

## RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF GALATIANS, PART 2\*

Walter B. Russell III

The previous article in this series presented rhetorical analysis as a tool for analyzing the Bible. A six-step procedure was adopted and the first four steps were discussed.<sup>1</sup>

1. Determine the *rhetorical unit* to be studied, which corresponds to the pericope in form criticism. (Obviously the unit in this study is the Epistle to the Galatians.)

2. Define the *rhetorical situation* of the unit. This roughly corresponds to the *Sitz im Leben* of form criticism. (The situation in Galatia that called forth Paul's epistle is the entry into the region of Jewish Christian teachers, apparently from Jerusalem or elsewhere in Judea, who advocated the long-held Jewish model of Gentile attachment to Israel by becoming proselytes. Perhaps they questioned Paul's credentials and appealed to the Jerusalem apostles. They taught that Gentile Christians must be "Judaized" if they were to become a part of God's people I Gal. 2:141.)

3. Determine the one overriding *rhetorical problem* that may be present and particularly visible at the beginning of the discourse. (The rhetorical problem that functions as an organizing principle for Galatians is twofold: Paul was responding to the two problems created by the Judaizers regarding the Galatians' identity and their behavior as the people of God. Should they adopt Jew-

Walter B. Russell III is Associate Professor of New Testament, Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, California.

\* This is article two in a two-part series.

<sup>1</sup> The six steps are from George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 33-38. See the previous article for a discussion of the first four steps (Walter B. Russell III. "Rhetorical Analysis of Galatians, Part 1," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (July—September 1993): 341-58).

ish practices to become a part of the true people of God? Should they take up the yoke of the Law to guide their behavior?)

4. Determine which of the three *species of rhetoric* the rhetorical unit fits judicial, deliberative, or epideictic. (Galatians is of the deliberative species because Paul was seeking to persuade his audience to make a definitive decision about their identity and behavior in the immediate future.)

5. Consider the *arrangement of material* in the text in terms of its subdivisions, persuasive effect of their parts, their coordination, and devices of style.

6. *Review the process* of analysis by looking over the entire unit and its success in addressing the rhetorical situation and what the implications may be for the speaker or audience.

#### STEP FIVE IN THE RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF GALATIANS:

##### DETERMINE THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE MATERIAL

The fifth step in rhetorical analysis is obviously the longest and most difficult because it demands painstaking analysis of the flow of argument in the epistle.

The rhetorical purpose of Galatians may be stated as follows: To persuade the Galatians to reject the Judaizers' false gospel and to continue in the true gospel Paul had preached to them because (a) its nature alone was legitimately confirmed, while the Judaizers' false gospel was rejected, (b) it alone placed the Galatians among the true people of God through their faith in Christ, and (c) it alone gave them true deliverance from sin's power through their receiving the Holy Spirit.

##### PRESCRIPT/SALUTATION (1:1-5)

While identifying himself (1:1a) and his cosenders (1:2a), naming the recipients (1:2b), and greeting the Galatian churches (1:3), Paul also introduced his three main points that were then proved successively in the three main sections of the epistle.<sup>2</sup> (1)

<sup>2</sup> While the overall form of this section is that of the salutation or prescript of an epistle and not that of a formal exordium (the introduction to a speech), it nonetheless has additional features normally found in an exordium (or proem/principium), as Robert G. Hall has observed ("The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians—A Reconsideration," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 [1987]: 282-83). These features are the unusual additions of Paul's declaration of apostolic identity in 1:1 and his declaration of Christ's deliverance in 1:4. In this sense the salutation evidences at a micro level what is true at the macro level of Galatians: Paul integrated epistolary and rhetorical features into one smooth-flowing entity. One key element of this integration is Paul's use, from the epistle's start, of antithesis, a rhetorical device. "Antithesis occurs when the style is built upon contraries" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, trans. Harry Caplan [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954], 4.15.21). Antithetical argumentation pervades every section of Galatians.

His apostleship was through Jesus Christ and God the Father (1:1). This was proved in the defense of his apostleship and gospel in 1:11-2:21. (2) God is truly Father over them (emphasized by the threefold repetition of θεοῦ πατρὸς [ἡμῶν], 1:1, 3-4, which is unique in Paul's salutations).<sup>3</sup> This was proved in Paul's defense of their true identity in chapters 3 and 4. (3) The Lord Jesus Christ died substitutionally for them and that alone gave them deliverance from the present evil age (1:4-5). This was proved in the defense of their true deliverance from sin's power in 5:1-6:10. PROLOGUE OR PROEM OR EXORDIUM (1:6-10)<sup>4</sup>

Paul stated the two options (gospels) before the Galatians and the general proposition or cause of his letter (to be progressively specified in his following argumentation): "to persuade the Galatians to reject the Judaizers' nongospel and to continue in the true gospel which he had preached to them." As Betz has observed,

<sup>3</sup> Also this kind of subtlety may be an example of *insinuatō* or the "subtle approach" that ancient rhetoricians developed as a technique of introducing a difficult rhetorical problem. "Now I must explain the Subtle Approach. There are three occasions on which we cannot use the Direct Opening, and these we must consider carefully: (1) when our cause is discreditable, that is, when the subject itself alienates the hearer from us; (2) when the hearer has apparently been won over by the previous speakers of the opposition; (3) or when the hearer has become wearied by listening to the previous speakers" (ibid., 1.6.9).

However, in Galatians this subtlety is found in an expanded salutation, not in an exordium. Nevertheless in the oral setting of the Galatian churches, the salutation functions somewhat as an exordium functions in a speech. Paul was apparently aware of this and introduced the major themes of Galatians in subtle fashion from the very beginning of the epistle. He did the same thing in the expanded salutation in Romans 1:1-7. After introducing his main themes with this salutatory subtlety in Galatians, Paul was then free to state his proposition in the next, section (Gal. 1:6-10) in stark direct language. Such skillful and sensitive communication would not be lost on the expert listeners of an oral culture. For a defense of this emphasis on orality, see Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy* (New York: Methuen, 1982). Also underscoring the importance of oral communication due to the previously overstated literacy level in the Roman Empire is William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 175-284.

<sup>4</sup> As many have noted (e.g., J. H. Roberts, "Transitional Techniques to the Letter Body in the *Corpus Paulinum*," in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament*, ed. J. H. Petzer and P. J. Hartin [Leiden: Brill, 1986], 198), in place of the customary thanksgiving section at this point, Paul presented a confrontive official introduction. It has the characteristics of and functions like the rhetorical exordium or prologue of a speech. As Aristotle observed, "The exordium (προοίμιον) is the beginning of a speech, as the prologue in poetry and the prelude in flute-playing, for all these are beginnings, and as it were a paving the way for what follows.... So then the most essential and special function of the exordium is to make clear what is the end or purpose of the speech" (*The "Art" of Rhetoric*, trans. John Henry Freese [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926], 3.14.1, 6).

See also the discussion of the exordium in Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. H. E. Butler, 4 vols. [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921], 4.1!2:7-49; and *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 1.4.6-7.

this general statement of Paul's intent has three parts.<sup>5</sup>

1. 1:6-7. Verse 6 is the ironic statement of the *causa* with a sense of **θυμασμός** or wonderment in verse 6a at the desertion (**μετατίθεσθε**) of his readers, instead of a simple statement of fact,<sup>6</sup> so "solemnly is our attention called to the whole subject-matter of the epistle."<sup>7</sup> This statement of the *causa* is then followed with an **ἐπανόρθωσις** or *correctio* in verse 7 in which Paul retracted the status of "gospel" from these disturbers (**οἱ ταρασσοντες**), and added the charge against them of wanting to distort (**μεταστέψαι**) the gospel of Christ.<sup>8</sup> The key terms of this section are political terms,<sup>9</sup> or better, the terms of community and community loyalty. Paul's appeal is for unity of the community that the true gospel of Christ had previously created among them.

2. 1:8-9. The gospel they had received is the true gospel and Paul pronounced a curse on anyone who preached a contrary gospel (v. 8). He reiterated that curse in verse 9. The antithesis Paul created between his opponents and himself was between an apostle of Jesus Christ (v. 1) and the community-disturbers and gospel-distorters (v. 7) who are under a divine curse.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Hans Dieter Betz, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *New Testament Studies* 21 (1975): 359-62.

<sup>6</sup> About the content of an exordium Aristotle observed, "Hearers pay most attention to things that are important, that concern their own interests, that are astonishing, that are agreeable; wherefore one should put the idea into their heads that the speech deals with such subjects" (*The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 3.14.7).

According to Stanley K. Stowers (*Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986], 22), the ironic rebuke is another convention used in place of a thanksgiving in the papyrus letters. This "signals the mood and purpose of the letter" (22) and also introduces blaming letters (139). Cronje notes that this is one of many rhetorical techniques Paul used in Galatians to create "defamiliarization" and thus to influence recipients more powerfully (J. Van W. Cronje, "Defamiliarization in the Letter to the Galatians," in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament*, 214-17). Also Paul's amazement made their wavering personal and set up his relational discussion in Galatians 4:12-20 (see Steven J. Kraftchick, "Ethos and Pathos Appeals in Galatians Five and Six: A Rhetorical Analysis" [PhD diss., Emory University, 1985], 220). Hansen sees this as an "astonishment-rebuke" formula that is a major indicator of the type of epistle and the structure of the letter (Walter G. Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians—Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement* 29 [Sheffield: JSOT, 1989], 33-44).

<sup>7</sup> E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible Explained and Illustrated* (1898; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968), 923.

