

Torah in Galatians

The Significance of the Reception of the Septuagint

Martin Meiser

1 Introduction: Conflicting Identities

Paul's letter to the Galatians is not »rewritten Bible« in a narrow sense of this meanwhile well-debated¹ term: The so-called »Old Testament« has an authoritative status for him; he does not write a text that should become authoritative in opposition to the authority of his Bible. Interpretation of the Bible, not rewriting the Bible is an adequate labelling of his activity. There are, however, analogies between Paul's letter and the so-called »rewritten Bible Literature« with regard to distinct modes of interpretation, for instance, the application of own insights and harmonizing interpretations. Is the Septuagint »rewritten Bible«? Moshe Bernstein excluded translations from the category »rewritten Bible«.² With regard to genre, this seems wise; with regard to techniques of interpretation, we can ask for analogies in methods.

The letter to Galatians, written ca. 55–56³, witnesses the conflict between two seemingly irreconcilable concepts of identity. According to the »Jewish-

¹ Cf. M. Bernstein, »Rewritten Bible: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?« *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–196, 175: »One group's rewritten Bible could very well be another's biblical text!« Cf. further E. Tov, »Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,« *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–354, 336: »The boundary between biblical texts and non-biblical texts was not as fixed as we would have liked for the purpose of our scholarly analysis.«

² Bernstein, »Rewritten Bible« (n. 1), 177.

³ In this contribution, it is not possible to discuss the question concerning »when« and »where« in an appropriate way. In my view, the letter to the Galatians is prior to 2 Cor 5:21 and the letter to Romans: 1. In Galatians, Paul does not use the formula δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ which would be suitable for the purpose of his argumentation; 2. In Rom 8:3f., Paul combines what is split in Gal 3:10 (argument of fact) and 3:11 (argument of divine positing); the argument of fact is radicalized by anthropological reflection on the character of human σάρξ. 3. In Gal 3:17, Paul does not recognize Gen 17:9, 11 with regard to the term διαθήκη. Rom 4 is dedicated to an improvement of his flawed argument (cf. also J. Becker, *Paulus. Der Apostel der Völker* [Tübingen ³1998], 315), perhaps motivated by »sharp questioning from nonbelieving Jews or Jewish Christian challengers« (C. J. Roetzel, *Paul. The Man and the Myth* [Edinburgh 1999], 123).

Christian⁴ agitators, the unity of relationship to the offspring of Abraham⁵, held by circumcision and observance to the Torah, encompasses the distinct groups within Judaism, e. g. the believers in Jesus as the Messiah and other groups who do not share this belief. Non-Jewish believers in Jesus are free to join the group⁶ and to become co-heirs of the promise given to Abraham. Among the distinct Jewish groups, Paul's opponents are not close-minded but open-minded to non-Jews who are converting to Judaism. Their position has affinities to Isa 2:1–4; 56:7, but not to Deut 23:2. Circumcision and observance of the Torah, however, are indisputable preconditions from their point of view. According to Paul's concept of ecclesial unity, however, the unity »in Christ« encompasses distinct preconditions concerning Jewish or non-Jewish offspring, and it is exclusively »faith«, understood as acknowledgment⁷ of God's activity in the cross and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which enables both Jews and non-Jews to join the group of Jesus-adherents. This concept, based on »interactive interpretation of Scripture«,⁸ is a concept of salvation history⁹ yet including a fundamental pessimistic appraisal concerning humans fulfilling the will of God.¹⁰ Given the identity of Jesus Christ's Father with the God of Israel, Paul has to determine the role

⁴ M. D. Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians. Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* (Minneapolis 2002), 193–199, stated that Paul's opponents are Jews from the local synagogue. Gal 6:12f., however, would not make sense on this assumption.

⁵ Probably the opponents of Paul used the concept of Abraham as Father of Israel in order to convince the Galatians to circumcision (M. C. de Boer, *Galatians. A Commentary* [The New Testament Library; Louisville 2011], 185). D. J. Moo, *Galatians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids 2013), 187, correctly states, however, that it is not cogent that a specific interpretation of Gen 15:6 was part of their preaching in Galatia.

⁶ According to Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 192, we »have no evidence that the agitators were disputing the fact that *Gentiles* could be included in Abraham's family« (emphasis original).

⁷ Especially in Galatians, »faith« concerns *fides quae*, not *fides qua*. In terms of *history of religion*, the background of this concept lies in the usage concerning the conversion to Judaism (Jdt 14:10; Wis 12:2; Philo, *Abr.* 69 f.; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.169; cf. H. Räisänen, »Galatians 2.16 and Paul's Break with Judaism«, *NTS* 31 [1985]: 543–553, 546).

⁸ M. Müller, »The New Testament Reception of the Old Testament«, in *The New Testament as Reception* (ed. idem and H. Tronier; JSNT 230; Sheffield 2002), 1–14, 9. It is both an honour and pleasure for me to greet Mogens Müller with this contribution.

⁹ K. Stendahl, *Der Jude Paulus und wir Heiden. Anfragen an das abendländische Christentum* (Kaiser Traktate 36; München 1978), 33; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London 1977), 442; J. D. G. Dunn, »The New Perspective on Paul«, in idem, *The New Perspective on Paul. Collected Essays* (WUNT 185; Tübingen 2005), 89–110, 103. N. T. Wright, »Curse and Covenant: Galatians 3.10–14«, in idem, *The Climax of the Covenant. Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (London and New York 1991), 137–156, 155; J.-Chr. Maschmeier, *Rechtfertigung bei Paulus. Eine Kritik alter und neuer Paulusperspektiven* (BWANT 189; Stuttgart 2010), 174f. My pleading for a salvation historical approach is based on Gal 3:23–25 (see below).

¹⁰ The one-sidedness of emphasizing salvation history is an issue of critique, cf. H. Hübner, »Pauli Theologiae proprium«, *NTS* 26 (1980): 445–473, 463; E. Lohse, »Theologie der Rechtfertigung im kritischen Disput – zu einigen neuen Perspektiven in der Interpretation der Theologie des Apostels Paulus«, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 249 (1997): 66–81, 70; F. W. Horn, »Juden und Heiden. Aspekte der Verhältnisbestimmung in den paulinischen Briefen. Ein

of the Law whose role as central identity marker is undisputed within Judaism. Within the Galatian conflict, Paul claims that his own position is in accordance with God's will and the γραφή.

A coherent interpretation of the many opaque passages within Galatians presupposes a sober methodology. The following issues are important from my point of view: 1. In cases of doubt, the context within Galatians is decisive. The letter to the Romans does not have a prejudicing role. On the other hand, parallels within 2 Corinthians and Romans make sure that some issues in Galatians are not only the result of rhetoric in conflict. 2. Despite the singularity of some Pauline thoughts not accepted in some Jewish circles, we have to understand Paul on the background of ancient Judaism. 3. For Paul, the »new life in Christ« was a matter not of theoretical arguing but of his own experience (cf. Gal 1:15 f.).

The arrangement of this contribution is as follows: after some terminological remarks I will comment the »*propositio*«¹¹ Gal 2:15–21 and will give an outline of the »*probatio*«.¹² Within the frame of salvation history, I will explain at first the threefold role of the Torah during the era before the coming of Christ (announcement, curse, and restriction), then the role of the Torah in the life of the believers (command of love).

2 Νόμος and Γραφή: Paul's Terminology

Some scholars regard the two terms νόμος and γραφή as interchangeable¹³ – but why should Paul use both terms and not only one of them? Sometimes this notion of equivalency is restricted to Gal 4:21b; 5:14.¹⁴ Other scholars present a distinction along the lines of activity vs. passivity: νόμος is a passive object; γραφή is an active instance.¹⁵ The latter part of this hypothesis is correct; in the case of νόμος, the focus on passivity does not cover the spectrum of usage. According to Douglas Moo, Paul uses γραφή when singling out a particular text.¹⁶ Rhetorical motivation sometimes may be the rationale for Paul's terminology:

Gespräch mit Krister Stendahl,« in *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive. Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion* (ed. M. Bachmann; WUNT 182; Tübingen 2005), 17–39, 31; Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 159; J. Schröter, »Der Mensch zwischen Wollen und Tun. Erwägungen zu Römer 7 im Licht der »New Perspective on Paul«,« in *Paulus – Werk und Wirkung* (FS Lindemann; ed. P.-G. Klumbies and D. S. du Toit; Tübingen 2013), 195–223, 220.

¹¹ H. D. Betz, *Galatians. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis 1979), 113.

¹² *Ibid.*, 113.

¹³ J. Rohde, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (THKNT 9; Berlin 1989), 160 n. 39.

¹⁴ V. M. Smiles, *The Gospel and the Law in Galatia. Paul's Response to Jewish-Christian Separatism and the Threat of Galatian Apostasy* (Collegeville 1998), 122.

¹⁵ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 175; F. Vouga, *An die Galater* (HNT 9; Tübingen 1998), 85.

¹⁶ Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 239.

