

Πίστις, Δικαιόω and  
the Apocalyptic Paul:

Assessing Key Aspects  
of the Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians

by

Hefin J. Jones

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of  
Master of Theology

Moore Theological College

Newtown, N.S.W.

March 31, 2015

I certify that the substance of this dissertation of 39,987 words (excluding bibliography), has not previously been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree. I also certify that any assistance received in conducting the research embodied in the dissertation, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in the text or notes.

I consider that this dissertation is in a form suitable for examination and conforms to the requirements of Moore College for the degree of Master of Theology.

*'Man is not condemned to be his own project'*

— J. Louis Martyn

## Abstract

J. Louis Martyn, Martinus C. de Boer, and Douglas A. Campbell are three representative and influential scholars who reflect an Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians. This Apocalyptic Reading stresses the theocentric and christocentric interpretation of the letter. This thesis assesses two key aspects of the Apocalyptic Reading, namely, Paul is committed to a cosmological apocalyptic eschatology that consequently reframes and redefines δικαιο- terms throughout the letter, and Paul is concerned to teach that cosmic rectification is brought about by the faithfulness of Christ.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1 — Paul's Apocalyptic Readers .....	11
1.1 From the Reformation to the Apocalyptic Paul .....	11
1.2 The Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians and Justification.....	16
1.2.1. Albert Schweitzer.....	16
1.2.2. Ernst Käsemann.....	18
1.2.3. J. Christiaan Beker.....	21
1.2.4. J. Louis Martyn.....	24
1.2.5. Martinus C. de Boer.....	29
1.2.6. Douglas A. Campbell.....	32
1.2.7. Other Apocalyptic Readers of Galatians .....	34
1.2.8 Apocalyptic Claims.....	35
1.3 Our Thesis.....	38
Chapter 2 — Reading Galatians Apocalyptically .....	39
2.1 Martyn & de Boer's apocalyptic reading of Galatians and cosmological aspects of Paul's eschatology.....	42
2.2 How much clarity does the shift from apocalyptic to apocalyptic eschatology bring? .....	47
2.3 Does the language of ἀποκάλυψις in Paul properly evoke apocalyptic eschatology?.....	57
2.4 To what extent can cosmological apocalyptic eschatology be distinguished from forensic apocalyptic eschatology? .....	62
2.5 Conclusion.....	74
Chapter 3 — Faith and Justification: Galatians 2:15-21 .....	76
3.1 How does πιστεύω function in Galatians 2:16 in particular? .....	81
3.2 Πίστις Χριστοῦ .....	96
3.2.1 Arguments against the objective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ and for the subjective rendering. ....	98
3.2.2 Arguments against the subjective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ and for the objective rendering. ....	121
3.3 Would Paul's use of δικαίω and δικαιοσύνη have been readily accessible and interpretable by the Galatians?.....	126
Chapter 4 — Faith and Justification: Galatians 3:1-4:7 .....	138
4.1 Is πίστις always, often, or ever 'Christological' in Galatians 3:1-4:7? .....	140
4.1.1 Does the use of πίστις in Galatians 3:23-25 determine its use throughout Galatians?.....	147
4.1.2 Does Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 at Galatians 3:11 provide an independent confirmation of a 'Christological' understanding of expressions that contain ἐκ πίστεως throughout Galatians? .....	153
4.1.3 If an 'anthropological' reading of πίστις in Galatians 3:1-4:7 is possible, is there evidence	

that it is either probable or even necessary? .....	160
4.2 Does Paul reframe and/or redefine δικαιώ in Galatians 3:1-4:7? .....	169
 Chapter 5 — Faith and Justification: Galatians 5:2-6 .....	178
5.1 Is πίστις 'Christological' in Galatians 5:2-6? .....	182
5.2 Is it likely that the δικαιο- terms of Galatians 5:4 & 5 encode cosmological rectification? .....	191
5.2.1 Galatians 5:4 .....	193
5.2.2 Galatians 5:5 .....	194
 Chapter 6 — Summary and Conclusions.....	199
 Bibliography.....	206