<sup>8</sup> Paul was using the direct approach in this exordium, which many times included boosting the speaker's own ethos or credibility with his hearers and attacking the credibility of his opponents (e.g., *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 1.5).

<sup>9</sup> Betz, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," 359.

<sup>10</sup> Aristotle underscored the significance of this kind of language in deliberative exordia: "Deliberative oratory borrows its exordia from forensic, but naturally they

3. 1:10. Paul's harsh words toward the Galatians (vv. 6-7a) and toward his opponents (vv. 7b-9) proved that he was not now (ἄρτι) seeking to please men, nor was he still (ἔτι) trying to please men.<sup>11</sup> Rather, he was now a bondservant of Christ and thus was willing to displease men by preaching the gospel of Christ, which had obviously displeased his opponents.<sup>12</sup>

Paul's *causa* or general purpose for the epistle, stated in 1:6-10, was then developed in a linear argument from 1:11-6:10 (until the *conclusio* of 6:11-18). In this lengthy linear argument, Paul proved through three major arguments why his gospel is the true; gospel and why the Judaizers have "no gospel."

are very uncommon in it. For in fact the hearers are acquainted with the subject, so that the case needs no exordium, except for the orator's own sake, or on account of his adversaries, or if the hearers attach too much or too little importance to the question according to his idea. Wherefore he must excite or remove prejudice, and magnify or minimize the importance of the subject. Such are the reasons for exordia" (*The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 3.14.12). Of course Paul had theological reasons for pronouncing this curse that goes beyond the techniques of oratory.

<sup>11</sup> Regarding verse 10 Betz observed, "The two rhetorical questions and the assertion in v. 10 put a clear end to the exordium. They deny that Paul is a rhetorical 'flatterer,' 'persuading' (ἀνθρώπους πείθω) or 'pleasing' men (ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν), or a magician, trying to 'persuade God' (πείθω τὸν θεόν)" (*The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, 362). While Betz's observation is generally accurate, it misses the main thrust of Paul's words, which is to contrast himself with Judaistic behavior. Verse 10 has this twofold temporal contrast: (1) Now there are those who are seeking to please men (e.g., Peter [Gal. 2:11-14] and the Judaizers -6:12-131) and (2) previously Paul himself was trying to please men with Judaistic behavior (e.g., 1:13-14). Paul's ethical appeal in 1:10 has a narrower focus than Betz has allowed.

<sup>12</sup> Among those who have rhetorically analyzed Galatians no consensus exists about whether verse 10 is connected with the preceding or the following verses. For example Betz connects it with verse 11 and calls both of them *transitus* or *transgressio* (after Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratorio of Quintilian*, 4.1.76-79) because they end the exordium and provide the smooth transition in the narratio ("The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," 361-62). Hester disagrees with this grouping and connects verse 10 to 1:6-9 as part of the exordium because he calls 1:11-12 a stasis which serves as the thesis for the *narratio* in 1:15—2:10 (James D. Hester, "The Rhetorical Structure of Galatians 1:11-2:14," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 [1984]: 225-29). Hall follows Hester in seeing 1:11-12 as the thesis for the narration section, but he adds verse 10 to this thesis because it relates to the theme of Paul's seeking divine not human approval in the narration of 1:10-2:21 ("The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians—A Reconsideration," 285).

The best suggestion seems to be that of Kennedy, who sees verse 10 as the explanatory conclusion (γάρ) of the exordium: "Verse 10 is very interesting in that Paul here shows how rhetorically conscious he is by calling attention to the fact that his proem does not seek favor with the audience. The verse is a written aside which contributes to his ethos by its candor" (*New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 148). Theologically Kennedy's suggestion makes the most sense also in that Paul was beginning a recurring contrast in Galatians between the true pattern of behavior in following Christ (which risks rejection by people) and the man-pleasing pattern of behavior (which fears the rejection of men and seeks status among them. See 1:13-14; 2:6, 11-14; 3:3-4; 4:15-20, 28-29; 5:10-12; 6:5, 12-16. The man-pleasing pattern is truly accursed (5:21 and 6:8).

PROOF OR PROBATIO OR CONFIRMATIO (1:11–6:10)<sup>13</sup>

The Galatians should reject the Judaizers' nongospel and continue in the true gospel Paul had preached to them because (1) its nature alone was legitimately confirmed, while the nature of the Judaizers' nongospel was rejected (1:11-2:21), (2) it alone placed them among the true people of God through faith in Christ (3:1-4:31), and (3) it alone gave them true deliverance from sin's power through their receiving of the Holy Spirit (5:1-6:10).

A HISTORICAL ARGUMENT PROVING THE SUPERIORITY OF PAUL'S GOSPEL VIA NARRATIVE OR NARRATIO (1:11–2:21)<sup>14</sup>

Paul preached the true gospel and the Judaizers preached a nongospel. His gospel was divine, not "according to man."

*Thesis of the narrative* (1:11-12).<sup>15</sup> Echoing 1:1, Paul stated

<sup>13</sup> This is the most decisive section of a speech because it gives proof or reasons why the hearers should accept the speaker's proposition. The ancient rhetoricians gave much of their attention in their handbooks to the proof section of the writing. This is especially true of the role of proof in the judicial or forensic species of rhetoric (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 1.10.18-25; Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, 5/2:153-369). Paul, however, within the deliberative species of rhetoric, was presenting evidence as to why the Galatians should reject the false gospel of the Judaizers and continue in the true gospel he had preached to them. Proof was a necessary part of this species also (Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 3.17.4; and *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 3.4.8-9).

<sup>14</sup> This argument seems to anticipate the question forming in the minds of the Galatians: "Which gospel has been confirmed by the Jerusalem apostles and Jerusalem church?" Normally in the forensic species of rhetoric, the purpose of narratio was to recount in brief fashion "the statement of facts" (διήγησις) (e.g., Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, 4.2.40). Though it was rare, Quintilian also allowed for *narratio* to be used in deliberative speeches: "As regards the statement of facts, this is never required in speeches on private subjects, at least as regards the subject on which an opinion has to be given, because everyone is acquainted with the question at issue. Statements as to external matters which are relevant to the discussion may however frequently be introduced" (ibid., 3.8.10-11).

In a discussion of forensic rhetoric Quintilian explained that external matters are those facts that have a bearing on the case, but are not the specific facts of the case itself (*The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, 4.2.11-12). They do, however, contribute to one's understanding of the speaker. In light of this, Kennedy has remarked, "This well describes the narrative in Galatians, the function of which is to establish Paul's ethos and thus to support his claim of the truth of his gospel" (*New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 145).

<sup>15</sup> Most commentators agree that Galatians 1:11–2:21 is about the origin of Paul's gospel and his independence as an apostle. This is only partially true, however. Through the rhetorical analyses of Joop Smit ("Paulus, de galaten en het judaisme. Een narratieve analyse van Galaten 1–2," *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 25 [1981]: 337-62) and Bernard Lategan ("Is Paul Defending His Apostleship in Galatians?" *New Testament Studies* 34 [1988]: 411-30), the theological and rhetorical purpose of this autobiographical section of Galatians is also seen to be a defense of the nature or quality of Paul's gospel that originated with Christ and was preached independently from the Jerusalem apostles. This is seen from Paul's opening statement in Galatians 1:11 that his gospel is not *tcara avopwrov*. This is not so much a statement

that the gospel he preached is not *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* ("according to man") that is, it is from Christ, not man. Apparently the Judaizers claimed they received their teaching from the Jerusalem apostles and were taught by them (cf. Acts 15:24); hence the nature of their teaching was *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*. Paul then defended the nature of his gospel and dispensed with theirs in the two main points of his narrative.

*Point one in the narrative* (1:13-17). Christ's direct revelation of the true gospel to Paul led to a radical change in Paul's identity and his behavior (*ἀναστροφήν*, 1:13) apart from any consultation (*προσανεθέμην*, v. 16) with the Jerusalem apostles. The true gospel changed Paul from a Jewish zealot who persecuted the church to a Christian proclaimer of the gospel among the Gentiles.<sup>16</sup>

*Point two in the narrative* (1:18-2:21). That Paul's message was the true gospel was repeatedly confirmed by the Jerusalem apostles because it did not contradict nor distort their understanding of the universal nature of the gospel.

The first confirmation of this is presented in 1:18-24. Three years after Paul's conversion, his 15-day visit to Jerusalem to see Cephas (and James) was too brief for him to be catechized by them

about its origin (which occurs in 1:12), as it is a statement about the gospel's quality or nature. In essence Paul was saying that his gospel is *κατὰ θεόν* (cf. Gal. 1:1 and Rom. 1:1). Specifically Paul focused on the universal nature or quality of the gospel in Galatians 1:13–2:21. This universal nature is characterized in this section as "the truth of the gospel" (2:5, 14). It is a gospel that is nonparticularistic and nonethnocentric. This true gospel was opposed by the Judaizers' gospel, which was particularistic and ethnocentric (e.g., 2:3-5), and thus *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*. This false gospel is therefore also contrary to "the grace of God" (2:21). See especially Lategan, "Is Paul Defending His Apostleship in Galatians?" 416-26, for a helpful analysis. In a sense this thesis for the narrative section is also a thesis for the whole proof section (1:11–6:10). See also F. F. Bruce, "Further Thoughts on Paul's Autobiography," in *Jesus and Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kummel zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Earle Ellis and Erich Grasser (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 21-25.

