See also Ethelbert Stauffer, *TDNT* 3, s.v. ἵνα.

82 The concept occurs also Rom 6:10, 11 (where it is supplemented by "in Christ Jesus"). The opposite is "live for oneself" (ζῆν ἑαυτῷ), cf. Rom 14:7; 2 Cor 5:15. Related expressions are: "live for the Lord" Rom 14:8; 2 Cor 5:15; "live with Christ" Rom 6:8; 2 Cor 7:3; 13:4; 1 Thess 5:10; (2 Tim 2:11); cf. Phil 1:21f; "live by the Spirit" Gal 5:25; cf. Rom 8:13; "live out of faith" Gal 3:11; Rom 1:17; "live in faith" Gal 2:20. See furthermore Luke 20:38; Heb 9:14; 1 Pet 2:24; 4:6; *Herm. Mand.* 3.5. See Rudolf Bultmann, *TDNT* 2, s.v. ζῶν κτλ., esp. 863 n. 263.

83 Cf. esp. *Sent. Sextus* 201 (in Henry Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus: A Contribution to the Early Christian History of Ethics* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univer-

sity, 1959] 34): τέλος ἡγοῦ βίου τὸ ζῆν κατὰ θεόν ("Consider as the goal of life living in accordance with God."). Cf. also Pyth. *Sent.* 30 (ibidem, 87). For Jewish parallels, see 4 Macc. 6:18; 7:19; 16:25; Philo *Her.* 111; *Mut.* 213; cf. *Her.* 57; *Post.* 73; *Det.* 48. On the subject of the "telos formulae" see Gerhard Delling, "Telos-Aussagen in der griechischen Philosophie," *ZNW* 55 (1964) 26–42; now in his *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1950–1968* (ed. Ferdinand Hahn et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 17–31.

84 Other formulaic statements about "dying with Christ" are found in Rom 6:3–10; 8:17; Phil 3:10, 21; Col 2:12–14, 20; 3:3–4; Ign. *Eph.* 9.1; Ign. *Trall.* 11.2; Ign. *Smyr.* 1.1; 7.2. On the whole concept see Bultmann, *Theology*, § 33; Conzelmann, *Outline*, 209, 281; Betz, *Nachfolge*, 169–85; Robert C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ* (BZNW 32; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967), esp. 55–61; Eduard Schweizer, "Die 'Mystik' des Sterbens und Auf-erstehens mit Christus bei Paulus," in his *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Zurich: Zwingli, 1970) 183–203; idem, "Dying and Rising with Christ," *NTS* 14 (1967) 1–14; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul* (New York: Herder, 1964); idem, "Todes- und Lebensgemein-

schaft mit Christus: Neue Studien zu Röm 6, 1–11," in his *Schriften zum Neuen Testament* (Munich: Kösel, 1971) 361–90, with extensive bib.; Peter Siber, *Mit Christus Leben* (ATHANT 61; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971) esp. 192, 196, 222ff. Since most authors find the concept of baptism in Gal 2:19f, literature on baptism usually discusses the passage. See Mussner (pp. 179ff) with bib.

85 See the conclusions reached by Blank, *Paulus und Jesus*, 298f.

86 This is done systematically by Schlier (pp. 99f) who follows patristic commentators and interprets the event of death as "an objective event which happens to the baptizant in the act of baptism." This act is "a growing together with the death of Christ," and it implies "a real, even if invisible elimination of 'the old man' and his basis of life which was entirely controlled by sin." It also includes "the creation of a new basis of life in which man in Christ Jesus is opened up for God." Most recent commentators follow Schlier, esp. Blank, *Paulus und Jesus*, 298f; Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung," 239–42. For a critique of this sacramentalism, see Schulz, "Katholisierende Tendenzen in Schliers Galater-Kommentar," *KD* 5 (1959) 33–41; Betz, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1," 106 n. 111.

87 On the meaning of ἐγώ ("I") in Gal, see on 2:19, n. 76. Strangely, no satisfactory investigation of the notion in Paul exists. See, for further literature, Ethelbert Stauffer, "ἐγώ," *TDNT* 2.356–62; Rudolf Bultmann, "Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus," in his *Exegetica*, 198–209; Werner Georg Kümmel, *Römer 7 und das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament* (Munich: Kaiser, 1974).