Perhaps Paul's opponents also terminologically referred to »Scripture«¹⁷; in Gal 4:21b, Paul is forced to use the term νόμος due to his describing the wish of the Galatians to be subject to the νόμος in 4:21a.¹⁸

The following solution seems more adequate: γραφή encompasses both law and promise (therefore Paul changes from νόμος in Gal 3:21 to γραφή in 3:22¹⁹); γραφή signifies the authoritative document, νόμος names its content, cursing as well as defining a new state for the believers in Christ.²⁰ In Gal 3:22, γραφή is the authoritative document revealing men's sinfulness, proving that the law was unable to make alive.²¹ When halakhic topics are debated, the word γραφή occurs neither in the Pauline writings²² nor in the Letter of Aristeas (cf. 155; 168: νόμος). So Paul's terminology has its Jewish analogies.

The Scripture foresees the justification of those of faith (Gal 3:8) and offers criteria for evaluating the death of Jesus Christ (Gal 3:13). Further, the Scripture includes imprisoning under the power of sin for all things (Gal 3:22). On the other hand, Scripture provides in the very concrete situation the adequate behavior for the Galatians (Gal 4:30). The Torah itself offers terminology for describing the difference between »the present Jerusalem, being in slavery« and the free »Jerusalem above« (Gal 4:25 f.) but condemns the sinner (Gal 3:13, 19; 5:18) and marks the general rule for Christian ethics (Gal 5:14).

3 History of Salvation and its Foundation

It is not my intention here to present an exhaustive exegesis of Gal 2:15–21; I will concentrate on verses 16, 19, and 21, whereas other aspects are treated only summarily.

In Gal 2:15, the »we« is the Jewish-Christian »we«. Paul shares the common Jewish conviction emphasizing the distinctiveness of Jews and non-Jews: Due to

¹⁷ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 234, on Gal 3:8.

¹⁸ Despite these rhetorical necessities, Paul can use the term νόμος in Rom 3:21 and 3:31 with regard to subjects beyond of legislative.

¹⁹ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 175; D. Sängler, »Das Gesetz ist unser παιδαγωγός geworden« (Gal 3,24),« in idem, *Von der Bestimmtheit des Anfangs. Studien zu Jesus, Paulus und zum frühchristlichen Schriftverständnis* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 2007), 158–184, 181.

²⁰ According to J. L. Martyn, *Galatians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB33A; New York 1997), 360, Paul distinguishes »the cursing voice of the Law from its scriptural and promissory voice«. The issue, however, is more complex, cf. Gal 5:14.

²¹ F. Mußner, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT 9; Freiburg i. Br. et al. 1974), 253.

²² This is also valid for the expression καθώς/ὅτι γέγραπται. 1 Cor 9:9 is no real exception: Here Paul is not discussing a halakha to be observed in the literal sense, he is offering an allegorical interpretation. Gal 3:22 is not a commentary on the Torah in its halakhic aspect, but rather a statement about the function of the Holy Scripture in disclosing all human beings as sinners.

their ignorance of divine law, non-Jews are *eo ipso* sinners.²³ In Gal 2:16, the inner logic between εἰδότες and ἐπιστεύσαμεν raises problems of its own. A causal interpretation of εἰδότες²⁴ should not cause the misunderstanding that a utility balance concerning human inability leads to a rational decision to become believer in Christ. The formula »from solution to plight«²⁵ is correct in this point. The foundation of this εἰδότες is not a neutral analysis of common »Jewish and/or Christian life« – vide Phil 3:6! – but a conclusion on the basis of the coming of Jesus Christ. The »we« of v. 16 also is the Jewish-Christian »we«, but it is debatable whether Peter, James or Barnabas would have agreed to this thesis. Paul henceforth introduces his own concept of identity, not someone else's. »He is not arguing that Gentiles should be included, with Jews, in the people of God; he is arguing, rather, that Jews should be included, with Gentiles, in the mass of ordinary humanity ...«²⁶.

The formula ἔργα νόμου is subject to a vivid debate. James D. G. Dunn primarily referred this formula to rules marking the distinction between Jews and non-Jews: Circumcision, Sabbath, laws concerning food and purity.²⁷ Focusing on the same aspects,²⁸ Michael Bachmann emphasized another antinomy stressed already by Ernst Lohmeyer:²⁹ the formula means »rules of the Law«, not »activities according to the Law«³⁰. In diachronic terms, Bachmann suggested 4QMMT and other Old Testament and ancient Jewish texts as the closest analogy to this formula;³¹ in synchronic respect, he emphasized the difference between

²³ Cf. Jub. 22:16 f.; Let. Aris. 139–142; 2 Macc 6:13–17 etc.

²⁴ Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 157; de Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 143. R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas 1990), 83, interprets it as circumstantial.

²⁵ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (n. 9), 443.

²⁶ Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 157. Similarly U. Schnelle, *Paulus. Leben und Denken* (de Gruyter Lehrbuch; Berlin 2003), 302; B. O. Ukwuegbu, *The Emergence of Christian Identity in Paul's Letters to the Galatians. A Social-Scientific Investigation into the Root Causes for the Parting of the Way between Christianity and Judaism* (Arbeiten zur Interkulturalität 4; Bonn 2003), 262.

²⁷ Dunn, »New Perspective« (n. 9), 98; idem, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle, New Testament Theology* (London and New York 1993), 354–366.

²⁸ M. Bachmann, »Bemerkungen zur Auslegung zweier Genitivverbindungen des Galaterbriefes,« in idem, *Von Paulus zur Apokalypse – und weiter. Exegetische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Neuen Testament* (NTOA 91; Göttingen 2011), 277–295, 287.

²⁹ E. Lohmeyer, »Probleme paulinischer Theologie II: Gesetzeswerke,« *ZNW* 28 (1929): 177–207, referring to T. Levi 19:1; 2 Bar. 57:2 (182) marked a difference between Paul and Luther at this point (192; 203): the phrase does not mean performed deeds but conditions of fulfilling the Law (200). The problem of fulfilment or failure is not connected with this term (205); cf. M. Bachmann, »Lutherische oder Neue Paulusperspektive? Merkwürdigkeiten bei der Wahrnehmung der betreffenden exegetischen Diskussionen,« *BZ NF* 60 (2016): 73–101, 76. H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KEK 7; Göttingen 4¹⁹⁶⁵), 91 f., focuses on the opposing »works of the law of Beliar.«

³⁰ M. Bachmann, »Keil oder Mikroskop? Zur jüngeren Diskussion um den Ausdruck ›Werke‹ des Gesetzes,« in idem, *Von Paulus zur Apokalypse* (n. 28), 99–159, 139.

³¹ M. Bachmann, »Merkwürdigkeiten« (n. 29), 95 f., referring to Exod 18:20; Lev 18:3–5; 1 Macc 2:51; T. Levi 19:1.

judgment according to human activity (Rom 2:16) and justification ἐξ ἔργων νόμου in Gal 2:16; in the latter place, the sources of justification are named, not the base of judgment.³²

Other exegetes criticized the one-sided emphasis on »rules«: According to Dieter Sänger, οἱ ἐκ πίστεως is a phrase of ontology and therefore, Bachmann's interpretation of ἔργα νόμου is wrong. Paul does not share the conviction that perfect obedience to Torah has salvific power. The irrealis of Gal 3:21 does not only mean a practical impossibility for the Law's making alive but a principal one. There is no objection to 3:12b because 3:12a is an allusion to Hab^{LXX} 2:4.³³ Sänger paraphrases the formula ἔργα νόμου with »without any human effort« (»ohne menschliches Zutun«).³⁴ In Martinus de Boer's exegesis, 4QMMT by no means excludes a reference to human activity. 4QMMT is an exact parallel, meaning »the works/deeds required by the law. ... For Paul, then ... ›the works of the law‹ are the actions performed or carried out in obedience to the many commandments of the Mosaic law as preserved in the Pentateuch«³⁵. Bernard Ukwuegbu and de Boer correctly deny that any selection of rejected laws is an adequate interpretation, referring to Gal 5:3 (»obligated to do the whole law«).³⁶

In my view, Phil 3:6 is an argument against a one-sided conceptualization of »activity vs. passivity«. We also should avoid modernizing, e. g. by existentialistic interpretations, when describing historical issues.³⁷ If, however, our thesis is correct that Paul's notion of salvation history includes an anthropological pessimism we should not disrupt the rule from their fulfilment. Gal 3:10 marks the curse on all who do *not* fulfil the will of God (see below).

The formula πίστις Χριστοῦ is also much debated. There are some important arguments for an interpretation as gen. subj.: in Gal 1:4; 2:20, Paul emphasizes Jesus' activity in »giving himself«³⁸; Gal 2:20 cannot mean the »faith in Christ«

³² Bachmann, »Von den Schwierigkeiten des exegetischen Verstehens. Erwägungen am Beispiel der Interpretation des paulinischen Ausdrucks »Werke« des Gesetzes,« in *Kontexte der Schrift* (vol. I: Text, Ethik, Judentum und Christentum, Gesellschaft; FS E. W. Stegemann; ed. G. Gelardini; Stuttgart 2005), 49–59, 53.