<sup>16</sup> Paul accomplished several things in this section of the narrative that made powerful contributions to his credibility with the Galatians. One is his modeling of his changed identity and pattern of behavior, since these were two issues perplexing the Galatians. Paul proved that he had identity with Judaism and that his pattern of behavior as a persecutor of the church and as a zealot for Jewish traditions gave him status within that community beyond many of his peers. In other words he already had what the Judaizers were promising the Galatians. Paralleling Philipians 3:1-11, Paul readily gave up this status for the privilege of having Christ revealed within him (Gal. 1:16). The second boost to his credibility is that his status within Israel was probably much greater than that of any of the Judaizers. Yet he had readily given up that status to preach Christ among the Gentiles (v. 16b). The nature of the gospel demanded these changes in Paul's identity and pattern of behavior, contrary to the Judaizers' charge. For a rousing defense of the paradigmatic purpose in Paul's autobiographical remarks in Galatians 1–2 see George Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1985), 123-76. Also see B. R. Gaventa, "Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as Paradigm," *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986):309-26.

(his oath recorded in 1:20 underscores this fact<sup>17</sup>). Yet afterward (vv. 21-24), the churches of Judea glorified God because of Paul's gospel proclamation in Syria and Cilicia, which they considered "preaching the faith" (εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν, v. 23).<sup>18</sup>

The second confirmation of Paul's preaching is recorded in 2:1-10. After 14 years Paul went to Jerusalem again. He presented the gospel to the Jerusalem apostles in private. The noncircumcising nature of Paul's message was confirmed by the apostles when Titus, a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised (vv. 1-3). "The truth of the gospel"—that is, its noncircumcising nature for Gentiles—was defended by Paul and the Jerusalem apostles against ψευδαδελφούς ("false brothers"), who advocated the bondage of "Judaizing" Gentile Christians (vv. 4-5). Again, the apostles<sup>19</sup> contributed nothing to Paul (οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, v. 6) in terms of teaching him, but they did confirm that they and he had been entrusted with the same gospel (vv. 7-8) and apostleship (v. 9), but to different groups (Jews and Gentiles).<sup>20</sup>

The third confirmation of the truth of Paul's message is given in 2:11-21. The Judaistic behavior in Antioch by Cephas and certain men from Jerusalem contradicted and distorted "the truth of the gospel" (v. 14) they had previously confirmed.<sup>21</sup> Paul

<sup>17</sup> See J. Paul Sampley, "'Before God, I do not lie' (Gal. 1:20): Paul's Self-defence in the Light of Roman Legal Praxis," *New Testament Studies* 23 (1977): 477-82, for further legal and rhetorical significance in this oath.

<sup>18</sup> Recounting this incident showed that Paul and the Christian churches of Judea were unified in their understanding of the gospel.

<sup>19</sup> For a wide range of views on the Jerusalem apostles as "pillars," see R. D. Aus, "Three Pillars and Three Patriarchs," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1979): 252-61; C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," in *Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii* (Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn, 1953); David M. Hay, "Paul's Indifference to Authority," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 36-44; and Ronald Y. K. Fung, "A Note on Galatians 2:3-8," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 25 (1982): 49-52.

<sup>20</sup> When Paul spoke in Galatians 2:9 of the "grace" that had been given him, this was his favorite term for Christ's calling him and appointing him as the apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. 1:15-16; Rom. 1:5; 15:15-16; 1 Cor. 3:10; 15:10-11; Eph. 3:1-13; Phil. 1:3-7). This term became a sort of theological abbreviation for the doctrine of the universal nature of the gospel (Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979], 27-28). See the insightful note on this term in J. Armitage Robinson, *Commentary on Ephesians*, 2d ed. (London: Macmillan, 1904; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1979), 221-26.

<sup>21</sup> While this part of the narrative was embarrassing for Cephas and Barnabas, it served an edifying function for the Galatians. Aristotle observed this function of narrative in deliberative rhetoric: "In deliberative oratory narrative is very rare, because no one can narrate things to come; but if there is narrative, it will be of things past, in order that, being reminded of them, the hearers may take better counsel about the future" (*The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 3.16.11).

rebuked this behavior (2:11-14) and then presented the theology behind the confirmation (2:15-21).<sup>22</sup>

This public rebuke was necessary because the Judaistic behavior was not consistent with "the truth of the gospel," which eliminated the Judaizing of Gentiles (cf. vv. 3-5).<sup>23</sup> "The truth of the gospel" also had specific application to Jewish Christians who still attempted to live Torah-observant lives (e.g., Cephas, Barnabas, and the rest, vv. 11-14). The gospel eliminated the barrier that Torah-observance created between Jewish and Gentile Christians for four reasons. (1) Neither Jew nor Gentile is justified by keeping the Law, but only through faith in Christ (vv. 15-16).<sup>24</sup> (2) Being justified through faith in Christ apart from Torah-observance does not make Jewish Christians like nonobservant Gentile "sinners" because no one can be judged as a "transgressor" (παράβατην) of the Law if he is not required to obey it (vv. 17-18).<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Betz ("The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," 367-68) and those who have followed him label this section the *propositio*, which is supposed to be a summation of the *narratio* and an easy transition to the proof section that follows. The following analysis shows that it does provide a significant transition into the next section (3:1-4:31). However, it is not a summation of the legal content of 1:11-2:14, but rather a specific application of "the truth of the gospel" (2:5, 14) to Jewish Christians. Further, Kennedy argues that "the main objection to calling it a proposition, as Betz does (pp. 113-14), is that it is argumentative, and it may indeed be derived as some have believed from an earlier speech" (*New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 148-49).

<sup>23</sup> While Paul stated in Galatians 2:11 that Cephas "stood condemned" (κατεγνωσμένος ἦν), scholars persist in asserting that Cephas was unmoved by Paul's rebuke, so that this event in Antioch became the watershed experience that led to a break between Jewish Christianity and Paul's Gentile mission (e.g., David R. Catchpole, "Paul, James and the Apostolic Decree," *New Testament Studies* 23 (1976-77): 428-44; James D. G. Dunn, "The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem according to Galatians 1 and 2," *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982): 461-78; and idem, "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18)," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 18 (1983): 3-57. Effectively refuting this thinly supported thesis are J. L. Houlden, "A Response to James D. G. Dunn," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 18 (1983): 58-67; and Daniel Cohn-Sherbok, "Some Reflections on James Dunn's: 'The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18)'," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 18 (1983): 68-74. See also John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1988), 76-83.

<sup>24</sup> See James D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 65 (1983): 103-18, for an excellent discussion of these verses. "Covenant works had become too closely identified as Jewish observances, covenant righteousness as national righteousness" (ibid., 114).

<sup>25</sup> As Paul did in Romans 7:1-7a, he also here began his discussion of the Jewish Christians' relationship to the Torah in the first person plural and thereby emphasized his solidarity with this, his group. However, in both Romans 7:7b-25 and Galatians 2:18-21 Paul soon shifted to the first person singular. As Betz has observed, "rhetorically there is no difficulty with this form" (Galatians, 121) because of Paul's ongoing modeling within Galatians of how Jewish Christians should respond to the true gospel and its free offer to the Gentiles (e.g., 1:13-16a). It is unthinkable that this first person singular would signal Paul's uniquely individual

(Cf. Rom. 4:15 for this principle.) (3) Jewish Christians died to the Law and live to God because of their cocrucifixion with Christ, which applied His substitutionary death to them to free them from the bodily constraints of the Law on them (Gal. 2:19-20). (4) If Jewish Christians nullify (ἀθετῶ) the universal nature of the gospel (τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ)<sup>26</sup> by emphasizing Torah-observance, then Christ died needlessly (2:21).

AN EXPERIENTIAL ARGUMENT PROVING VIA SCRIPTURE FULFILLMENT THE SUPERIORITY OF SONSHIP THROUGH FAITH (3:1–4:31)<sup>27</sup>

The Galatians should reject the Judaizers' nongospel and continue in the true gospel Paul had preached to them because it alone placed them among the true people of God through their faith in Christ.

First external proof:<sup>28</sup> The evidence of their own experience of the Holy Spirit and miracles (3:1-5). The undeniable physical evidence of the reception of the Holy Spirit by the Galatians clearly validated that they were already true sons of Abraham

response to the Torah-free gospel, because such an emphasis would immediately undercut the point he was making about his solidarity with Jewish Christians. Therefore Paul's first person singular language in 2:18-21 is considered a rhetorical and stylistic change that lowered the threat level to the Jewish Christians and held Paul up as the model while still directly addressing the application of the truth of the gospel to them. See especially Werner George Kummel, "'Individual geschichte' and 'Weltgeschichte' in Gal. 2:15-21," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 157-73, for a defense of this stylistic usage.

<sup>26</sup> See note 20 for an explanation of Paul's use of χάρις in connection with the Gentile inclusion. Note this previous usage in 1:15-16 and 2:9. This is another example of Paul's theological shorthand.

<sup>27</sup> This argument overturned the Judaizers' central claim by causing the Galatians to view their experience in the light of Scripture. The twofold question Paul addressed is, What is the identifying mark God promised to the sons of Abraham (circumcision or the Holy Spirit), and by what means is that identifying mark to be received (by taking up the yoke of Torah or by believing in Jesus Christ)?

Paul developed this argument in 3:1–4:31 with six diverse proofs. Quintilian strongly advocated diversity in argumentation: "Are we to have nothing but premises and conclusions from consequents and incompatibles? Must not the orator breathe life into the argument and develop it? Must not he vary and diversify it by a thousand figures, and do all this in such a way that it seems to come into being as the very child of nature, not to reveal an artificial manufacture and a suspect art not at every moment to show traces of an instructor's hand? What orator ever spoke thus?" (*The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, 5.14.32).