88 We differ here especially from Schlier (pp. 101f) who interprets Gal 2:20 by a mixture of Rom 8:9f and Col 3:3f: "Christ is our life," and we who have died with him in baptism also live with him in a hidden way in God. He lives in us through the indwelling Spirit (Rom 8:9f). "Justification in Christ has not only killed the old man and thereby removed him from the Law, but it has also created in us the new hidden man in Christ who becomes strong through the Spirit and the faith, and who 'takes shape' . . . (Gal 4:19)." The "Christ in us" is "the inner man," which we have "put on" in baptism (Eph 3:16f; Col 3:9f). According to Schlier, all expressions correlating "Christ" and "us" (e.g., "we in Christ," and "Christ in us") are baptismal formulae. Similarly, Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung," 240. On Rom 7:9ff, see Käsemann (*Römer*, 183ff) with further bib.

and its place is occupied by “sin” (Rom 7: 14, 17), as is the entire “flesh” (σάρξ). When we compare Gal 2: 20 with Romans, the “I” in Gal 2: 20 can be compared with the concept of “our old man” (ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος ἡμῶν) in Rom 6: 6, who dies with Christ in baptism. Also different from Galatians is the introduction of the concept of “the inner man” (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος) in Rom 7: 22.⁸⁹ Paul does not say in Romans, as he does in Galatians, that the “I” is evil as such, but he makes new distinctions: “our old man” which is identical with the “flesh” and the “sinful body” (τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας) dies together with Christ, but according to Rom 7: 22-23 one part of the “I”, the “inner man” with its “mind” (νοῦς) wills the good but is hindered from achieving it “by the law of sin which resides in my members.”⁹⁰ In other words, not all of the “I” is dead—the “mind” (νοῦς) of the “inner man” is still alive even though it is imprisoned and prevented from its activities.

To return to Galatians, since the “I” is dead, another agent must do the “living in me” if the statement “I shall live for God” (v 19) is to be accepted.⁹¹ Paul’s thesis specifies that “Christ lives in me” (ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ

Χριστός). This statement must be seen in connection with Gal 1: 16 (“God revealed his son in me”) and 4: 6 (“God has sent the Spirit of his son into our hearts”). The underlying assumption is that the resurrected Christ (1: 1) is identical with the “Spirit” (2 Cor 3: 17a) which is given to the Christians, and which dwells in them and provides “life for God” for them.⁹² There can be no doubt that Paul speaks here in “mystical” terms.⁹³ The doctrine of the indwelling Christ is developed in the *probatio* section in those passages which deal with the Spirit (3: 2-5; 4: 6 especially), and in the *exhortatio* section in the passages dealing with “life in the Spirit” (especially 5: 5, 16, 17, 18, 22-23, 25; 6: 1, 8.)

(4) Verse 20b contains the fourth and concluding “thesis”: “what I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me.” Again, this thesis is simply added to the previous ones (δέ [“and”]). In terms of content, it further interprets what is meant by “Christ lives in me” (v 20a). Paul’s understanding that life has some kind of object is strange.⁹⁴ ὅ (“what”) can be understood to simply refer to “life,”⁹⁵ it can be taken to limit that

life (“to the extent that I have life”),⁹⁶ or it can point to the following “in the faith.”⁹⁷ A decision is difficult. At any rate, Paul’s concept of life requires not only a subject which lives the life, but also a content-object: those who live, live something, i.e., a life. What the Apostle means is clear: Christian life takes place “in the flesh” (ἐν σαρκί).⁹⁸ This statement, simple as it is, may be polemical. It rejects widespread enthusiastic notions, which may have already found a home in Christianity, according to which “divine life” and “flesh” are mutually exclusive, so that those who claim to have divine life also claim that they have left the conditions of mortality.⁹⁹ The Christian life “in the flesh” is at the same time a life “in faith” (ἐν πίστει ζῶ).¹⁰⁰ In other words, the “divine life” which the

Christian receives through the indwelling of Christ expresses itself as “faith.”¹⁰¹ This faith is of course “faith in Christ Jesus” (2: 16).¹⁰² The full interpretation of this “thesis” is to be found in the entire *probatio* section (3: 1-4: 31) and in the *exhortatio* section (5: 1-6: 10).