³³ Sänger, »Gesetz« (n. 19), 167 n. 30.

³⁴ D. Sänger, »Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefs und das Problem einer Entwicklung in Paulus' theologischem Denken,« in *Beiträge zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte* (ed. W. Kraus; BZNW 163; Berlin and New York 2009), 247–275, 272.

³⁵ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 146; cf. also M. Müller, »Aufhören oder Vollendung des Gesetzes? Eine Antwort an Friedrich Beißer,« *KD* 52 (2005): 308(–309).

³⁶ Ukwuegbu, *Emergence* (n. 26), 248 f.; de Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 145–147.

³⁷ The starting point for Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 57–59, is the distinction between ἐκ and διὰ, leading to a distinction between the person and its characteristics. I doubt whether this was a plausible concept in antiquity and especially in ancient Judaism.

³⁸ R. B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ. An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (SBL.S 56; Chico 1983), 175.

but the »faith of Christ«³⁹ or the »faith of God and Christ«⁴⁰; Gal 3:22 would be a meaningless tautology⁴¹; »faith in Christ« would be unambiguous if Paul would say πίστις εἰς Χριστόν (cf. Col 2:5); in Rom 4:16, πίστις Ἀβραάμ is gen. subj.; the parallel in Gal 2:21 indicates that it must refer to Christ's death (his »obedience« in Rom 5:19).⁴² Martyn refers to the analogy between Gal 2:20 and Rom 5:15.⁴³ In my view, however, this formula is to be understood as gen. obj. Within Gal 2:16, it is repeated in the formula εἰς Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν.⁴⁴ »Redundancy is no argument against this solution, as repetition is the hallmark of this verse ... «⁴⁵ Jesus Christ is neither called πιστός in Paul's writings⁴⁶ nor subject of a verb connoted with »faithfulness«. ⁴⁷ Paul emphasizes Jesus' »obedience«, but not his »faith«. ⁴⁸ The formulation in Gal 3:22 is »Paul's way of reinforcing the importance of his argument«⁴⁹; »... insistence on reading πίστις Χριστοῦ as a subjective genitive runs the risk of throwing other, clear lines of Paul's argument in some confusion. ... [The] agency of Christ is consistently described in other terms (›in/through/to Christ‹), but nowhere else in terms of Christ's own faith or faithfulness.«⁵⁰ Roy Harrisville underlined that we have no unambiguous patristic references for the gen. subj.⁵¹

The final clause in v. 16 sounds like a repetition of the antagonism dominating the verse as a whole. Perhaps Paul has Ps^{LXX} 142:2 in mind.⁵² A quotation formu-

³⁹ S. K. Williams, *Galatians* (Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville 1997), 69; H. Klein, »Aspekte des Glaubens im paulinischen Schrifttum,« in *Kirche als versöhnte Gemeinschaft* (FS C. Klein; ed. idem and H. Pitters; Sibiu-Hermannstadt 2007), 75–92, 81.

⁴⁰ St. C. Carlson, *The Text of Galatians and Its History* (WUNT 2/385; Tübingen 2015), 96–101, argues for this distinct reading in Gal 2:20 (ἐν πίστει ... τῆ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ), witnessed by Φ^{46} , B, D*, F, G etc., implying that the formula πίστις Χριστοῦ is gen. subj. His arguments: why should the term »Son of God« be used at all? »The context does not trigger the use of this term; rather, the more commonly Pauline term ›Christ‹ would be more appropriate in the immediate context.« (97 f.) The phrase »faith in/of the Son of God« is unique to Paul (98). Paul does not otherwise describe two faiths for a Christian one in God and another in Christ« (99). On the other hand, God and Christ are mentioned in the nearby context, especially v. 19 (99).

⁴¹ Longenecker, *Galatians* (n. 24), 87; de Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 159.

⁴² De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 159; similarly Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 271.

⁴³ Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 259.

⁴⁴ D. Sänger, *Die Verkündigung des Kreuzes und Israel* (WUNT 75; Tübingen 1994), 125 n. 305. Cf. also Phil 1:29 (πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν); cf. A. Lindemann, »Paulus – Pharisäer und Apostel,« in idem, *Glauben, Handeln, Verstehen. Studien zur Auslegung des Neuen Testaments* (vol. 2; WUNT 282; Tübingen 2011), 33–72, 49 n. 86.

⁴⁵ D. A. deSilva, *Galatians. A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament; Waco 2014), 33.

⁴⁶ K. Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THKNT 6; Leipzig 1999), 87.

⁴⁷ G. D. Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1995), 325 n. 44.

⁴⁸ C. H. Cosgrove, *The Cross and the Spirit. A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians* (Macon 1988), 56.

⁴⁹ J. D. G. Dunn, »Once More Πίστις Χριστοῦ,« *SBLSPS* 30 (1991): 730–744, 740.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 744.

⁵¹ R. A. Harrisville, »Πίστις Χριστοῦ: Witness of the Fathers,« *NovT* 36 (1994): 233–241.

⁵² Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 159; de Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 154.

la, however, is missing, though it would have been advantageous for Paul's argument.⁵³ We would regard this clause superfluous if not recognized as quotation,⁵⁴ but Paul does not make an argument from this. The catena Rom 3:10–18 sounds like rewriting Bible but we are simply not allowed to infer Rom 3:10–18 here.

In Gal 2:19, the first clause, ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, is notoriously enigmatic. The ἐγὼ is best understood as typical ἐγὼ, due to 2:18,⁵⁵ for which Paul presents himself »as a paradigm of the believer's experience, which the Galatians should recognize as true also of themselves.«⁵⁶ The particle γὰρ refers back to μὴ γένοιτο of v. 17: The new life is by no means a life of sin. For understanding νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, it is crucial to note that Paul does not speak »about commenting a life that is characterized by violation of the Law (see 5:14 ...).«⁵⁷ The issue of the Torah in Pauline ethics, however, is more complex. In any case, the accusing and condemning function of the Law comes to an end.⁵⁸ Concerning διὰ νόμου, in ancient times Deut 18:15, 18 and Gen 15:6,⁵⁹ in modern times Gal 1:13 f.;⁶⁰ 3:10,⁶¹ 13,⁶² 19–25⁶³ and Phil 3:5 f.⁶⁴ are suggested as explaining parallels. We should avoid modernizing concepts concerning the law's »carrying out its own activity apart from God«⁶⁵ or the law's self-disqualification⁶⁶ or the human freeing herself/himself from the law.⁶⁷ The final clause in v. 19 leads to Gal 3:13: Jesus Christ freed us from the curse of the law. 2:20a emphasizes the totality of Jesus Christ's dominating within Paul's life which, in ethical conformity to the cross of Jesus Christ,⁶⁸ is decisive for avoiding sin followed by the curse of law.⁶⁹

⁵³ D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen 1986), 18; Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 59.

⁵⁴ Mußner, *Galaterbrief* (n. 21), 174; Smiles, *Gospel* (n. 14), 131 with n. 57.

⁵⁵ Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 60.

⁵⁶ Smiles, *Gospel* (n. 14), 165; similarly Williams, *Galatians* (n. 39), 75.

⁵⁷ Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 257.

⁵⁸ D. Kremendahl, *Die Botschaft der Form. Zum Verhältnis von antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik im Galaterbrief* (NTOA 46; Fribourg and Göttingen 2000), 272.

⁵⁹ Ancient Christian exegetes sometimes maintained that the Law itself announces its abrogation (see M. Meiser, *Galater* [Novum Testamentum Patristicum 9; Göttingen 2007], 110).

⁶⁰ J. D. G. Dunn, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's New Testament Commentaries; London 1993), 143, referring to the introducing ἐγὼ; Rohde, *Galater* (n. 13), 116; Dunn, *Theology* (n. 27), 143; de Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 160.

⁶¹ Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 169.

⁶² Schlier, *Galater* (n. 29), 100 f.; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter 1982), 143; Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 257.

⁶³ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 122.

⁶⁴ W. Eckey, *Der Galaterbrief. Ein Kommentar* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010), 144 f.

⁶⁵ Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 257.

⁶⁶ Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 61.

⁶⁷ Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 169.

⁶⁸ Kremendahl, *Botschaft* (n. 58), 272.

⁶⁹ Cf. J. Lambrecht, »Paul's Reasoning in Galatians 2:11–21,« in idem, *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and on Revelation* (AnBib 147; Rome 2001), 157–181, 166.

2:21bc is no irrealis: a verb is missing in the protasis, the particle ἄν is missing in the apodosis.⁷⁰ According to some exegetes 2:21a renders a rebuke of Paul's adversaries that his rejection of the law means a rejection of grace⁷¹ but the opposite is true: »By saying that he does not nullify God's grace in Christ, Paul implies that the new preachers with their law-based gospel are doing precisely that ...«⁷².