<sup>28</sup> An "external proof" is a proof that exists outside the author's creation of it. "Internal proofs" (artistic proofs) are invented by the author. As Kennedy has noted, there are three common kinds of external proofs in the New Testament: quotations from Scripture, the evidence of miracles, and the naming of witnesses (*New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 14). Paul used all three forms of external proof in Galatians 3:1–4:31. In his first argument (esp. 3:5) he cited the evidence of miracles and the Galatians' own witness of these.

who had received the blessing of the Spirit through faith, not through Torah-observance. Paul interrogated them about the evidence of which they were witnesses.<sup>29</sup>

*Second external proof: The evidence of an enthymematic argument (3:6-14).*<sup>30</sup> Verses 6-7 present the premise. Just as (καθώς) Abraham believed and was reckoned righteous, then (ἄρα) those who are of faith are sons of Abraham. Verses 8-14 present supporting proof from Scripture. In verses 8-9 Paul stated that God's justifying of the Gentiles through faith was foreseen in Scripture (Gen. 12:3). Then in Galatians 3:10-12 Paul wrote that God's justifying of the Gentiles through faith is not replaced by the works of Law because the Law can bring a curse (Deut. 27:26) and operates on a quid pro quo basis (Lev. 18:5), whereas God justifies through faith (Hab. 2:4).<sup>31</sup> In Galatians 3:13-14 Paul stated that God's justifying of the Gentiles through faith is accomplished in Christ Jesus, who redeemed Jews from the curse of the Law (Deut. 21:23) so that Abraham's blessing (the promised Holy Spirit) might come to the Gentiles through faith.

*Third external proof: The evidence of another enthymematic argument (3:15-29).* As in verses 6-14 so here in verses 15-29, Paul again presented a premise (vv. 15-16) followed by supporting proof from Scripture (vv. 17-29). His premise is that the universal promissory aspects of the Abrahamic Covenant could not be set aside nor conditionally modified after it was ratified and these aspects are fulfilled in Abraham's singular seed, Christ.

The Mosaic Law was a covenant added 430 years after the Abrahamic Covenant (Exod. 12:40). Its addition did not nullify God's previous granting of inheritance based on His promise

<sup>29</sup> "In regard to interrogation, its employment is especially opportune, when the opponent has already stated the opposite, so that the addition of a question makes the result an absurdity.... Again, interrogation should be employed when one of the two propositions is evident, and it is obvious that the opponent will admit the other if you ask him. But the interrogator, having obtained the second premise by putting a question, should not make an additional question of what is evident, but should state the conclusion.... Thirdly, when it is intended to show that the opponent either contradicts himself or puts forward a paradox" (Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric* 3.18.1-4). Paul brilliantly executed the rhetorical use of interrogation in Galatians 3:1-5.

<sup>30</sup> An "enthymeme" is a deductive proof in the form of a statement with a supporting reason and is a truncated syllogism of sorts. Aristotle called the enthymeme "a kind of syllogism, and deduced from few premises, often from fewer than the regular syllogism" (*The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 1.2.13). See Edward P. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 72-79, for a full discussion of the enthymeme.

<sup>31</sup> See Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 63-72, for a helpful discussion of the real issue within this passage and the broader context of Galatians 3-4.

(Gal. 3:17-18). Verses 19-25 are a digression.<sup>32</sup> Because of transgressions (*παραβάσεων*) and until Christ the Seed should come, the Mosaic Law was added (*προσετέθη*) for the temporary purposes of shutting up (*συνέκλεισεν*) all under sin and becoming a tutor (*παιδαγωγός*) to lead the Jews to faith in Christ. Then in verses 26-29 Paul affirmed that faith in Christ is now all that is needed to enter into the full-privileged covenantal relationship of a son of God and Abraham's offspring.

*Fourth external proof: The evidence of their experience of the Holy Spirit again* (4:1-11). The Galatians' experience of the Spirit of God's Son crying "Abba! Father!" ("*Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ*") in their hearts proves that they had been adopted as God's sons and had left behind the previous childish, slavish era of the Law (4:1-7). To give up their status as God's full-privileged sons and to turn back again to the status of slaves under bondage to the weak *στοιχεῖα* ("elements") and to Torah-observance caused Paul to fear for them (4:8-11).

*Fifth external proof: The evidence of their previous acceptance of Paul*<sup>33</sup> and their resulting happiness<sup>34</sup> (4:12-20). In 4:12

<sup>32</sup> Betz identifies this section as an extremely concise *digressio* (*Galatians*, 20), and notes that "it does not add a new argument to the defense, but prevents a wrong conclusion the readers might reach on the basis of the preceding" (*ibid.*, 163). Given this strategic function in Paul's argumentation, one should not conclude that a digression by Paul is a wandering off into irrelevant material. Digressions were noted elements in classical rhetoric (Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, 4.3.15-17). See Wilhelm Wuellner, "Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation," in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition*, ed. W. R. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken (Paris: Bearchesne, 1979), 177-88, for a discussion of Paul's rhetorical use of digressions in 1 Corinthians.

<sup>33</sup> While one might conclude that this is a rambling and personal digression within a tightly reasoned section (Gal. 3:1-4:31), such a conclusion would miss the powerful argumentative force of an appeal to an existing friendship and the experience of past hospitality in Mediterranean cultures. Paul's proof draws on both of these highly exalted values within the culture of his day. Betz notes the rhetorical value of this section. "A personal appeal to friendship is entirely in conformity with Hellenistic style, which calls for change between heavy and light sections and which would require an emotional and personal approach to offset the impression of mere abstraction. The argumentative force lies in the topic itself, the marks of 'true' and 'false' friendship" (*Galatians*, 221). Hansen regards 4:12 as a request formula (*Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ*) within the personal appeal section (4:12-20) that initiates the long request section of the epistle (4:12-6:10) (Abraham in Galatians, 44-50).

<sup>34</sup> Paul's rhetorical question in 4:15a ("Where then is that sense of *μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν*, your happiness or blessedness?") reflects the most basic appeal of the deliberative species of rhetoric. This appeal is to what is most beneficial to the hearers: "The end of the deliberative speaker is the expedient or harmful; for he who exhorts recommends a course of action as better, as he who dissuades advises against it as worse; all other considerations, such as justice and injustice, honour and disgrace, are included as accessory in reference to these" (Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 1.3.5). "Since in causes of this kind [deliberative speeches] the end is Advantage, and Advantage is divided into the consideration of Security and the con-

Paul appealed to his readers to continue to imitate him.<sup>35</sup> He pleaded with them to identify again with his non-Judaistic behavior as he did with them because there was no alienation between them. They initially identified with Paul in spite of his bodily condition and received (ἐδέξασθέ) him with great hospitality as Christ Jesus Himself, but their present entertaining of the Judaizers' theology made Paul now seem like their enemy and made continued friendship unlikely (4:13-16). The Judaizers sought to influence the Galatians for their own personal benefit, not because of true friendship, whereas Paul was deeply concerned for them as if he were again a mother in labor with them (4:17-20).<sup>36</sup> *Sixth external proof:*<sup>37</sup> *The ironic reversal of a Judaizers' proof text to prove in a climactic manner the Galatians' true Abrahamic sonship*<sup>38</sup> (4:21-31). To those who want to be under the

sideration of Honour, if we can prove that both ends will be served, we shall promise to make this twofold proof in our discourse" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 3.4.8).

Paul had already dealt with the advantage of security in inheritance by promise (Gal. 3:6-14). He had also dealt with the advantage of honor in his explication of the Galatians' present status within the people of God as υἱοὶ θεοῦ ("sons of God" not δοῦλοι in 3:26–4:11). Therefore this appeal to their advantage is just another facet of the advantage of honor that they will have if they continue in the true gospel Paul preached. This facet of honor deals with their corporate concern for their reputation and their loyalty. See Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: Knox, 1981), 25-50, for a discussion of how pivotal the "honor-shame" values were in the first-century Mediterranean world.

<sup>35</sup> See Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding*, 164-68, for a helpful discussion and defense of the imitatio Pauli nature of Galatians 4:12-20.

<sup>36</sup> All throughout 4:12-20 Paul used antithetical argumentation, and this section is no exception. On the maternity of Paul see B. R. Gaventa, "The Maternity of Paul: An Exegetical Study of Galatians 4:19," in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 189-201.

<sup>37</sup> This is both the climactic and most memorable of the six proofs of 3:1–4:31, as the rhetorical handbooks suggested: "In the Proof and Refutation of arguments it is appropriate to adopt an Arrangement of the following sort: 1) the strongest arguments should be placed at the beginning and at the end of the pleading; 2) those of medium force, and those that are neither useless to the discourse nor essential to the proof, which are weak if presented separately and individually, but become strong and plausible when conjoined with the others, should be placed in the middle. For immediately after the facts have been stated the hearer waits to see whether the cause can by some means be proved, and that is why we ought straightway to present some strong argument. 3) And as for the rest, since what has been said last is easily committed to memory, it is useful, when ceasing to speak, to leave some very strong argument fresh in the hearer's mind. This arrangement of topics in speaking, like the arraying of soldiers in battle, can readily bring victory" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 3.10.18). Paul's first proof in 3:1-5, which appealed to the Galatians' experience of the Holy Spirit by faith, and this final proof in 4:21-31 seem to fit the rhetorical qualifications of the strongest proofs, as the following analysis should reveal.