In 2: 20 Paul defines¹⁰³ “faith” by a further statement combining the christological title “Son of God”¹⁰⁴ with a christological formula. The title “Son of God” is well-attested in Paul.¹⁰⁵ The following christological formula combines two participial expressions, both of which occur elsewhere, together¹⁰⁶ or separately:¹⁰⁷ “who loved me and gave himself up for me.” The formula refers to Christ’s death on the cross as an act of

89 For this concept, see 2 Cor 4: 16; also Eph 3: 16, where the notion is used differently. See Conzelmann, *Outline*, 180; Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 391ff.
90 Note the different meaning in Rom 7: 24a (“I” is simply “sinful man”) and 7: 24b, probably a post-Pauline gloss, where the “I” is split. See Bultmann, *Exegetica*, 278f; Käsemann, *Römer*, 190ff, with further literature.
91 Cf. Phil 1: 21: ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός (“for me living means Christ”). See Bultmann, “ζῶω,” *TDNT* 2.866-70.
92 Rom 8: 2-11 provides a more systematic and slightly different interpretation. In Rom 8: 9f the “Spirit of God,” “the Spirit of Christ,” and the indwelling Christ are all one. If Christ dwells in the Christian, it means that “the body is dead because of sin” and that “the spirit is life because of righteousness.” The same Spirit raised Jesus from the dead and makes the mortal bodies of the Christians alive (8: 11). Schlier (pp. 101-03) interprets Rom into Gal and goes further in systematizing Paul, saying that in baptism the “new man” is created sacramentally as the “objective basis” upon which the Christian life rests. “Spirit” and “faith” are the means by which “the new life based upon Christ in baptism” be-

comes real in the concrete life of the Christian. Schlier explicitly rejects all “mysticism” as “subjectivism” and favors sacramental objectivism. Similarly Kertelge, “*Rechtfertigung*,” 240.
93 Cf. the close parallel *Odes Sol.* 10.2: “And He [God] has caused to dwell in me His immortal life, and permitted me to proclaim the fruit of the peace” (tr. Charlesworth). The concept of a deity indwelling in man was held widely in different religions in antiquity, including Christianity. The literature on the subject is vast. See Widengren, *Religionsphänomenologie*, 516ff; Reitzenstein, *Mysterienreligionen*, 361 and *passim*; Hermann Kleinknecht, “*πνεῦμα, πνευματικός*,” *TDNT* 6.339-59; Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, 136ff, 216ff; Johannes Haussleiter, “*Deus Internus*,” *RAC* 3.794-842; Hans Dieter Betz, “The Delphic Maxim *ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ* in Hermetic Interpretation,” *HTR* 63 (1970) 465-84; *PECL*, index, s.v. *ἐνθουσιασμός*, “Inspiration.”
94 Cf. the parallel in Rom 6: 10.
95 So Schlier, p. 102 n. 4. Many commentators refer to the parallel in Plutarch *Virt. et vit.* 100F: καὶ γὰρ ὁ καθεύδουσι τοῦ σώματος ὕπνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνάπαυσις . . . (“For what sleep there is, it is sleep and repose for the body . . .”).