## Introduction

*Apocalyptic*<sup>1</sup> has staged a remarkable comeback in Pauline interpretation and as a resource for theological reflection. One of the principal architects of this rehabilitation has been J. Louis Martyn who, in particular in his groundbreaking 1997 commentary on *Galatians*,<sup>2</sup> has prosecuted the case that the Paul of the so-called 'authentic letters' was a thoroughly apocalyptic theologian. Goaded by a comment in J. Christiaan Beker's *Paul the Apostle* (1980)<sup>3</sup> that Galatians was the most difficult of Paul's letters to fit within an apocalyptic framework, Martyn has sought to demonstrate the fundamentally apocalyptic character of even that letter.<sup>4</sup> If Galatians was apocalyptic then so too was the rest of Paul. This vision of an Apocalyptic Paul

---

<sup>1</sup> Earlier scholarship represented by J. Christiaan Beker and J. Louis Martyn made extensive use of the adjective *apocalyptic* as a substantive, referring to a particular kind of eschatology, a sociological movement that held such an eschatology, and even occasionally to a literary genre in which this eschatology could be found. It was frequently used as a partial synonym of the similarly polyvalent *apocalypticism*. Recent scholarship has proposed, and sometimes even adhered to, a strictly adjectival use of *apocalyptic* and the reserving of *apocalypticism* as a name of a kind of socio-historical movement. Where *apocalyptic* will be used substantively in this thesis it will be generally found in italics, and will normally reflect the usage of the author(s) under discussion.

<sup>2</sup> James Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997).

<sup>3</sup> Johan Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980). Reprinted with an important additional preface as *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (First Paperback Edition; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).

<sup>4</sup> James Louis Martyn, review of J. Christiaan Beker *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*, *Word & World* 2/2 (1982): 194–98. Note Beker's response in his preface to *Paul the Apostle*, (1984), xix–xx.

mediated by Martyn, though harking back to Käsemann and Schweitzer,<sup>5</sup> has continued to spawn ongoing reflection<sup>6</sup> and debate.<sup>7</sup> At the very least, Martyn has persuaded many that the deapocalyptisation of Paul is not an option, even if not all of his specific proposals have won the day.<sup>8</sup>

Of particular interest to us, however, is Martyn's characterization of Paul's apocalyptic gospel:

The fact that Galatians does not contain the expression "the rectification of God" says nothing against the major thesis of Käsemann's seminal essay, "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul," . . . The study of Paul's letters may pose no issue more important than the question whether the gospel has fundamentally to do with possibility (and human decision) or with power (and divine invasion). . . . Paul's

---

<sup>5</sup> The early Barth is an indirect influence, Bruce L. McCormack, 'Can We Still Speak of "Justification by Faith"? An in-House Debate with Apocalyptic Readings of Paul', in *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter* (ed. Mark W. Elliott et al.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 179.

<sup>6</sup> Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5-8* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013).

<sup>7</sup> The Apocalyptic debate between M. C. de Boer and N. T. Wright at the November 2014 SBL/AAR Conference is an especially recent example.

<sup>8</sup> Illustrative of this is the widespread application of the term *apocalyptic* to Galatians, Paul, and his theology by the various authors in Mark W. Elliott et al., *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014).



fundamental perception of δικαιοσύνη is that of God's powerfully  
invasive deed in making the whole of the cosmos right.<sup>9</sup>

In stark contrast [to covenantal nomism and *Heilsgeschichte*], Paul's  
theological horizon is given by the motif of God's warlike and  
liberating invasion of the cosmos in Christ's cross and in Christ's Spirit,  
coupled with the bold assertion of the new creation inaugurated by  
that invasion. Because of developments in Galatia, Paul can re-preach  
this good news only by specifying the collision between that cruciform  
invasion and the Law. But just in this way he shows that in that  
collision the cosmos that one might call "human-entry-into-the-  
covenant-of-Israel-on-condition" is eclipsed by the new creation born  
in the divine-invasion-of-the-cosmos-on-no-conditions. It is in the  
singular gospel that this redemptive invasion is announced and  
performed.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> James Louis Martyn, 'Events in Galatia: Modified in Covenantal Nomism versus God's Invasion of the Cosmos in the Singular Gospel: A Response to J. D. G. Dunn and B. R. Gaventa', in *Pauline Theology, Vol 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon* (ed. Jouette M. Bassler; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 160–79, 165 n. 12.