<sup>38</sup> Many commentators contend that Paul had already "fired his powder" and now as an afterthought reiterated his argument about the seed of Abraham (e.g., Hein-

Law the Mosaic Law speaks about the slave-son Ishmael, who was born according to the flesh to the slave woman Hagar, and the free-son Isaac, who was born through the promise (δι' ἐπαγγελίας, 4:23) or by the Spirit (κατὰ πνεῦμα, 4:29) to the free-woman Sarah.

In 4:24-27 these two women allegorically represent (a) the Hagar-covenant associated with the present Jerusalem and her "children" who are in slavery to the Mosaic Covenant (i.e., Judaizers), and (b) the Sarah-covenant associated with the heavenly Jerusalem and her children who are in the freedom of the New Covenant (i.e., the Galatian Gentile Christians).<sup>39</sup>

Those "Ishmaelites" who are born κατὰ σάρκα, the Judaizers, were still persecuting the "Isaacites" who were born according to the Spirit and therefore the Judaizers should be cast out from the people of God (4:28-31).<sup>40</sup>

rich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 5th ed., Kritischexegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 7 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], 216, and Ernst DeWitt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, International Critical Commentary* [Edinburgh: Clark, 1921], 251). However, such a perspective shows insensitivity to the weight of this kind of argumentation in Paul's day and it shows insensitivity to the rhetorical coup that Paul achieved by reversing what appears to be a proof text, in the Judaizers' argumentation. Barrett has argued that almost all the Old Testament passages Paul used in Galatians 3-4 are Judaizer proof texts to which he responded by putting them in the proper redemptive historical framework (C. K. Barrett, "The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians," in *Essays on Paul* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982], 154-70). This seems true of the Sarah-Hagar story in Genesis 16 and 21, which Paul would have no normal reason to use in his ministry. However, the Judaizers' use of these narratives would underscore their central point: Gentiles are "Ishmaelites" and are not sons of Abraham and can enter into the Abrahamic promise only by attaching themselves to the Israelite sons of promise—the "Isaacites"—by the approved means of circumcision. This may have been the pinnacle of Judaistic argumentation and may explain why Paul saved this proof as his climactic one. See Gijs Bouwman, "Die Hagar-und-Sara-Perikope (Gal 4,21-31)—Exemplarische Interpretation zum Schriftbeweis bei Paulus," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil 2, Band 25 (1987): 3135-55 for a bibliography on the Sarah-Hagar pericope. Also see Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, 141-50.

<sup>39</sup> Paul created historical correspondences by the use of these historical narratives. His connection of the Genesis narratives to the present Galatian situation is described by him in 4:24a as ἀτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα ("This contains an allegory," NASB; "These things may be taken figuratively," NIV). However, this methodology may be more a mixture of what is presently called "typology" and "allegory" (Betz, *Galatians*, 238-40), with typology being the predominant method. Such historical correspondences were appropriate and effective types of proof within the Jewish hermeneutics of his day (E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* [Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981], 51-54). See Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, 201-15, for an up-to-date discussion of the debate over this passage. Hansen's conclusion seems most judicious: "Our examination of Paul's hermeneutical approach to the Hagar-Sarah story confirms the position that his basic typological interpretation is supplemented by an allegorical treatment in order to relate the people in the story to the specific issues in the Galatian church, and so to counteract the troublemakers' use of the same text" (ibid., 214-15).

<sup>40</sup> Again this climactic proof of Paul's does not rest on his allegorizing, but on the

A CAUSAL<sup>41</sup> ARGUMENT<sup>42</sup> PROVING VIA COMMUNITY COMPARISONS  
THE SUPERIORITY OF PRESENT DELIVERANCE IN CHRIST (5:1–6:10)<sup>43</sup>

first proof that he established in this heading (3:1–4:31). In that proof (3:1–5), Paul, appealed to the Galatians' own witness of their possession of the Holy Spirit by faith in Christ alone and therefore their supernatural birth by God's Spirit (3:3, 5). By returning in 4:21–31 to the issue of possession of the Spirit, Paul effectively bracketed the whole argument of 3:1–4:31 with his most powerful evidence: the Galatians' prior reception of the Spirit who was promised as part of the Abrahamic universal blessing (3:8–9, 14). The *interrogatio* method in both proofs also underscores the bracketing sense. The point of this sixth proof in 4:21–31 is that the "Isaacites" are characterized by a supernatural birth by God's Spirit, while the "Ishmaelites" are simply characterized by a birth according to human bodies unaided by God's Spirit. Given this simple means of identifying the sons of Abraham who will inherit (cf. Jub. 16:15–19), then the Galatian Christians ironically qualify according to a strict reading of the Genesis narratives. They are the Isaacites because of their Isaac-like birth (κατὰ πνεῦμα), while the Judaizers are actually the Ishmaelites because of their Ishmael-like birth (κατὰ σάρκα). Paul took what was a prime piece of Judaistic argumentation and turned it on its head to his advantage.

<sup>41</sup> The limitations of epistolary analysis of Galatians manifest themselves quickly when scholars seek to find the beginning of a purely paraenetic or exhortative section of the letter. As Merk has noted, six different beginnings for the moral exhortation section of Galatians have been championed (4:12; 4:21; 5:1; 5:2; 5:7; 5:13), and he prefers 5:13 (Otto Merk, "Der Beginn der Paränese im Galaterbrief," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60 [1969]: 104). If Paul had used some of his more obvious stylistic transitions for the beginning of the paraenetic section (e.g., Rom. 12:1; 1 Thess. 4:1), the task of analyzing his letter to the Galatians would be simpler. But these transitions are more the exception than the rule. Also past commentators have sought to separate this so-called paraenetic material too sharply from the theological argumentation of Galatians 3–4. The following are insightful comments about this section: "Gal. 5.1–6.17 forms the culmination of Paul's argument to the Galatians, the point he has intended to make from the beginning of the letter: the Galatians must not submit to circumcision. Thus, although these chapters contain a great deal of moral exhortation, they should not be viewed exclusively as paraenesis. They are the climax of Paul's deliberative argument aimed at persuading the Galatians not to be circumcised" (Frank J. Matera, "The Culmination of Paul's Argument to the Galatians: Gal. 5.1–6.17," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 [1988]: 79–80). Beginning this section at 5:1 rather than 5:13 (or elsewhere) is not so much based on a change to paraenetic language (which really begins in 5:13) as on a change in subjects: from the Galatians' identity as sons of Abraham (Gal. 3–4) to their experiencing or using that freedom as sons (Gal. 5–6). Greater emphasis on the flow of Paul's rhetoric in Galatians reveals more readily this seam in his argument.

<sup>42</sup> A "causal argument" is an argument that says, "If A is the cause, then B should be its effect or manifestation." Many times it is argued backwards from the effect to the cause. This is the case here.

<sup>43</sup> The question Paul was answering in 5:1–6:10 is, Which community pattern of behavior manifests true freedom from sin's power? This issue of freedom from the power of transgressions was apparently the primary felt need to which the Judaizers appealed (H. D. Betz, "Spirit, Freedom, and Law: Paul's Message to the Galatian Churches," *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 39 [1974]: 153–55). Of course their answer was to take up the yoke of the Law and the mark of circumcision so that the Galatians could be included within the safety of God's covenant community—ethnic Israel. Paul's answer in 5:1–6:10 is found in a comparison of the behavior patterns of these two competing identities of the people of God. While the content of this section is

The Galatians should reject the Judaizers' nongospel and continue in the true gospel Paul had preached to them because it alone gave them true deliverance from sin's power through their receiving of the Holy Spirit.<sup>44</sup>

Paul's exhortation and warning about the antithetical consequences of their identity choice for their continued deliverance from, sin's power (5:1-12).<sup>45</sup> In the exhortation (5:1) Paul stated that the choice the Galatians faced was between continuing in the freedom of Christ or submitting again to the yoke of slavery (the Mosaic Law).<sup>46</sup>

ethical and exhortative in nature, its function is argumentative and not purely exhortative within Paul's epistle. First, he continued his antithetical or contrasting argumentation between the Judaizers and himself. Of course he argued for the superiority of his position over theirs. Second, he was proving the superiority of his true gospel over their nongospel in three areas. The first area concerned their antithetical natures (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον versus κατὰ θεόν) and the confirmation by Jerusalem of his gospel (1:11–2:21). The second area involved the conflicting "gospels," both of which sought to impart true Abrahamic sonship (3:1–4:31). Now in the third major area, Paul was proving the superiority of his gospel within the ethical realm. The gospel provides the only adequate and appropriate constraint for the believers' behavior: the Holy Spirit (versus the constraint of circumcision and Torah-observance). There is nothing new about Paul's exhortation to choose between these two. What is new in 5:1–6:10 is the realm of choice—the ethical or behavioral. Therefore this paraenetic material serves a vital, perhaps climactic function, within the whole rhetoric of Galatians. See Kraftcheck, *Ethics and Pathos Appeals*, 3-61, and Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 1-35, for recent surveys of the role of Galatians 5–6 in the whole epistle.

<sup>44</sup> The moral exhortation found in this argument is considered one of two kinds of deliberative rhetoric by Quintilian (*The Institutio Oratorio of Quintilian*, 3.4.9). The other kind of deliberative oratory is dissuasion. These same two are echoed by Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 1.3.3, and in *Rhetorica ad Herenniuna*, 1.2.2. Letters of exhortation and advice were also a common type of epistle in the Mediterranean world. Galatians evidences many characteristics of letters of this type (Stowers, *Letter-Writing*, 91-152). See also the epistolary handbook of Pseudo Demetrius and his comments on types of epistles in Abraham J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, ed. Bernard Brandon Scott (Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), 31-41.