4 Outline of Galatians' *argumentatio*

The *propositio* Gal 2:15–21 is followed by a doubled argumentation (3:1–4:11; 4:12–5:12), shaped by the sequence: argument from the Galatian's indubitable⁷³ experience (Gal 3:1–5; 4:12–20)/argument from Scripture (Gal 3:6–4:7; 4:21–31)/conclusion (Gal 4:8–11; 5:1–12). Within this doubled argumentation, it is correct to state differences in textual pragmatics: The first argument envisages a theoretical base, the second argument prepares the claim for the Galatians' decision.⁷⁴

Of course, Gal 3:1–5 is not only rhetorical rebuke. The presence of the Holy Spirit among the uncircumcised Galatians is »God's presence in their midst as the public confirmation of Paul's private commission.«⁷⁵ The dissociation between Spirit and Law also is not only rhetorical exaggeration but is rooted in Paul's conviction (cf. 5:18).

Gal 3:6–9 ties in with the second formula of 3:5b (ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως), 3:10–14 with the first one (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου).⁷⁶ The conjunction γάρ in 3:10 should be taken not so much as causative but »as marking another step in the argument«⁷⁷. 3:10–14 reveals the reverse of 3:6–9,⁷⁸ the fate of those who are not believing sons of Abraham: They are cursed; to be cursed here is the same as not to be blessed.⁷⁹ Deut 11:26–29; 27; 28; 30 include this notion.⁸⁰ 3:15–18 interprets the singular of Gen 17:8 (σπέρμα) with reference to Christ in order to confirm the status of the Gentile Jesus-believers as the true descendants of Abraham.⁸¹ Further, Gal

⁷⁰ J. Lambrecht, »Second Thoughts. Some Reflections on the Law in Galatians,« in idem, *Collected Studies* (n. 69), 257–265, 259.

⁷¹ Longenecker, *Galatians*, (n. 24), 94; Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 259.

⁷² De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5) 163.

⁷³ M. Hietanen, *Paul's Argumentation in Galatians. A Pragma-Dialectical Analysis* (LNTS 344; London and New York 2007), 90, argues that Gal 3:1–5 describes not experiences per se, but Paul's interpretation of these experiences, perhaps not shared by the Galatians themselves. »Naturally, Paul's interpretations and explanations are intended to be convincing.«

⁷⁴ Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 114.

⁷⁵ Cosgrove, *Cross* (n. 48), 122.

⁷⁶ Sanger, »Gesetz« (n. 19), 167.

⁷⁷ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 144 n. 50.

⁷⁸ Sanger, »Gesetz« (n. 19), 168.

⁷⁹ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 144.

⁸⁰ Dunn, *Epistle* (n. 60), 169.

⁸¹ It could be asked whether Paul introduces an antinomy in his own argumentation: There would be no possibility to be ἐκ πίστεως between Abraham and Jesus Christ. Some ancient

3:15–18 states that the law, given 430 years after the promise to Abraham, cannot abrogate this promise. What, however, is the function of the law? 3:19–25 gives an answer whereas 3:26–29 reaffirms the new reality in Christ including the state of Abraham's heritage. 4:1–7 ensures that after God's sending of Jesus Christ, the status of heir is not only promised but realized. 4:8–11 is a concluding warning to fail with respect to this status. 4:12–20 reminds of the primordial experiences in order to dissociate the Galatians from the opponents; Gal 4:21–31 anew affirms the status of the believers in Jesus by introducing a typology arguing with the difference of social status between slave and free-born. By the conclusion 5:1–12, Paul appeals for decision.⁸²

5 Scripture and Faith (Gal 3:6–9; 4:21–31)

Paul states a parallel (Gal 3:6: καθώς) between the experience of the Galatians and Abraham's experience, based on faith. In this way, the experience of the Galatians is legitimated as real divine experience. In a broader sense, Gal 3:6–9 is a rewriting of Gen 12. The Galatians' receiving of the Holy Spirit (3:2, 5) proves the truth of Paul's proclamation. By faith, Galatian Jesus-believers achieve the status of true progeny of Abraham. 3:6–9 includes a double argument: The descendants of Abraham are οἱ ἐκ πίστεως; the addressees of blessing include the Gentiles⁸³ (in contrast to Pss. Sol. 9:9). Paul's exegesis of Gen 15:6 isolates this verse from its context and is comparable to Philo, *Virt.* 211–219, who relates Gen 15:6 to Abraham's⁸⁴ conversion.⁸⁵ Abraham »was remembered as in effect the first proselyte and type of true conversion«.⁸⁶ Gal 3:7 presupposes the distinction

theologians state the participation of the Saints before Christ in the blessing for Abraham; cf. Meiser, *Galater* (n. 59), 147.

⁸² It is disputed whether Gal 5:1 or 5:12 should be regarded as beginning of the ethical part. The latter decision is to be preferred, cf. O. Merk, *Der Beginn der Paränese im Galaterbrief*, in idem, *Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Exegese. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. R. Gebauer, M. Karrer and M. Meiser; BZNW 95; Berlin and New York 1998), 238–259.

⁸³ Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 72.

⁸⁴ The form Ἀβραάμ instead of Ἀβραάμ also occurs in Philo's works (*Migr.* 44; *Mut.* 177) and in the Septuagint MSS 53 and 244. It is, however, not possible to establish a text-form behind the form Ἀβραάμ; Philo, Paul, and the scribes of 53 and 244 independently may have changed.

⁸⁵ M. Konradt, »Die aus Glauben, diese sind Kinder Abrahams« (Gal 3,7). Erwägungen zum galatischen Konflikt im Lichte frühjüdischer Abrahamtraditionen,« in Gelardini, *Kontexte* (n. 32), 25–48, 34, 46: Abraham is presented here as a type of proselyte who finds the way to an adequate cognition of God. Konradt emphasizes that Paul's deviation from the main line of Jewish concept of Abraham (faithfulness is visible in obedience, cf. Sir 44:20; 1 Macc 2:52 etc.; cf. W Reinbold, »Gal 3,6–14 und das Problem der Erfüllbarkeit des Gesetzes bei Paulus,« *ZNW* 91 [2000]: 91–106, 94; de Boer, *Galatians* [n. 5], 187, referring to Jub. 23:10; 24:11) is by no means a general abrogation of Jewish thought.

⁸⁶ Dunn, *Epistle* (n. 60), 160.

between human sons of Abraham and theological ones, explained in 4:21–31;⁸⁷ οὔτοι is restricting.⁸⁸ The blessing of the Gentiles, announced in Gen 12:3,⁸⁹ is fulfilled in the Gentile Christians.⁹⁰ The formula ἐκ πίστεως in Gal 3:8, however, is Paul's insertion.

In his second biblical *probatio*, Paul again applies the Abrahamic cycle, not concerning Abraham himself but his sons, Ismael and Isaac. Perhaps Paul's opponents in Galatia used Gen 16 and Gen 21 in their missionary efforts among the Galatians,⁹¹ arguing that Paul's preaching »represented an ›Ishmaelian‹ form of truth«⁹² whereas only Isaac was considered the true son of Abraham. In any case, the doublet of Scriptural proof shall intensify Paul's effort to present a biblical foundation for his own position. In Paul's view, reception of the Bible is not simply an ornament but indispensable for his argumentation. The textual pragmatics of the question in Gal 4:21b is not only polemics but clarifying: Adherence to Paul's proclamation – not to the proclamation of the opponents – is the true obedience to the Law; this obedience is obliging for Paul as well as for his opponents. In this respect, reception of the Bible is not an arbitrary act but a matter of obedience. In 4:22, Paul »reduces« Abraham's descendants to two sons (cf. in contrast Gen 25:2) in order to underline the following typological⁹³ antithesis; the temporal order of the birth of Ismael and Isaac is a foreshadowing for the newness of the possibility to believe in Jesus Christ. The term δι' ἐπαγγελίας in v. 23 is based on Gen 17:16.⁹⁴

Gal 4:25 f.⁹⁵ is one of the key texts for later Christian anti-Judaism. Christians expressed sentiments of superiority of the free Christianity, reading Scripture on

⁸⁷ Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 72. J. Becker, *Der Brief an die Galater* (NTD 8/1; Göttingen 1998), 48, calls it the first decisive element of re-interpretation of Jewish tradition.

⁸⁸ Schlier, *Galater* (n. 29), 72.

⁸⁹ In Gal 3:8, Paul replaces the formula πάσαι αἱ φύλαι τῆς γῆς (Gen 12:3) by πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (Gen 18:18), in order to justify the integration of the ἔθνη in the group of Jesus-adherents; cf. Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 199.

⁹⁰ Paul does, however, not include the phrasing τῆς γῆς. Perhaps his notion of ἔθνη was not a notion which includes Jews and non-Jews but an exclusive one specified only to non-Jews; cf. Th. Witulski, »Abraham als Beleg für die soteriologische Dysfunktionalität des νόμος«, *SNTSU* 39 (2014): 159–205, 163 f.

⁹¹ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 286. Therefore, Paul does not consider certain issues related to Hagar and Ismael which could weaken his argument, especially the promise of progeny also for Hagar (Gen 16:10 etc.); cf. Rohde, *Galater* (n. 13), 194.