<sup>10</sup> Martyn, 'Events in Galatia', 179.

The church is the beachhead the invasive and militant God is establishing in the world of humanity as he carries out his war of liberation, freeing the whole of the human race from the powers of Sin and Death (Gal 6:10; 1 Cor 15:20-28).<sup>11</sup>

Martyn has persuaded a small but influential following, reflected most notably by Martinus C. de Boer's 2011 *Galatians*,<sup>12</sup> and Douglas Campbell's *The Deliverance of God* (2009).<sup>13</sup> On their reading, Paul's teaching about δικαιοσύνη and δικαίω is not to be understood in the light of *covenantal nomism*, nor the older *forensic* 'Lutheran' interpretation, but rather in the light of *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*. Further, by adopting the subjective rendering of the Pauline expression πίστις Χριστοῦ, these Apocalyptic Readers of Galatians strongly stress divine action in and through the faithful Christ. Christian *faith in Christ* is relegated to a decidedly subsidiary role, justification is understood as the setting-to-rights of the cosmos, and divine action is underscored. Their reading is robustly theocentric and christological. As de Boer puts it:

---

<sup>11</sup> James Louis Martyn, 'Afterword: The Human Moral Dilemma', in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5-8* (ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013), 166 n. 19.

<sup>12</sup> Martinus Christianus de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (New Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011).

<sup>13</sup> Douglas Aitchison Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

The focus of Paul is the redemptive or liberating action of God in Christ, . . . Apocalyptic eschatology thus has little or nothing to do with a decision human beings must make, but everything to do with a decision God has already made on their behalf. According to Paul, God has done this in the apocalyptic-eschatological event of Jesus Christ, who (so Paul claims) died for human beings and was raised by God. Paul presents himself primarily as a theologian of this revelation, this apocalypse, of God.<sup>14</sup>

What makes the *Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians* (ARG) all the more remarkable was that *Galatians* was long seen as a bastion of the classical Reformation reading of Paul. Along with his letter to the Romans, *Galatians* was the locus classicus for the distinctively Protestant understanding of Justification by grace alone through faith alone in Christ Jesus alone.<sup>15</sup> The last thirty years have seen that consensus shattered.

---

<sup>14</sup> Martinus Christianus de Boer, 'Paul, Theologian of God's Apocalypse', *Interpretation* 56/1 (January 1, 2002): 33. See also the summary in Douglas Karel Harink, *Paul among the Postliberals: Pauline Theology beyond Christendom and Modernity* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2003), 16–17, 'The stress on God's action is an important corrective to the often decidedly sociohistorical focus of the "new perspective," with its concomitant emphasis on human agents and the workings of human communities.'

<sup>15</sup> Martin Luther, *A Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians Based on Lectures Delivered by Martin Luther at the University of Wittenberg in the Year 1531 and First Published in 1535* (trans. Philip S. Watson; London: J. Clarke, 1953), 136–141; trans. of *In Epistolam Sancti Pauli ad Galatas Commentarius ex Praelectione Domini Martini Lutheri Collectus* (Wittenburg: J. Luft, 1535); Jean Calvin, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians* (ed. David Wishart Torrance and Thomas Forsyth Torrance;

Following Ed P. Sanders<sup>16</sup> work, James D.G. Dunn<sup>17</sup> and N. Thomas Wright<sup>18</sup> have been the principal voices in establishing and promoting a New Perspective on Paul<sup>19</sup> in which Paul's concerns are less focussed on the salvation of the individual by means of faith in Christ, but are rather more concerned with the unfolding of God's plans for Israel and the Gentiles, and the new relationship between them in Christ. Corporate, socio-historical and covenantal categories have come to dominate the discussion, and the nature of justification and the role of faith are in question.

---

trans. Thomas Henry Louis Parker. Calvin's Commentaries 12; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), 39ff.; trans. of *Ioannis Calvini commentarii in quatuor Pauli Epistolas: ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses* (Geneva: Jean Girard, 1548).

<sup>16</sup> Ed Parish Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM, 1977); Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); Sanders, *Paul* (Past Masters; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992).