<sup>45</sup> Paul used the term ἐλευθερία ("freedom") three times in Galatians (2:4; 5:1, 13) to express the opposite condition of slavery to the Mosaic Law. While Paul did not use ἐλευθερία in 4:1-7 to describe slavery's opposite, it is obvious that such a term would be appropriate to describe the condition of sonship and heirship into which the Christian has entered (4:5-7). God sent forth His Son that He might redeem (ἐξαγοράσῃ) those under Law unto freedom (4:4-5). This is significant in the discussion beginning in 5:1 because "freedom" in 5:1, 13 is specifically freedom from the daily constraints of the Mosaic Law. Christ has delivered the believer from the bondage of the στοιχία that existed during the era of the Mosaic Law (4:3, 9). Therefore to return to Torah-observance is to be enslaved to these στοιχία again (4:8-10). Conversely standing firm in ἐλευθερία is experiencing the continuing deliverance by Christ from sin's power. Paul's point in 5:1–6:10 is that the indwelling Holy Spirit, not Torah-observance, is the only adequate and appropriate constraint that Christ has provided to carry out His continuing deliverance. Therefore "freedom" in Galatians 5–6 is freedom from sin's power by Christ's deliverance.

<sup>46</sup> Paul's consistent message in this area is that Christ had delivered the Galatians from "this present evil age" (1:4) and from the bondage under the στοιχία τοῦ

In 5:2-6<sup>47</sup> the apostle solemnly warned against identifying with the Judaizers. The deliverance from sin's power that Christ offers to His own would be of no benefit (οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει) if they became part of the Judaizers' community (with its identifying mark of circumcision) and severed themselves from Christ and His grace that was at work within His community by "faith working through love."<sup>48</sup>

The antithetical impact of the Judaizers and Paul on the Galatians<sup>49</sup> is discussed in 5:7-12. The Judaizers were hindering the continued obedience of the truth by the Galatians, while Paul was being persecuted for preaching the Judaizing-free truth to them. The Judaizers had hindered their "running" and their hearing of God's voice with their leaven-like persuasion, which is not from God (vv. 7-9). By contrast, Paul had confidence that the Galatians would choose to follow him, even though he was still being persecuted (vv. 10-11). Then in a ridiculing curse Paul wished that the Judaizers would even' emasculate themselves (v. 12)

The fundamental manifestation of deliverance from sin's powers (5:13-26).<sup>50</sup> This deliverance is manifested among God's

κόσμου during the era of the Mosaic Law (4:3, 8-11). Therefore it is absolutely amazing to him (1:6) that they would be so foolish (3:1) as to do this fearful reverting (4:11) to the anachronistic and inferior mode of childish slavery that existed before the fullness of the time of the Son (4:1-7). The "yoke of slavery" in 5:1 is the Mosaic Law in the sense that it was the guardian and manager during the period of slavery to the στοιχῆα (4:1-7).

<sup>47</sup> See Kraftchick, *Ethos and Pathos Appeals*, 233-39, for a helpful explication of the rhetorical features of irony, amplification, *contentio*, and especially of pathos appeal in Galatians 5:1-6.

<sup>48</sup> The issue here is not maintaining the eternal deliverance from sin's penalty (i.e., justification by faith), but going on to maturity in Christ (3:3) and continuing to experience Christ's earthly deliverance from sin's power. This is only achieved "through the Spirit, by faith" (5:5). In Romans 7:6 Paul affirmed that this serving in "newness of the Spirit" is possible because believers have been severed (κατηργήθητε) from the Law. Ironically in Galatians 5:4 Paul said that seeking to be justified by Law will lead to being severed (κατηργήθητε) from Christ! Both instances speak of releasing the Christian from the authority and benefit of another as he lives the Christian life. In other words this is an existential, not an eternal deliverance that is achieved only when God's people are (a) appropriately arrayed around Christ (5:4a), (b) operating on the principle of God's grace (v. 4b), and (c) emphasizing "faith working through love" (v. 6b). As Paul later sketched out in verses 13-16, these three ingredients were not present within the Judaizers' community which emphasized circumcision and Torah-observance.

<sup>49</sup> Again, see Kraftchick, *Ethos and Pathos Appeals*, 240-47, for a more in-depth rhetorical analysis of 5:7-12, especially in terms of the pathos and ethos content within this section.

<sup>50</sup> Betz and those who follow his structuring of Galatians divide 5:1—6:10 into three sections, each begun by a restatement of the "indicative" of salvation: 5:1-12; 5:13-24; and 5:25—6:10 ("The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to

people not by their competitively striving with each other but rather by their serving each other through love.<sup>51</sup>

In introducing the subject of the antithetical choices (5:13-15) Paul stated that the manifestation of freedom from the constraints of the Mosaic Law within the community of God's people should not be used as an opportunity for continued fleshly failure, which is vitriolic and self-consuming, but rather as an opportunity through love to serve one another, which is the summarizing principle of the whole Mosaic Law.<sup>52</sup>

the Galatians," 376-77). This is an appealing structure, but not altogether convincing, especially in using "if we live by the Spirit" in 5:25 as the third indicative statement. A more accurate description of these three "indicatives of salvation" is that each of them is half of an antithesis contrasting the appropriate response to freedom from the Mosaic Law's daily constraints with the inappropriate Judaizers' response. One must then see how these antitheses are being used in Paul's argument. The latter two antitheses in verses 13-15 and 25-26 seem to function as brackets for verses 13-26 because they deal with the same topic of community unity and coherence versus community jealousy and competitive strife. Also verse 25 is related to verse 24 by asyndeton (no particle) and this makes for a forceful connection. Paul's use of the vocative Ἀδελφοί in 6:1 is typical of the beginning of a new section of the argument (e.g., 1:11; 3:15; 4:12; 5:13).

<sup>51</sup> The causal argument of 5:1-6:10 is manifested in 5:1-12 in comparing the antithetical effects or impacts that the two groups were having on the Galatians. The Galatians were being persuaded by Paul to question the cause behind the Judaizers' effect (5:7-9). Now in 5:13-26 Paul continued his causal argument by again arguing from the effects backward to the cause that produced them. He was inviting the comparison of the two communities—the Judaizers and his—in the area of community unity and coherence. If, in fact, Christ was delivering them from sin's power, then that deliverance should manifest itself in a unified and loving community of believers. This is the only appropriate community manifestation for those born κατὰ πνεῦμα.

Speaking about the phenomena of human transformation in a causal argument, Sherry observed, "It is assumed that certain phenomena in the world are effects brought about by the spirit of God, and that such effects resemble their cause. St Paul speaks of men being changed by degrees into the likeness of God by the Spirit (2 Cor 3:18), and Aquinas maintains that human perfections like goodness and wisdom are caused by and participate in their divine exemplars (S. T. Ia.13.5, 6, 10; 14.6). To parody Scripture, by their fruits you shall know Him" (Patrick Sherry, *Spirit, Saints, and Immortality* [Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984], 35). Conversely, those born κατὰ σάρκα will approach community as an opportunity for the σάρξ (5:13) and will manifest community phenomena or effects that are readily observable as a fulfilling of the desire of the σάρξ (5:16).

Therefore structurally Paul bracketed the listing of these two antithetical effects or manifestations of community life in Galatians 5:16-24 with the corresponding antithetical causes of those effects in 5:13-15 and 5:25-26. He was persuading the Galatians that the people of God, having been born κατὰ πνεῦμα, should manifest a life in community that is directly traceable to God's Spirit. An objective comparison of the community lives of the two groups will clearly reveal both the standards and causes of such a life.

<sup>52</sup> These verses introduce the theme of this section (5:13-26). Paul was showing the contrary ends of the two gospels the Galatians had heard. The "gospel" preached by the community of the flesh provides more opportunity for fleshly expression. The end of this kind of Judaizing emphasis is mutually destructive relationships. Ironically the end of the true gospel and its manifestation is the fulfillment of the basic

The two choices are clearly delineated in 5:16-24. Those who insist on living according to the past standard of fleshly behavior within the community under the Mosaic Law will share in the sins of a community composed of those who will not inherit the kingdom of God. However, those who identify with the community of God's Spirit will be enabled by the Spirit to manifest the fruit of loving unity apart from the daily constraints of the Law.

The standards of the Holy Spirit and the community of the Spirit are diametrically opposed to the fulfilling of fleshly behavior that takes place within the community of the flesh which is under the Law (*ὑπὸ νόμον*), so that those who possess the Spirit but live within the flesh community will not be able to do what they wish (vv. 16-18). The community of the flesh manifests the relationally destructive effects of fleshly behavior which confirm that this community is not composed of the true sons of Abraham who will inherit the kingdom of God (vv. 19-21). By contrast, the community of the Spirit manifests the relationally edifying effects of spiritual behavior, which are not legally prohibited and which evidence that those in the community of the Spirit have seen their *σάρξ* and its manifestations crucified (vv. 22-24).

In verses 25-26 Paul affirmed that being part of the community of the Spirit means one should choose to live according to the rule or standard of the Spirit and not according to the competitive striving that characterizes the community of the flesh.<sup>53</sup>

*Some specific manifestations of the deliverance from sin's power* (6:1-10). The relational goal of the Law within the community of the Spirit is manifested in the gracious restoration of sinning members and in the generous financial sharing with appropriate persons within the community.