⁹² Longenecker, *Galatians* (n. 24), 199.

⁹³ Ancient Christian exegesis evaluated the term ἀλληγορούμενα as uncommonly used; cf. Meiser, *Galater* (n. 59), 216.

⁹⁴ In the works of Philo of Alexandria, not salvation history but distinct levels of philosophical and theological knowledge is the kernel of such an antithesis, cf. G. Sellin, »Hagar und Sara. Religionsgeschichtliche Hintergründe der Schriftallegorese Gal 4,21–31,« in idem, *Studien zu Paulus und zum Epheserbrief* (ed. D. Sänger; FRLANT 229; Göttingen 2009), 116–137, 131 f.

⁹⁵ Within Gal 4:25a, the longer reading including Hagar »is redundant at best and contradictory at worst« (Carlson, *Text* [n. 40], 166), but also in the short reading, the »note about Arabia

a higher spiritual level vs. slavish Judaism, bound by literal interpretation of the Bible.⁹⁶ According to Dunn, Paul's opponents used the comparison of Abraham's two sons in order to underline »that Abraham's inheritance came down to later generations through the line of Isaac; that is, the children of Israel«⁹⁷. Insofar Gal 4:21–31 is »not ... a primary expression of his own theology ... That is, why ... it comes at the end of his argument, as a kind of addendum to it, rather than a principal part of his own argument«.⁹⁸ In terms of Tajfel's socio-psychology, Paul probably intended to establish a positive self-evaluation of a Jesus-believing minority just coming into being against a Jewish majority conscious of their long-standing religion-centered identity.⁹⁹ The opposition »free vs. slave« reclaims the higher status for the new-coming minority κατὰ ἀνθρώπων;¹⁰⁰ the opposition »above¹⁰¹/now«, understandable mainly within an apocalyptic frame,¹⁰² reclaims a higher status in terms of divine legitimation. The quotation of Isa 54:1 in Gal 4:27 is connected by means of *gezera shawa*.¹⁰³ Paul is more invoking this identity than »doing much to strengthen the scriptural case he is making«.¹⁰⁴ Emphasizing the multitude of converts¹⁰⁵ strengthens the positive self-evaluation of any group.

The change from νόμος (4:21) to γραφή (4:30) is deliberate: The self-dissociation from Paul's opponents cannot be based on νόμος.¹⁰⁶

is not merely logically superfluous but structurally superfluous as well.« (167). »These considerations raise the possibility that some or all of the v.25a parenthesis is a marginal note what was interpolated into the text of Galatians« (167).

⁹⁶ Meiser, *Galater* (n. 59), 220; 224 f. For modern Jewish and Christian critics cf. Sellin, Hagar (n. 94), 130 n. 48.

⁹⁷ Dunn, *Theology* (n. 27), 96.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ph. Esler, *Galatians* (New Testament Readings; London 1998), 41–43.

¹⁰⁰ The point of comparison between being under the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and being under the Torah, including the festal calendar (Gal 4:8–11), is δουλεύειν. In Old Testament theology, however, δουλεύειν is regarded as joyful piety, cf. Ps 118 [119]:38, 49, 65 etc.

¹⁰¹ The present believers in Christ are children of »Jerusalem above«. The term »future Jerusalem« would not make sense: The Galatians, living in the present, should identify themselves as part of these people.

¹⁰² M. B. Cover, »New and Above; Then and Now« (Gal 3.21–31): Platonizing and Apocalyptic Polarities in Paul's Eschatology,« in M. W. Elliott et al., eds., *Galatians and Christian Theology. Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter* (Grand Rapids 2014), 220–229, 226 f., refers to Heb 11:13–16 as closest analogy to the Platonizing phrase »Jerusalem above«.

¹⁰³ Esler, *Galatians* (n. 99), 213.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 213 f.

¹⁰⁵ Williams, *Galatians* (n. 39), 129. This promise is not fulfilled by the earthly descendants of Isaac; Isaiah gives a prophecy concerning eschatology (Becker, *Galater* [n. 87], 73).

¹⁰⁶ It is debatable whether Paul encourages the Galatians to expel the opponents or not; cf. Sellin, »Hagar« (n. 94), 127.

6 Why do »Works of Torah« not Justify (3:10–14)?

Paul's argument¹⁰⁷ is based on an exegesis of certain biblical passages,¹⁰⁸ shaped by principle of *gezera shawa*. The opposition between justification by faith and justification by works of the law is the result of the occurrence of the roots of δικ- and πιστ- in both Hab 2:4 and Gen 15:6. Lev 18:5 is connected with Hab 2:4 *ad vocem* ζῆν, with Deut 27:26 *ad vocem* ποιεῖν, specified by the formula πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ νόμου. The common term κατάρρα for Deut 21:23¹⁰⁹ and 27:26 gives reason for the evaluation of Jesus Christ's death as the basis of justification.

Why, however, do »works of Torah« not justify? Is it a contrast of activity vs. passivity, or is it a salvation history point that God has changed the preconditions for salvific community? Or is it a change in salvation history based on a pessimistic statement on human behaviour? Gal 2:16 does not allow a decision per se. Gal 3:10–12, however, leads to this interpretation.¹¹⁰ At a first glance, Paul here seems to give two irreconcilable answers: 1. Everyone¹¹¹ who stands under the law¹¹²

¹⁰⁷ There is no consensus concerning the rhetoric of this passage, cf. Witulski, »Abraham« (n. 90), 164–197.

¹⁰⁸ Paul marks the quotations of Deut 27:26 and 21:23, but such a marker is missing in Gal 3:11 f. (concerning Hab 2:4 and Lev 18:5). The missing quotation marker seemed perhaps obsolete for Paul in 3:12 after the curse of 3:10 which does not concern the doers but the non-doers of the law. The missing of the quotation marker in 3:11 is not so easy to explain. One could suggest a distinction between the marked negative and the un-marked positive phrases; the Pauline usage of Scripture, however, does not support such a thesis.

¹⁰⁹ The Pauline wording ἐπικατάρρατος is missing in the manuscript tradition of Deut^{LXX} 21:23. The reading θεοῦ, missing in Paul, is thoroughly witnessed; the preposition can be changed. The reading θεοῦ has its parallels in Hebrew (יְהוָה); probably there are, however, also manuscripts without יְהוָה (cf. Jerome, *Comm. Gal.*, CC.SL 77A, 92, whose polemics, to be rebuked, would not make sense if he would not know such manuscripts). The article ὁ before κρεμύμενος is witnessed also in the manuscript tradition of Deut 21:23 (V 15–72–82–376 d 246 n 30'-343 t 318 18'-120–630*-669 646).

¹¹⁰ Gal 3:13a, isolated from the context, could support an interpretation apart from any thoughts of salvation history, but of a traditional perspective on Paul, the logic between 3:13a (13b is a parenthesis explaining the phrase γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρρα) and 3:14 is not sufficiently explainable. Also we should realize that Paul's argument has its end in 3:29, not in 3:28, and in 4:7, not in 4:6.

¹¹¹ The reading of Gal 3:10 in NA²⁷ is confirmed by Carlson, *Text* (n. 40), 177. The secondary ἐν before πᾶσι is a slight harmonization to the Septuagint text (Carlson *Text* [n. 40], 189). The omission of πᾶς ἀνθρώπος is witnessed also by MS 426 and in the Samaritan Pentateuch and Targum Onqelos – that is to say, within Jewish (and non-Christian) sources – whereas the phrase ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ only reoccurs in Christian writings. Paul introduces γεγραμμένα, taken from Deut 28:58; 30:10.

¹¹² Longenecker, *Galatians* (n. 24), 117, quotes an anti-parallel for the negatively accentuated wording »under the law«, Josephus, *C.Ap.* 2.210: »To all who desire to come and live under the same laws with us [ὑπὸ τοῦς αὐτοῦς ἡμῖν νόμους] he [Moses] gives a gracious welcome, holding that it is not family ties alone that constitute relationship, but agreement in the principles of conduct.«

does *not* obey the law¹¹³ – that is an answer of human fact.¹¹⁴ 2. The righteous one will live by faith¹¹⁵ – that is an answer including a new divine decision. There is, however, no discrepancy if we have Paul's notion of the history of the biblical literature in mind: Habakkuk wrote after Moses, conscious of the curse witnessed in Deut 27:26.¹¹⁶ In Rom 8:3 f. these answers are settled in a relation of causality: With regard to the inability of the flesh, God changed the conditions of salvific access but this may be a radicalization of Paul's thought, not to be presupposed already in Galatians. Do Gal 3:11 f. formulate two principles? With regard to δυνάμενος in Gal 3:21b formulating not intention but effect I remain skeptical.