<sup>17</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1990); Dunn, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's New Testament Commentaries; London: A & C Black, 1993); Dunn and Alan M. Suggate, *The Justice of God: A Fresh Look at the Old Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1993); Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Revised edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

<sup>18</sup> Nicholas Thomas Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992); Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Oxford: Lion, 1997); Wright, *Paul for Everyone: Galatians and Thessalonians* (London: SPCK, 2002); Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives* (London: SPCK, 2005); Wright, *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (London: SPCK, 2009); Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. (2 vols.; Christian Origins and the Question of God 4; London: SPCK, 2013); Wright, *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978-2013* (London: SPCK, 2013).

<sup>19</sup> Wright first used the expression for this approach in his 1978 Tyndale lecture, Nicholas Thomas Wright, 'The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith (1978)', in *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul 1978-2013* (London: SPCK, 2013), 6; repr. from *TynBul* 29 (1978). However, Dunn is usually credited with popularising the name in his 1982 Manson Memorial lecture, James D. G. Dunn, 'The New Perspective on Paul', in *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SCM, 1990), 183-206. Wright has become reticent about its use, Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 925 n. 426.

But in many ways the ARG is as attractive as it is arresting. In contrast to readings that have concentrated on the anthropological, sociological, or ethical aspects of the letter, the sheer theocentricism and christological focus of the apocalyptic reading is compelling. The boldness of the cosmological drama detected and depicted by Martyn et al lifts us from abstractions and psychologising to the great central events of God's rescue. Further, the emphasis on divine initiative, divine intervention, divine irruptive power acting graciously to liberate a captive humanity is itself potent. Needless to say, this apocalyptic reading, while challenging key aspects and emphases of the New Perspective on Paul, is also a significant challenge to a classical Protestant understanding of justification by grace through faith. Justification is primarily about liberation rather than acquittal; faith is at most a reflex rather than an instrument of grace. Some have also detected in this reading of Galatians, at the very least an implicit universalism,<sup>20</sup> and in fact de Boer, for one, espouses salvific universalism explicitly.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 954 n. 507, accuses Martyn and de Boer of implicit universalism and 'the presence or absence of explicit faith becomes irrelevant.'

<sup>21</sup> Martinus Christianus de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, Vol 1 (New York: Continuum, 1998), 371-74, espouses universalism, and it might be inferred from Martyn, *Galatians*, 33. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, entertains the possibility e.g. 78, 94, 927-30, 953 n. 60, 1097 n. 42; Note Campbell's 'Barthian' response to Hilborn in Chris Tilling ed., *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul: Reflections on the Work of Douglas Campbell* (Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2014), 126.

To readers of Galatians, raised with a solidly 'Evangelical' (read 'Lutheran') translation such as the NIV, de Boer and Campbell's readings of the letter seem strange at first glance. Need robust theocentrism and christocentrism be purchased at the cost of universalism? But might our unease be dispelled by freeing ourselves from the straightjacket of the English translation tradition and immersing ourselves back into the Koinē? Might an attempt to attend more carefully to the 1st century context help us see past 16th to 21st century concerns?

In this dissertation our aim is to assess key aspects of the ARG offered by Martyn, de Boer and Campbell. In particular we will focus on two interpretive moves that are described as crucial by Martyn:

- (1) The recognition that Paul is committed to a *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*, that reframes the otherwise normally *forensic* language of δικαιοσύνη / δικαίω as *cosmic rectification*.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 97-98 n. 51, 'We will see shortly that the distinction between the two "tracks" of Jewish apocalyptic is essential to the reading of Galatians . . . A crucial issue is that of determining which of these two "tracks" is dominant in a given source.'