The reality that even some Christians will be caught in sin is

purpose of the whole Mosaic Law: loving edification of one's neighbor. In other words the Law's fulfillment ultimately can be distilled into relational terms. Therefore in another manifestation of the causal argument of this whole section (5:1-6:10), Paul was arguing that observing the effects of community relationships and unity should reveal the true cause of those effects. This is why mutual destruction is powerfully tied to *σάρξ* and mutual edification to *πνεῦμα*. Observing the community effects reveals the root community cause.

<sup>53</sup> In addition to the rhetorical devices of *contrarium* (which may be called antithetical expressions) and *repetitio* (of flesh and Spirit) in 5:13-26, Kraftchick has observed the use of *synonymia* in this section (*Ethos and Pathos Appeals*, 248). Paul described the Christian life in relationship to the Holy Spirit with the terms *περιπατεῖτε* (v. 16), *ἄγεσθε* (v. 18), *ζωμεν* (v. 25), and *στοιχῶμεν* (v. 25). Duncan paraphrases verse 25 to bring out the corporate nature of Christians' relationship with the Holy Spirit that *στοιχῶμεν* seems to indicate: "If our individual lives are lived 'by the Spirit,' let us allow the Spirit to marshal us in our corporate relationships" (George S. Duncan, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* [London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934], 178).

to be dealt with by those in the community of the Spirit (ὁμῆς οἱ πνευματικοί) in gentleness and humility as restoration is sought in mutual concern and burden-bearing, not in arrogant competition (6:1-5).<sup>54</sup> Also the community of the Spirit should manifest generous financial sharing, especially with its teachers and other believers, because this is sowing to the Spirit and contrasts with sowing to the flesh, which emphasizes circumcision and Torah-observance and ends in corruption (6:6-10).<sup>55</sup>

POSTSCRIPT OR EPILOGUE OR CONCLUSIO (6:11-18)<sup>56</sup>

In an appended personal conclusion written in his own hand, Paul recapitulated<sup>57</sup> the Judaizers' man-pleasing, their fleshly

<sup>54</sup> Strelan's thesis that Galatians 6:1-5 (with 6:6-10) is about bearing a common financial burden is appealing but not totally convincing (John G. Stelan, "Burden-bearing and the Law of Christ: A Reexamination of Galatians 6:2," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 [1975]: 266-76). As Barclay and Young have noted, the phrase "bear burdens" (τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε) usually has a more general reference to the many physical and spiritual burdens of everyday life. This less restricted sense seems to fit more smoothly into the general relational picture Paul had been sketching (Barclay, *Obedying the Truth*, 131-32; and E. M. Young, "'Fulfil the Law of Christ,' An Examination of Galatians 6:2," *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 7 [1977]: 31-42).

<sup>55</sup> Hurtado makes a strong case that this financial sharing is specifically Paul's appeal for the Jerusalem collection and therefore it relates to Galatians 2:10 (Larry W. Hurtado, "The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 5 [1979]: 46-62). However, this appeal is most allusive and oblique if that is what Paul was doing. Two problems exist if Galatians 6:6-10 is related to the Jerusalem collection. First, Galatians 2:10 clarifies that the motive for a Jerusalem collection was poverty. This clarification may have been necessary in light of a Judaistic collection for the Jerusalem church under the motive of a temple offering of some sort as if the Galatians were new proselytes. Second, it might be that Galatians 6:6-10 is also an antidote for a Judaistic collection. The Galatians' financial "sowing" should be with their local teachers and the household of faith, not with the fleshly system of the Judaizers. Therefore rather than a very subtle appeal for his Jerusalem collection for the poor (which was still future), Paul may have been correcting an inappropriate Judaistic collection (cf. F. F. Bruce, "The Church of Jerusalem in the Acts of the Apostles," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 67 [1985]: 651-61). While all this is speculative, it does seem to treat Paul's language in Galatians 6:6-10 in a more straightforward manner than Hurtado's thesis.

<sup>56</sup> Aristotle describes the ideal content and function of an epilogue: "The epilogue is composed of four parts: [1] to dispose the hearer favourably towards oneself and unfavourably towards the adversary; [2] to amplify and depreciate; [3] to excite the emotions of the hearer; [4] to recapitulate. For after you have proved that you are truthful and that the adversary is false, the natural order of things is to praise ourselves, blame him, and put the finishing touches. . . . In the exordium we should state the subject, in order that the question to be decided may not escape notice, but in the epilogue we should give a summary statement of the proofs" (*The "Art" of Rhetoric*, 3.19.1). Paul included all four of these elements with great passion in his epilogue, which has both the epistolary and rhetorical elements of a conclusion.

<sup>57</sup> Betz notes that 6:12-17 is technically the *peroratio* or brief conclusion containing the indignatio of 6:12-13 and the *conquestio* of 6:17 (Galatians, 23). This *peroratio/recapitulatio* is bracketed by Paul's handwritten authentication in 6:11 and the benediction in 6:18. See also Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, 51-52, 65-66, 69-70.

motives, and his Cross-oriented motives, and he reiterated the rule of the new creation (καινή κτίσις) which negates the necessity of circumcision. Also before pronouncing his final benediction (v. 18), Paul recapitulated his apostolic authority by pointing out how the "marks of Jesus" (στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) on his body should negate any further trouble from the Judaizers (v. 17).

#### STEP SIX IN THE RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF GALATIANS: REVIEW THE PROCESS

The sixth step in the process of rhetorical analysis is to "look back over the entire book and seek to recapture the picture of the whole. The rhetorical analysis of Galatians is as follows:

I. Prescript/Salutation (1:1-5).

II. Prologue/Proem/Exordium (1:6-10).

The general proposition or causa of the letter is to persuade the Galatians to reject the Judaizers' nongospel and to continue in the true gospel Paul had preached to them.

III. Proof/Probatio/Confirmatio (1:11-6:10).

(The causa is expressed in three proofs.)

A A historical argument proving the superiority of Paul's gospel via Narrative or Narratio (1:11-2:21). (The nature of Paul's gospel alone was confirmed, while the nature of the Judaizers' nongospel was rejected.)

1. Thesis of the narrative—The nature of the gospel (1:11-12).

2. Point one in the narrative: It radically changed Paul (1:13-17).

3. Point two in the narrative: It was confirmed by the Jerusalem church (1:18-2:21).

a. It was confirmed three years after Paul's conversion (1:18-24).

b. It was confirmed 14 years later in Jerusalem (2:1-10).

c. It was confirmed in Paul's confrontation with Cephas and others over Judaistic behavior (2:11-21).

B. An experiential argument proving the superiority of their sonship-through-faith via Scripture fulfillment in six external proofs (3:1-4:31).<sup>58</sup> (Paul's gospel alone placed them among the true people of God through their faith in Christ.)

<sup>58</sup> As explained in note 28, an external proof is a proof that exists outside the author's creation of it. An internal or artistic proof is a proof invented by the author.

1. First external proof (3:1-5): The evidence of their own experience of the Holy Spirit and miracles.
  2. Second external proof (3:6-14): The evidence of an enthymematic argument (faith of Abraham/sons of Abraham).
  3. Third external proof (3:15-29): The evidence of another enthymematic argument (The particularistic Mosaic Covenant does not invalidate the universal Abrahamic Covenant.).
  4. Fourth external proof (4:1-11)The evidence of their experience of the Holy Spirit again (crying "Abba" in their hearts).
  5. Fifth external proof (4:12-20): The evidence of their previous acceptance of Paul and their resulting happiness.
  6. Sixth external proof (4:21-31): The ironic reversal of a Judaizers' proof text to prove in a climactic manner the Galatians' true Abrahamic sonship.
- C. A causal argument proving the superiority of their present deliverance in Christ via community observation (5:1--6:10). (Paul's gospel alone provided true deliverance from sin's power through their receiving of the Holy Spirit.)
1. Paul's exhortation and warning about the antithetical consequences of their identity choice for their continued deliverance from sin's power (5:1-12).
  2. The fundamental manifestation of deliverance from sin's power in the community of God's people: loving service, not competitive striving (5:13-26).
  3. Some specific manifestations of the deliverance from sin's power: relational restoration and financial generosity (6:1-10).
- IV. Postscript/Epilogue /Conclusio (6:11-18).

Looking at this brief recapitulation of the argument of Galatians causes one to marvel at the genius and continuity of Paul's rhetoric. Was his rhetoric successful in helping him achieve his rhetorical purpose for Galatians? The following rhetorical purpose has been suggested for Galatians: "To persuade the Galatians to reject the Judaizers' false gospel and to continue in the true gospel which Paul had preached because (a) its nature alone was legitimately confirmed, while the Judaizers' false gospel was rejected, (b) it alone placed the Galatian Christians among the true people of God through their faith in Christ, and (c) it alone

gave them true deliverance from sin's power through their receiving of the Holy Spirit." If this states the rhetorical purpose of Galatians, it seems reasonable to conclude that Paul achieved this purpose. The combination of his powerful logical arguments, his authoritative use of Scripture, and his passionate appeal to his relationship with the Galatians seems more than adequate to have persuaded the Galatians to continue in the true gospel.