96 So, e.g., Lightfoot, p. 119: “So far as I live now in the flesh. . . .” This understanding takes into account that “life in the flesh” is not yet the full life to come in the afterlife.
97 So Bauer, s.v. ὅς, 7. c.
98 The adverb νῦν (“now”) is related to the οὐκέτι (“no longer”) in v 20a and points to the Christian existence in contrast to the pre-Christian (see Gal 3: 3; 4: 9, 29, and often in Paul). On the whole concept, see Peter Tachau, “*Einst*” und “*Jetzt*” im Neuen Testament (FRLANT 105; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).
99 Also 2 Cor 10: 3 is polemical: “for we are walking in the flesh” (ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες). See Betz, *Paulus*, 140f. Cf. also Gal 6: 12-17; 4: 13f; 5: 1-6: 10; Phil 1: 22, 24; 2 Cor 4: 11; Phlm 16; etc. Differently, Rom 8: 8f contrasts the “life according to the Spirit” with the “life according to the flesh” and concludes: “But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit” (ὁμοῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστέ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι . . .). The dualism between “flesh” and “Spirit” is clearly expressed in Gal 5: 16ff.
100 Cf. 1 Cor 16: 13: στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει (“stand in the faith”); 2 Cor 1: 24; 13: 5. See Bauer, s.v. πίστις, 2. b. β.
101 For Schlier (p. 102) the “earthly existence” of the Christian occurs “in a new mode of being: ἐν πίστει.” This “new mode of being” is granted to the Christian in baptism: “Christ has entered into our being, insofar as we were implanted in the being of Christ” (pp. 101f). This sacramental grace is received in baptism and continued in faith. Cf. the critique of Schlier by Kertelge, “*Rechtfertigung*,” 241f.
102 Cf. Eph 3: 17, where what Paul means is stated: κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρ-

δίαις ὑμῶν (“Christ dwells, through the faith, in your hearts”).
103 For other instances of such “definitions” see Burton, p. 139.
104 Instead of *υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*, P⁴⁶ B D* G it^{4,8} Marius Victorinus Pelagius read *θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ*. But “faith in God and Christ” is not a Pauline phrase and must be due to later theology. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 593.
105 On this title, see on Gal 1: 16.
106 Cf. Eph 5: 2: “. . . as also Christ loved us and gave himself for us as an offering and sacrifice to God for a fragrance of pleasant odor” (. . . καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας). For the textual question see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 606. A similar formula is found Eph 5: 25.
107 For the christology of self-sacrifice see Gal 1: 4; 3: 13; Rom 4: 25; 8: 32; 1 Tim 2: 6; Tit 2: 14; also Phil 2: 6f; 1 Cor 11: 23f; etc. References to the “love of Christ” are in form of the aorist participle (see Rom 8: 37; also Eph 5: 2, 25; 2 Thess 2: 16) or the noun *ἀγάπη* (see Rom 8: 35, 39; 2 Cor 5: 14; Eph 3: 19; Col 1: 13). Christ’s love and God’s love are related in Rom 8: 32, 39 (cf. 5: 5; 2 Cor 13: 11; Eph 2: 4; 2 Thess 2: 13, 16; 3: 5; and often in Ign.).
The variant reading *ἀγοράσαντος* by Marcion, Rufinus, is probably taken from Gal 3: 13, and is thus secondary (see Nestle-Aland, *apparatus criticus*, *ad loc.*).

love¹⁰⁸ and self-sacrifice on behalf of the Christian.¹⁰⁹

■ 21 The concluding statement of the *propositio* is the refutation¹¹⁰ of a charge: “I do not nullify the grace of God.” Of course, this refutation rests upon the preceding statements in the *propositio* (2:15–20) and anticipates what the Apostle will prove and defend in the following sections of the letter. Paul denies that his theology, which he had set forth in the four “theses” (v 19–20), amounts to a corruption of God’s grace. The concept of “the grace of God” (ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ)¹¹¹ describes the entire process of salvation in Christ; the term ἀθετέω (“nullify”) is rather strong and has legal overtones.¹¹² The implication is that the denial rejects a charge actually made by Paul’s opponents. It is conceivable that the charge “Paul annuls the grace of God” was actually made against him by his opponents.¹¹³ They could make such a charge if their concept of divine redemption (“grace of God”) would include the Torah covenant.¹¹⁴ But it could also be Paul himself who draws the conclusion from whatever his opponents say against him, and denies it.¹¹⁵