Two issues are crucial for a proper interpretation of Gal 3:10: 1. Any »existentialistic« interpretation of Gal 3:10a must be confronted with the following quotation of Scripture in Gal 3:10b; 2. It is not doing the Law but failure to do the Law that causes the curse.¹¹⁷ In light of 2 Cor 3:6, 9 and Rom 3:19 f., the presupposition made in Gal 3:10 was thus neither merely an argument ad hoc,¹¹⁸ explained in lines of social psychology,¹¹⁹ nor merely a theoretical presupposition

¹¹³ Lambrecht, »Second Thoughts« (n. 70), 261. Dunn, *Epistle* (n. 60), 171, argues twofold against this reading: 1. Paul's talk of »works of the law« is no attack on self-achievement. 2. Neither Judaism in general nor Paul by himself assumed that the obedience demanded by the law is impossible (Deut 30:11–14; Rom 8:4; Phil 3:6). This argument also reappears in N. H. Young, »Who is Cursed – And Why? (Galatians 3:10–14),« *JBL* 117 (1998): 72–92, 83; Reinbold, »Gal 3,6–14« (n. 85), 99 f. The first argument, however, is no help for an adequate interpretation of Gal 3:10. With regard to the second argument, we should keep in mind 1QH XII 24–32 as analogy to Rom 8:4: Only the help of God's Spirit enables human beings to fulfil the will of God. This analogy ensures that Paul's concept is astonishing but has its parallels in Second Temple Judaism. – In Rom 3:10–18, Paul will ground this thesis on biblical texts but this is not decisive for the interpretation of Galatians.

¹¹⁴ According to some exegetes, Gal 3:10 is a statement not on a real curse but on the annunciation of God's curse (Williams, *Galatians* [n. 39], 89 f., based on the context Deut 27–28 in general and on Paul's replacing of ἐπικατάρατος by »under the curse«; cf. also Reinbold, »Galater 3,6–14« [n. 85], 98). Regarding Gal 3:21b, I remain skeptical.

¹¹⁵ The variants of Hab 2:4 are understandable with regard to different suffixes in Hebrew; ך and ך are easily confused; the omission of any suffix is possibly but a scribal error. It is not necessary to state an intended change by Paul. Within Gal 3:11, the second ὅτι is causal, not the first one: A quotation of Scripture in Pauline texts is always *Probans*, not *Probandum* (Reinbold, »Galater 3,6–14« [n. 85], 97 n. 17).

¹¹⁶ John Chrysostom, *Comm. Gal.*, PG 61, 652.

¹¹⁷ Williams, *Galatians* (n. 39), 89; Maschmeier, *Rechtfertigung* (n. 9), 207. Reinbold, »Galater 3,6–14« (n. 85), 103 f., is correct when stating that Paul did not presuppose the principal impossibility to fulfil the law. We should, however, distinguish between the fact of sinning and the anthropological preconditions of human acting.

¹¹⁸ According to T. G. Gombis, »Arguing with Scripture in Galatia. Galatians 3:10–14 as a Series of Ad Hoc Arguments,« in Elliott et al., eds., *Galatians* (n. 102), 82–90, 82, »Paul is not making abstract theological claims about the Mosaic law or Judaism in opposition to Christian faith. He is, rather, making a series of strategically ad hoc arguments, very specifically addressing the crisis in Galatia as he understands it.« I do, however, not understand why Gal 3:10 is referred to the influencers in Galatia in a direct way.

¹¹⁹ According to Esler, *Galatians* (n. 99), 184 f., Paul accentuates »the difference between the groups (scil. Jesus-adherents in Galatia and non-believing Israel) by denigrating the outgroup«

caused by a prejudicing system of theology, but rather the true conviction of Paul: »Cursed is everyone who does not observe and obey all the things written in the book of the law.« But this is a quotation from the Torah, and thus we can conclude that, according to Paul, the Torah itself declared that all human beings are sinners, because they do not obey the Torah, and therefore the phrase »ministry of condemnation« (2 Cor 3,9) is understandable.

7 The Role of the Torah in the Era before Christ (Gal 3:19–25)

In Gal 3:19, the phrase τῶν παραβάσεων χάρις is ambiguous. There exist different lines of reception already in ancient Christian theology. Some applications offer interpretations in the sense of »to provoke«, technical exegesis emphasizes the restraining moment.¹²⁰ At least in former times, the interpretation along Rom 4:15 and 5:20 was predominant: law should provoke sin.¹²¹ Some exegetes underlined the demonic power of the law,¹²² belonging to the forces of the old age.¹²³ In recent research, this line of interpretation has lost its authoritative status but still has its adherents.¹²⁴ The shocking character of this concept¹²⁵ does not per se justify its refutation. There are, however, arguments against this exegesis based on both notion of God¹²⁶ and Pauline theology. »Why should God want an increase of sin building up to the coming of Christ?«¹²⁷ In general, it is a clumsy notion to imagine a law »given by a legislator for the simple reason and purpose of transgressing against the law.«¹²⁸ Referring to Rom 4:15 and 5:20 we should not forget the Pau-

(195). Ukwuegbu, *Emergence* (n. 26), 278, emphasizes the utility of this black-and-white-contrast for the self-dissociation of the in-group over against the out-group. I do not doubt the »utility of use« approaches of social psychology for explaining ancient Christian texts. In case of Gal 3:10, Esler's argument enables a critical reading of Pauline texts. With regard to the Jewish-Christian dialogue, our serious willingness to challenge our own presuppositions is a *conditio sine qua non*. I only doubt the character of 3:10 as an argument, which is only rhetorically denigrating.

¹²⁰ Meiser, *Galater* (n. 59), 153 f.

¹²¹ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 165; Bruce, *Galatians* (n. 62), 175; Rohde, *Galater* (n. 13), 154; Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 354 f.

¹²² M. Müller, »Christus als Schlüssel der biblischen Hermeneutik des Paulus,« in *Paulinische Christologie. Exegetische Beiträge* (FS H. Hübner; ed. Th. Söding, U. Schnelle and M. Labahn; Göttingen 2000), 121–139, 130.

¹²³ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 34.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ The reading τῶν παραδόσεων χάρις ἐτέθη is an attempt to avoid a scandalous statement (Bruce, *Galatians* [n. 62], 176).

¹²⁶ The implicit subject of προσετέθη in Gal 3:19 is God (Moo, *Galatians* [n. 5], 233).

¹²⁷ Longenecker, *Galatians* (n. 24), 138.

¹²⁸ C. A. Amadi-Azuogu, *Paul and the Law in the Arguments of Galatians* (BBB 104; Weinheim 1996), 187.

line interpretation of these words given in Rom 7:7–25.¹²⁹ Also *sub lege* the human being is confronted with God and God's will.¹³⁰ According to some exegetes, not Rom 4:15 but Rom 3:20 is an appropriate help for understanding: The law makes humans realize their sinfulness for the sake of turning sin into transgressions; it brings human sin to light¹³¹ and only hereby increases trespass.¹³² Dunn proposes an alternative reading: »Paul probably had in mind here the law's role within Israel to provide through its sacrificial system a means of atoning for transgression and thus of facilitating Israel's daily living within the covenant.«¹³³

In my view, the metaphor of the law as a pedagogue is decisive. The pedagogue had custodial and disciplinary functions rather than educative or instructional ones,¹³⁴ comparable not to a modern pedagogue but to »an imprisoning warden.«¹³⁵ We should, however, not confuse the negative emotions evoked by some (ancient) »pedagogues«¹³⁶ with their positive role¹³⁷ – this role¹³⁸ excludes an interpretation of Gal 3:19 in the line of »provoke sins«. In my view, the concept of παιδαγωγός in 3:24 (written in retrospect) suggests the following interpretation of 3:19: The function of the Torah as pedagogue is to make transparent the deficient state of all human beings before Christ and beyond faith. I agree with Richard Longenecker: »Both the immediate context and Paul's usual way of speaking about the function of the law favor a cognitive interpretation, that the law was given to bring about a consciousness of sin in sin-hardened humanity.«¹³⁹ In this way, the Law should restrain transgressions.¹⁴⁰

The next clause in Gal 3:19 (ἄχριστος οὖν) »runs contrary to many Jewish traditions holding that the law is eternal.«¹⁴¹ That is, however, no theoretically reasoned concept but grounded in the coming of the new age, which in Paul's personal

¹²⁹ Sängner, »Gesetz« (n. 19), 169 n. 35; Eckey, *Galaterbrief* (n. 64), 207; cf. also Smiles, *Gospel* (n. 14), 200. Becker, *Galater* (n. 87), 54, correctly recalls Gal 3:21b.

¹³⁰ Sängner, »Gesetz« (n. 19), 171 n. 40.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 234, referring to Rom 4:15; 5:20a.

¹³³ Dunn, *Theology* (n. 27), 89; similarly idem, *Epistle* (n. 60), 190.

¹³⁴ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 240.

¹³⁵ Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 363.

¹³⁶ Cf. however, D. J. Lull, »The Law was our pedagogue: A Study in Galatians 3:19–25,« *JBL* 105 (1986): 481–498, here 486–495.