### CONCLUSION

An epistolary analysis of the Book of Galatians is a frustrating endeavor because it is an exercise in discovering the absence of normal Pauline epistolary features.<sup>59</sup> While Galatians begins and ends with an identifiable prescript and postscript, the material in between is problematic. First, the absence of a thanksgiving section must be explained. Second, without a thanksgiving section ending in an eschatological climax, the beginning of the body of the epistle is not as definitive as one would like.<sup>60</sup> Third, there are no clear travel plans (only 4:20?) or a definitive beginning of a parentheses section. Is Galatians an epistle? Yes. However, the *absence* of these typical epistolary features reveals the limitations of using an epistolary analysis only. Additionally the *presence* of rhetorical features throughout the epistle underscores the value of using rhetorical analysis to understand both the form and function of this epistle within the Galatian churches.<sup>61</sup> In the heat of the moment and in the face of an extreme need for immediate persuasion, Paul seems to have naturally integrated rhetorical elements with epistolary form. An intimate knowledge of both rhetoric and epistle-writing would make this a natural response.

Hopefully this lengthy rhetorical analysis of Galatians has accomplished three things. First, it has demonstrated the value of

<sup>59</sup> However, Hansen seeks to demonstrate that there are a number of customary epistolary formulae that indicate the epistolary structure of Galatians (*Abraham in Galatians*, 21-54, esp. 30-31). And yet these formulae are not as definitive nor as conclusive as Hansen seems to believe, as evidenced by the significant degree of disagreement about the structure of the epistle, even among those who recognize the epistolary formulae.

<sup>60</sup> This is noted by J. H. Roberts, "Pauline Transitions to the Letter Body," in *L'Apotre Paul*, ed. A. Vanhoye (Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 1986), 93-99; and John L. White, "New Testament Epistolary Literature in the hramework of Ancient Epistolography," *Aufstieg and Neidergang der romischen Welt*, Teil 2, Band 25 (1987): 1744.

<sup>61</sup> Hansen lists at least 15 rhetorical arguments Paul used in Galatians (*Abraham in Galatians*, 79-93).

rhetorical analysis as an interpretive tool. The genius of Paul's argument in this epistle has been adequately highlighted more than previous descriptive analyses have done. Ideally, this approach enables one not only to describe what is there, but also to understand the argumentative value and function of each part of the epistle.

Second, tracing Paul's argument/rhetoric hopefully has demonstrated the continuity in his argument from Galatians 3–4 through Galatians 5–6. This continuity should help remove the chasm between chapters 4 and 5 that has hindered most expositions of the epistle.<sup>62</sup> At the minimum, the change in topics most commentators posit at Galatians 5:13 should be seriously questioned. Its existence is due in large part to misunderstanding the flow of Paul's argument.

Third, by noting the continuity in argumentation, one is helped in noting afresh how Paul used *σάρξ* ("flesh") and *πνεῦμα* ("spirit") in chapters 5 and 6. These terms can now be seen in light of the antithetical, argumentative fashion in which Paul used them. *Σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα* in Galatians 3–6 are seen as external entities (i.e., community identities), not as internal dualities. Given the traditional understanding of chapters 5 and 6 as almost a separate line of argumentation, this insight is obviously the most difficult one to accept and would need more validation.<sup>63</sup> However, the centrality of the flesh/Spirit antithesis in the spiritual life underscores the importance of clarifying this widely used paradigm.

<sup>62</sup> Also seeing this continuity is Andre Feuillet, who outlines the argument of Galatians according to salvation history and sees Galatians 4:21–6:10 as a continuation of Paul's argument, not as a closing paraenesis only ("Structure de la section doctrinale de l'Épître aux Galates [III, 1-VI, 10]," *Revue thomiste* 82 [1982]: 5-39).

<sup>63</sup> For a fuller validation of this point, see Walt Russell, *O Wretched Man! Rethinking the Flesh/Spirit Conflict in Paul's Writings* (Grand Rapids: Baker, forthcoming).

This material is cited with gracious permission from:

Dallas Theological Seminary  
3909 Swiss Ave.  
Dallas, TX 75204  
www.dts.edu

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: [thildebrandt@gordon.edu](mailto:thildebrandt@gordon.edu)

This article presents an overview of the rhetorical analyses of Galatians from 1995 to 2005. It concludes by highlighting five characteristics of such analyses: 1. The rigid application of the ancient rhetorical system is on the decline; 2. Scholars who still use insights from ancient rhetoric do so in a much more nuanced way, quite often presuppose a wider background, and are more interested in functions than in categories; 3. There has been a notable increase in the use of rhetorical approaches that were not based on ancient rhetoric; 4. The fact that Galatians is a letter has received more attention in the Book of Galatians Explained. Go To Galatians Index. Title: Galatians derives its title (pros Galatas), from the region in Asia Minor (modern Turkey), where the churches addressed were located. It is the only one of Paul's epistles specifically addressed to churches in more than one city (1:2; compare 3:1; 1 Cor. 16:1). Those two uses of the word Galatia make it more difficult to determine who the original recipients of the epistle were. Some interpret Galatia in its strict racial sense and argue that Paul addressed this epistle to churches in the northern Galatian region, inhabited by the ethnic descendants of the Gauls. From the book of Galatians we may surmise that the Galatian false teachers saw circumcision as a sacrifice of blood that enabled believers to live in a way that pleased God. In their view, Christians had to add circumcision to Christ's saving work. But from Paul's perspective this belief stripped Christ's death of its true meaning and value. This is why Paul wrote these words in Galatians chapter 5 verse 2. In a series of rhetorical questions, Paul referred to his first missionary journey. As Acts chapters 13 and 14 tell us, the Galatians had received many incredible blessings from the Holy Spirit when Paul had first been among them. Both they and he knew that these blessings of the Spirit did not come because they were keeping the Law of God. The epistle to the Galatians and classical rhetoric: part 3. Janet Fairweather. Summary. As for sententious utterances, it will be remembered that a whole book of the Bible is devoted to proverbs. We should beware of the European-centred view of things evident when Betz, with reference to the use of similitudo in Galatians 3:5, gives us references to Quintiliano Institutio Oratoria, Lausberg's Handbuch and Martin's Rhetorik, but makes no mention of the parables of Jesus. exemplars, offers much assistance to the would-be rhetorical analyst of Galatians. 39. It seems to me that the argumentative section of Galatians is much more of an integrated unity than either Betz's or Chrysostom's analysis suggests, and ties in well with what precedes and follows it. Rhetorical analyses of Galatians are necessarily selective regarding both the data they adapt from the classical world and the methodological avenues they pursue. This chapter will identify the choices made and, at times, question their appropriateness. It will begin with the classical sources which inform the discussion. Sources. The agenda as set by Betz and reaffirmed by Kennedy is to look to the Graeco-Roman rhetorical handbooks as sources for the material of the discussion. The classical sources employed to analyse Galatians, while all attempting to describe the same type of rhetoric, are not all of the same cloth; they require critical investigation before they can help us understand Paul. This has occasionally been recognized in NT studies, as attested by F. W. Hughes

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems. The book was printed by Druckpartner R&B belmann GmbH in Hemsbach on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Schaumann in Darmstadt. Printed in Germany. Preface. T. Martin<sup>30</sup> also analyses the rhetorical stasis of the Galatian controversy. He determines the principal stasis as Galatians 4:8-11 and the secondary stasis as Galatians 1:6-9. According to Martin, the principal stasis is one of quality. a. Paul affirms that the Galatians are not using their minds and must have been hypnotized into leaving the Gospel because they experienced a clear proclamation of it 3:1. b. Arguing from the experience of the Galatians, Paul reveals the illogical, unwise thinking that has led them astray 3:2-4. g. Paul supports his reasoning that the Galatians are part of the New Covenant community through citing Isaiah 54:1 where the barren women of Israel are urged to rejoice since God will bring more children from them than from those who are not barren (have a husband) 88 4:27. h. Paul argues that just as Ishmael had to be cast out because of his mocking of the child of promise, so should the Galatians, as children of promise, cast out the Judaizers 89 4:28-30. Rhetorical analyses of Galatians are necessarily selective regarding both the data they adapt from the classical world and the methodological avenues they pursue. This chapter will identify the choices made and, at times, question their appropriateness. It will begin with the classical sources which inform the discussion. Sources. The agenda as set by Betz and reaffirmed by Kennedy is to look to the Graeco-Roman rhetorical handbooks as sources for the material of the discussion. The classical sources employed to analyse Galatians, while all attempting to describe the same type of rhetoric, are not all of the same cloth; they require critical investigation before they can help us understand Paul. This has occasionally been recognized in NT studies, as attested by F. W. Hughes Book Information. Students and scholars reading the secondary literature on Galatians must often negotiate specialized language and complex lines of argument. In addition to the theological jargon that traditionally characterizes discussion of Galatians, one now encounters a significant amount of rhetorical and sociohistorical terminology, and the reader's familiarity with this specialized language is increasingly assumed. Apostasy to paganism : the rhetorical stasis of the Galatian controversy / Troy Martin. St. Paul's Epistles and ancient Greek and Roman rhetoric / Carl Joachim Classen. Paul's letter to the Galatians : epistolary genre, content, and structure / Nils A. Dahl. A paradigm of the apocalypse : the Gospel in the light of epistolary analysis / G. Walter Hansen. Book of Galatians Explained. Go To Galatians Index. Title: Galatians derives its title (pros Galatas), from the region in Asia Minor (modern Turkey), where the churches addressed were located. It is the only one of Paul's epistles specifically addressed to churches in more than one city (1:2; compare 3:1; 1 Cor. 16:1). Those two uses of the word Galatia make it more difficult to determine who the original recipients of the epistle were. Some interpret Galatia in its strict racial sense and argue that Paul addressed this epistle to churches in the northern Galatian region, inhabited by the ethnic descendants of the Gauls.