Why is the refutation justified? Because the accusation is false. The accusation rests upon a false presupposition and a false conclusion. “For if righteousness [came] through [the] Torah, then Christ has died in vain.” The abbreviation “through [the] Torah” (διὰ νόμου)¹¹⁶ is equal to “through [the] works of [the] Torah” (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου) in 2:16–17 and stands in contrast to “through [the] faith in Christ Jesus.” The noun “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη)¹¹⁷ describes what the act of justification (δικαιοῦσθαι) is expected to produce: the status of righteousness before God. The conditional clause, therefore, states the opposite of what Paul had formulated in v 16 as the common agreement. For this reason it must be a false presupposition.¹¹⁸ If it were accepted, however, it would simply amount to the affirmation of Jewish (non-Christian) doctrine, and in that case¹¹⁹ the death of Christ would be deprived of its salvific character. His death would have been a death “in vain” (δωρεάν ἀπέθανεν).¹²⁰ In other words, the charge against Paul would be justified only if he did

the opposite of what he is in fact doing. In fact, his opponents are those who argue a theology diametrically opposed to Paul’s, so that—here the refutation turns into an accusation—the charge of “invalidation of God’s grace” must be raised against his opponents. In Paul’s view, the “false brothers” at Jerusalem had denied God’s grace (2:4–5), Cephas had denied it in Antioch (2:11–14), the present opponents deny it, and

the Galatians themselves are about to reject the grace of God.¹²¹

If our interpretation is correct, we should expect the refutation to recur in the *peroratio*. And it does recur, but not as the refutation of the charge, because Paul disproves it fully in the *probatio* and the *exhortatio* sections. What he repeats in the *peroratio* is the accusation against the opponents (6:12–13).

121 See Gal 1:6f; 5:4, 11; 6:12–14.

108 On the notion of ἀγαπάω (“love”) see also Robert Joly, *Le vocabulaire chrétien de l’amour est-il original? Φιλεῖν et ἀγαπᾶν dans le grec antique* (Université libre de Bruxelles, Institut d’histoire du christianisme; Brussels: Presses Universitaires, 1968); Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 218–31.

109 Joachim Jeremias (*Abba*, 206f) has tried to show that Gal 2:20 contains a “ὑπέρ-formula,” which is derived from Isa 53. See also his somewhat different views in “παῖς θεοῦ,” *TDNT* 5.706–07. Against Jeremias, Kramer (*Christ, Lord, Son of God*, 30ff) attributes Gal 2:20 to an older stage of a formula, which is not influenced by Isa 53. For the whole, largely speculative discussion, see Wengst, *Christologische Formeln*, 55ff; furthermore, Harald Riesenfeld, “ὑπέρ,” *TDNT* 8.507–16; Hermann Patsch, “Zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund von Römer 4, 25 und I. Petrus 2, 24,” *ZNW* 60 (1969) 273–79.

110 On the *refutatio*, see, e.g., Rom 3:31; 6:1; 7:7; Matt 5:17; John 7:28; 8:42; 12:49; 15:16.

111 On the notion of “grace” see Gal 1:3, 6, 15; 2:9; 5:4; 6:18.

112 On this concept, see Gal 3:15; 1 Cor 1:19; 1 Tim 5:12; Ign. *Eph.* 10.3. See also Bauer, *s.v.*; Wilhelm Maurer, “τίθημι,” *TDNT* 8.155–59.

113 Schlier (p. 104) considers the possibility that Paul was actually accused of doing away with God’s grace.

114 For the unity of “grace” and “Torah” in Judaism, see Hans Conzelmann, “χάρις, κτλ.,” *TDNT* 9.387–91; Heinrich Gross, “Tora und Gnade im Alten Testament,” *Kairos* 14 (1972) 220–31; R. J. Zwi Werblowski, “Tora als Gnade,” *Kairos* 15 (1973) 156–63; Mussner, pp. 185f.

115 Cf. the charge in 2:17.

116 Cf. 2:19a.

117 On this concept, see Gal 3:6, 21; 5:5. For the literature, see on 2:16.

118 See 2:19; 3:21. On the unreal indicative in conditional sentences without ἄν in the apodosis cf. BDF, § 360; also Reitzenstein, *Mysterienreligionen*, 375f.

119 On the particle ἄρα, cf. 2:17; 3:29; 5:11. See Margaret E. Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies* (NTTS 3; Leiden: Brill, 1962) 36.

120 On “in vain” see 2:2; 3:4; 4:11.