¹³⁷ Dunn, *Theology* (n. 27), 90, is correct in emphasizing this point. Cf. also I. Pollmann, *Gesetzeskritische Motive im Judentum und die Gesetzeskritik des Paulus* (NTOA 98; Göttingen 2012), 188, whose perception of »repressive«, however, is modernizing from my point of view.

¹³⁸ Perhaps Paul had God's παιδεία (Hos^{LXX} 5:2 etc.: God as παιδευτής) in mind.

¹³⁹ Longenecker, *Galatians* (n. 24), 138.

¹⁴⁰ E. Stegemann, »Das Gesetz ist nicht wider die Verheißungen!« Thesen zu Galater 3,15–29,« in *Theologische Brosamen für Lothar Steiger* (ed. G. Freund and idem; DBAT.B 5; Heidelberg 1985), 389–395, 394; St. Nordgaard, »Paul and the Provenance of the Law: The Case of Galatians 3:19–20,« *ZNW* 105 (2014): 64–79, 77.

¹⁴¹ Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 232 f., referring to Josephus, *C.Ap.* 2.277; Jub. 1:27; Wis 18:4. W. Radl, *Galaterbrief* (SKKNT 9; Stuttgart 1985), 56, refers to Bar 4:1.

experience became reality also in his own life (Gal 1:15 f.). The reference to the angels perhaps has its base in Deut^{LXX diff. MT} 33:2 and is witnessed also in Jewish tradition.¹⁴² A nuance of inferiority is marked in Gal 3:17, 20 (see below). The mediator Paul has in mind (Gal 3:19b, 20) is Moses.

In 3:20 the plural in ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν has found three main lines of interpretation. It means either a duality of parties¹⁴³ or a plurality of the initiating party¹⁴⁴ or the notion that intermediary transaction is inferior to one in which God acts directly.¹⁴⁵ Dunn states »a further contrast between the law, given through intermediaries (angels and Moses), and, once again, the covenant, given *directly* to Abraham ›by God‹ (iii.17) himself (iii.18).«¹⁴⁶ The second and the third line of interpretation imply Paul's attribution of inferiority of the Law. If 3:20b, however, is Paul's confession to biblical monotheism,¹⁴⁷ perhaps even an allusion to Deut 6:4,¹⁴⁸ then it seems not wise to over-emphasize the inferiority of the law in which Deut 6:4 is included.¹⁴⁹

In order to achieve an adequate interpretation of Gal 3:21, we should keep in mind that »justice« is a precondition of »life«. The law promises life by doing (3:12) but curses everyone who is not doing all that is required by the law (3:10).

When Paul says that the Law lacked – and lacks – the power to make people alive, that is to make things right (cf. Phil 3,9; Rom 8:3), he finds himself contradicting not only the theology of the Teachers but also one of the sustaining pillars of classic Hebraic thought.¹⁵⁰

For an adequate interpretation of 3:19 f., the proper interpretation of the formula μὴ γένοιτο is decisive. Paul uses this formula always when someone draws (or might draw) a wrong conclusion from a correct presupposition.¹⁵¹ The coming-into-being of the Law witnesses its inferior status but does not qualify it as an entity inimical to God. »If the promises are God's promises, the law (even in Galatians) is God's law; they cannot therefore be opposed in principle to each other.«¹⁵² Similarly, Mogens Müller is correct in his assumption that 3:21 does not imply an antagonism with regard to content but that there is no concur-

¹⁴² Jub. 1:27; Josephus, *Ant.* 15.136. According to Nordgaard, »Paul« (n. 140), 74f., 79, Paul follows a tradition developed in Philo, *Opif.* 75: »the law had been ordained by a group of angels whom God had commissioned for this task so that he himself could both have the law and also remain unblemished by its fundamental imperfection« (79).

¹⁴³ Esler, *Galatians* (n. 99), 199; Longenecker, *Galatians* (n. 24), 41; Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 236f.

¹⁴⁴ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 228.

¹⁴⁵ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 171–73; Vouga, *Galater* (n. 15), 83.

¹⁴⁶ Dunn, *Epistle* (n. 60), 191.

¹⁴⁷ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 228.

¹⁴⁸ Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20); Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 237. We have to remember, however, that Paul does not mark 3:20b as a quotation.

¹⁴⁹ Becker, *Paulus* (n. 3), 316, correctly emphasizes this caveat.

¹⁵⁰ Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 22), 359. In n. 219 Martyn refers to Ps 119:93; Sir 45:5; 4 Ezra 14:30.

¹⁵¹ Smiles, *Gospel* (n. 16), 154.

¹⁵² Bruce, *Galatians* (n. 62), 180.

rence between the law and the covenant of promise.¹⁵³ Longenecker states that the condition in 21b is untrue. »... [T]he association of ›law‹ and ›life‹ is for Paul a false one.«¹⁵⁴ According to Dieter Sanger, the irrealis of 3:21 does not only denote a practical impossibility for the law's making alive but a principal one. There is no objection to 3:12b because ἐκ πίστεως in 3:12a is an allusion to Hab^{LXX} 2:4.¹⁵⁵ This principal character, however, should not be misunderstood. In 3:21 δυνάμενος names failure of effect, not intention. We should remember the missionary experience of Paul. The proclamation of the death of Jesus Christ effected God's supplying uncircumcised non-Jews with the Spirit (Gal 3:2, 5). That included the abrogation of the law as basis for justification in the era after the coming of Christ. We should not confuse the problem of general human inability to do the works of law and the intention of the law. There is no echo of Ezek 20:25 in Paul's writings.

The law as a means of justification and life, in terms of Lv. 18:5 ..., has been superseded by faith, in terms of Hab. 2:4b ... the conclusion is that, despite what is said in Lv. 18:5 (and in Rom 7:10: ἡ ἐντολή ἢ εἰς (ωήν) the law in fact proved unable to give life.¹⁵⁶

A proper interpretation of Gal 3:22 is dependent on a sober exegesis of 3:21. Due to 3:21 (»the law is not against the promises«), Lambrecht concludes: »Therefore, we can hardly believe that according to Paul ... the law in God's plan of salvation was never meant to justify. The negative predicament is a matter of human fact, not a matter of divine principle.«¹⁵⁷ Scripture confines anything¹⁵⁸ under sin, includes God's judgment on all human beings: They are sinners.¹⁵⁹ The thoroughgoing human inability to avoid sin is at issue.¹⁶⁰ Paul shares the extreme pessimism in some Jewish traditions.¹⁶¹ I understand Gal 3:22 according to Rom 3:20 as *usus elenchthicus legis*.

In 3:23, the »coming of faith« »may be understood both on the plane of salvation-history and in the personal experience of believers.«¹⁶² In 3:24, the phrase εἰς Χριστόν »must be taken in the merely temporal sense ... The ›coming of Christ‹ ended the period of the Torah, like the task of the pedagogue ends when the boy has reached the age of maturity.«¹⁶³

¹⁵³ Müller, »Christus« (n. 122), 131.

¹⁵⁴ Longenecker, *Galatians* (n. 24), 143.

¹⁵⁵ Sanger, »Gesetz« (n. 21), 167 n. 30.

¹⁵⁶ Bruce, *Galatians* (n. 62), 180.

¹⁵⁷ Lambrecht, »Second Thoughts« (n. 70), 263.

¹⁵⁸ The wording τὰ πάντα perhaps is deliberately used in order »to indicate a broader reference to the whole cosmos« (Moo, *Galatians* [n. 5], 239, referring on Gal 6:15; Rom 8:18–22).

¹⁵⁹ Mußner, *Galaterbrief* (n. 21), 253; cf. Becker, *Galater* (n. 89), 55.

¹⁶⁰ Rohde, *Galater* (n. 13), 161.

¹⁶¹ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 175 with n. 115.

¹⁶² Bruce, *Galatians* (n. 62), 181.

¹⁶³ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 178; cf. also Mußner, *Galaterbrief* (n. 21), 256–260; Bruce, *Galatians* (n. 62), 183; Martyn, *Galatians* (n. 20), 362.

8 The role of the Torah in the era after Christ's Coming (Gal 5:14, 18, 23)

The puzzling antinomy between the negative evaluation of the Law in Gal 5:3 and the positive evaluation in 5:14 has raised a plethora of suggestions. Some scholars interpret 5:14 as irony¹⁶⁴ or as *argumentum concessionis*;¹⁶⁵ some authors mark the difference between (Jewish) ποιεῖν and (Christian) πληροῦν¹⁶⁶ or interpret νόμος in the wider sense of γραφή.¹⁶⁷ Other exegetes emphasized the reduction of the Torah to ethics¹⁶⁸ or the love by command¹⁶⁹ or the replacement of the Torah by the command of love,¹⁷⁰ whereas, on the other hand, some exegetes distinguish between salvation and ethics¹⁷¹ or between particular and inclusive commands.¹⁷²

The most adequate interpretation, in my view, presupposes that »Paul is alive to complaints that without the law the gentile members of his congregations would lack the moral guidance offered by the Mosaic law«. ¹⁷³ The preaching of Paul's opponents forced him to clear up this point also over against the Galatians; due to Rom 13:8–10, I hesitate to interpret Gal 5:14 only as *argumentum concessionis*.

The issue of the Torah within Pauline ethics is complex. Some scholars denigrate the positive role of the Torah within Pauline ethics¹⁷⁴ whereas others hold

¹⁶⁴ H. Hübner, »Das ganze und das eine Gesetz. Zum Problemkreis Paulus und die Stoa,« in idem, *Biblische Theologie als Hermeneutik. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. A. Labahn and M. Labahn; Göttingen 1995), 9–26, 16.

¹⁶⁵ Betz, *Galatians* (n. 11), 275; M. Winger, »The Law of Christ,« *NTS* 46 (2000): 537–546, 543. E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia 1983), 97, concludes his commentary on Gal 5:14 with the words »Besides, I can tell you the *real* way to fulfil the law: Love your neighbour as yourself. Doing that *actually* fulfils the entire law« (97; original italics). In general, Sanders' interpretation is correct; I hesitate only as to whether the initial word »besides« is correct.

¹⁶⁶ St. Westerholm, »On Fulfilling the Whole Law (Gal 5:14),« *SEÅ* 51–52 (1986/1987): 229–237; J. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh 1988), 143. In the Septuagint and in Pauline texts, πληρόω is never used to designate obedience to the Torah (Esler, *Galatians* [n. 99], 204).

¹⁶⁷ De Boer, *Galatians* (n. 5), 344.

¹⁶⁸ M. Tiwald, *Hebräer von Hebräern. Paulus auf dem Hintergrund frühjüdischer Argumentation und biblischer Interpretation* (HBS 52; Freiburg i. Br. 2008), 403.

¹⁶⁹ Mußner, *Galaterbrief* (n. 21), 370.

¹⁷⁰ Esler, *Galatians* (n. 99), 203.

¹⁷¹ Rohde, *Galater* (n. 13), 229 f.

¹⁷² Williams, *Galatians* (n. 39), 147.

¹⁷³ Esler, *Galatians* (n. 99), 204; cf. also Moo, *Galatians* (n. 5), 346.

¹⁷⁴ M. Hooker, »Paul and Covenantal Nomism,« in *Paul and Paulinism* (FS Chr. K. Barrett; ed. eadem and S. G. Wilson; London 1982), 47–56; A. Lindemann, »Die biblischen Toragebote und die paulinische Ethik,« in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (FS H. Greeven; ed. W. Schrage; BZNW 47; Berlin 1986), 242–265; Chr. M. Tuckett, »Paul, Scripture and Ethics. Some Reflections,« *NTS* 46 (2000): 403–424, 423; U. Schnelle, »Die Begründung und die Gestaltung der Ethik bei Paulus,« in *Die bleibende Gegenwart des Evangeliums* (FS O. Merk;

the opposite position.¹⁷⁵ With regard to the levels of demands and argumentation, there are no real differences between Pauline and ancient Jewish ethics. With regard to the general foundation of Pauline ethics, it seems to me that Torah is at best one element among others but not the decisive one. Paul was able to regard his ethics as Jewish suitable ethics only because he identified the father of Christ with Israel's God.¹⁷⁶

How it is possible that the Holy Spirit in us is able to do what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do (cf. Gal 3:21; Rom 8:3)? In what respect does a commandment of the apostle not provoke the desire to contradict the law mentioned above?¹⁷⁷ For Paul, it is the Holy Spirit,¹⁷⁸ not the Torah, which overcomes the bad *yozer*.¹⁷⁹ The Holy Spirit enables Christians to dissociate themselves in perseverance¹⁸⁰ from the desires of the flesh (Gal 5:16) and to obey the commandment of love (Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8–10). In this way led by the Spirit, the believers are not subject to the Law (Gal 5:18).¹⁸¹ In practicing »love, joy, peace, patience ...« (Gal 5:22 f.), the demand of Lev 19:18 (Gal 5:14) is fulfilled. »There is no law against them« (Gal 5:23b).¹⁸² In this way, justification by faith can make alive

ed. R. Gebauer et al.; Marburger Theologische Studien 76; Marburg 2003), 109–131, 123 f.; F. W. Horn, »Die Darstellung und Begründung der Ethik des Apostels Paulus in der *new perspective*,« in *Jenseits von Indikativ und Imperativ. Kontexte und Normen neutestamentlicher Ethik* (vol. 1; ed. idem and R. Zimmermann; WUNT 238; Tübingen 2009), 213–231.

¹⁷⁵ B. Martin, *Christ and the Law in Paul* (NovTSup 52; Leiden 1989); P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (CRINT 3/1; Assen and Minneapolis 1990), 73; K. Finsterbusch, *Die Thora als Lebensweisung für Heidenchristen. Studien zur Bedeutung der Thora für die paulinische Ethik* (SUNT 20; Göttingen 1996); E. Reinmuth, *Paulus. Gott neu denken* (Biblische Gestalten 9; Leipzig 2004), 209–211; T. A. Wilson, *The Curse of the Law and the Crisis in Galatia* (WUNT 2/225; Tübingen 2007), 18; B. Rosner, »Paul and the Law. What he Does not Say,« *JSNT* 32 (2010): 405–419.

¹⁷⁶ M. Meiser, »The Torah in the Ethics of Paul,« in *The Torah in the Ethics of Paul* (ed. idem; LNTS 473; London 2012), 120–141.

¹⁷⁷ H. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (Tübingen ²1987), 200.

¹⁷⁸ We should not infer our modern concept of »spirit« as autonomy of mind in taking the responsibility for our doing. In some cases, Paul allows divergent decisions; in other cases, only one possible decision fulfils the criterion of Rom 12:2.

¹⁷⁹ M. Konrad, *Gericht und Gemeinde. Eine Studie zur Bedeutung und Funktion von Gerichtsaussagen im Rahmen der paulinischen Ekklesiologie und Ethik in 1 Thess und 1 Kor* (BZNW 117; Berlin and New York 2003), 488 f.

¹⁸⁰ In Gal 5:17, the final clause ἵνα μὴ ἂ ἐὰν θέλητε ταῦτα ποιῆτε is to be referred to both good and/or bad will; ἵνα is consecutive. Paul does not mean, however, that our will never becomes reality; this would denigrate the problem of sin. Rather, only permanent orientation toward the Spirit guarantees a life free from the curse of the law (Gal 5:18, see below).

¹⁸¹ There is a debate whether Paul in Gal 5:18 refers to the demands of the law (Becker, *Galater* [n. 85], 89; Esler, *Galatians* [n. 97], 203), or to the curse of the law (Th. Söding, »Glaube, der durch Liebe wirkt,« in *Umstrittener Galaterbrief. Studien zur Situierung der Theologie des Paulus-Schreibens* [ed. M. Bachmann and B. Kollmann; Biblisch-Theologische Studien 106; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010], 165–206, 190). Gal 4:8–11 could be an argument for the position first mentioned; Gal 5:14, however, suggests the latter position.

¹⁸² The formula κατὰ τῶν τοιοῦτων in Gal 5:23b can be understood neutral or masculine. The latter option is to be preferred, due to the parallel Gal 5:21b (Becker, *Galater*, [n. 87], 91).

what the law could not (Gal 3:21).¹⁸³ The punishing and cursing function of the Law came to an end.

This does, however, by no means imply the end of morality. Paul shares the notion of the Last Judgment similarly shared by all New Testament authors. There is no real antinomy between justification by faith and judgment with regard to the deeds (2 Cor 5:10) or between Paul and James. In Rom 3:28, Paul deals with the »getting in«, in Jas 2:14–26, James deals with the »staying in«. But also for Paul, it is true: Regarding the »staying in«, faith is characterized by working through love (Gal 5:6).

9 Conclusion

Both polemics and opaque phrasings in Galatians are challenging in several respects.

1. Sometimes it is helpful to draw on Romans in order to understand Galatians; sometimes, however, it is prejudicing and incorrect with regard to method. In search for criteria, I want to make just one point: In some cases, the growth of perfection in Romans would have been an advantageous help within the Galatian conflict. Here we should be reluctant to use Romans as commentary.
2. The integration of ancient rhetoric and of social psychology is a help for understanding Paul's arguments. Parallels in other letters of Paul, however, require a sober examination of the relationship between rhetoric and convictions manifest also beyond conflicts.
3. Not only a misguided reception history but also Paul's own statements demand theological (self-)reflection concerning the relationship between rhetoric and morality.
4. Reception of the Bible is by no means an arbitrary act that could be easily omitted. By insisting on receiving the Bible, Paul claims authority for his own position and demands obedience to scriptural authority. From a sceptic point of view, this seems to be an antagonism hindering any self-critical reflection. That, however, would not have been Paul's or any other ancient Jewish or Christian author's point of view.

¹⁸³ H. Lichtenberger, »Paulus und das Gesetz,« in *Paulus und das antike Judentum. Tübingen-Durham-Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters (19. Mai 1938)* (ed. M. Hengel and U. Heckel; WUNT 58; Tübingen 1991), 361–378, 368.