(2) That Paul's concern is to teach that cosmic rectification is brought about by *the faithfulness of Christ*, rather than to teach that justification is appropriated by *faith in Christ*.<sup>23</sup>

In pursuing these themes there will be relative neglect of some other aspects of Martyn's apocalyptic reading that would otherwise deserve more analysis such as the putative contrast between apocalyptic and salvation-historical approaches, and the claim that Paul mainly (only?) appropriates scripture in contexts where his opponents have done so initially and that he does so in a way that scripture is read strictly from the perspective of the apocalypse of Christ.<sup>24</sup> We will (i.) consider the way Martyn and de Boer in particular use terms like *apocalyptic* and *apocalyptic eschatology*, and how they distinguish *cosmological* from *forensic apocalyptic eschatology*, then we will (ii.) devote three chapters on Paul's use of πίστις / πιστεύω and δικαιοσύνη / δικαιόω in three key sections of the letter (Gal 2:15-21; 3:1-4:7; 5:2-6) where these terms are concentrated. However, we will begin by briefly relating the ARG to the Reformation

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, 251, 'the debate has demonstrated that the two readings do in fact lead to two very different pictures of the theology of the entire letter.' 'The result of this interpretation of *pistis Christou* is crucial to an understanding not only of Galatians but the whole of Paul's theology,' 271.

<sup>24</sup> John Anthony Dunne, 'Suffering and covenantal hope in Galatians: A critique of the "apocalyptic reading" and its proponents', *SJT* 68/1 (2015): 1-15. Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*, 51ff. Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013), 31-32.

reading of the letter and the New Perspective before outlining in some detail the particular positions of the various Apocalyptic Readers of Galatians.



## Chapter 1

### Paul's Apocalyptic Readers

#### 1.1 From the Reformation to the Apocalyptic Paul

Much Pauline scholarship since F. C. Baur has self-consciously seen itself in reaction to, or as a corrective to, Reformation readings of the Apostle.<sup>25</sup> With regard to Galatians and justification we are in the fortunate position of having access not only to copious theological writings on the topic by the principal first and second generation Reformers, but also to extensive exegetical commentaries on the letter written by them.<sup>26</sup> Though differences between Luther and Calvin's doctrines of justification have been both underestimated and overestimated, the commensurability of the basic structure of their viewpoint is essentially clear.<sup>27</sup> First,

---

<sup>25</sup> Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History* (trans. William Montgomery; London: A & C Black, 1912), 2, 12ff.; trans. of *Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911). Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 12ff., 114-16.

<sup>26</sup> Luther, *Galatians*; Calvin, *Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*.

<sup>27</sup> Carl R. Trueman, 'Simul Peccator et Justus: Martin Luther and Justification', in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges* (ed. Bruce L. McCormack; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 73-97; Karla Wübbenhorst, 'Calvin's Doctrine of Justification: Variations on a Lutheran Theme', in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges* (ed. Bruce L. McCormack; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 99-118; Stephen J. Chester, 'When the Old Was New: Reformation Perspectives on Galatians 2:16', *ExpTim* 119/7 (2008): 320-29; Juha Mikkonen, 'Luther and Calvin on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: An Analysis and Comparison of Substantial Concepts in Luther's 1531/35

the principal work of redemption is initiated, planned, and executed by the triune God through the incarnation, death and resurrection of God the Son who has assumed human nature into his divinity, and that work is outside of and not initiated in any way by anything in the human objects of redemption. The objective work of redemption has to be applied to believers, whether considered corporately as the church, or individually, and that occurs by faith-union with Christ as husband or head of the church and the believer.<sup>28</sup> Faith functions then not meritoriously but merely instrumentally as the means of union and justification. Justification is understood primarily in forensic terms. Essentially the salvation of believers comes as a result of the objective redemptive work of the God-Man Christ who is the mediatorial representative head of his people who are united to him by faith. Salvation is in Christ alone, by grace alone, through faith alone.<sup>29</sup> Salvation is not restricted to the past, whether Easter or conversion, but is understood as encompassing past, present and the ultimate future. Especially in Calvin one can see a

---

and Calvin's 1546/48 Commentaries on Galatians' (Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi University Press, 2007), 9 & 244.

<sup>28</sup> Luther, *Galatians*, 169-70, cf. 126, 142; Calvin, *Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*, 42-43; Jean Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (ed. John Thomas McNeill; trans. Ford Lewis Battles; 2 vols.; LCC 20-21; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 3.1.1; trans. of *Institutio Christianae religionis, in libris quatuor nunc primum digesta, certisque distincta capitibus, ad aptissimam methodum: aucta etiam tam magna accessione ut propemodum opus novum haberi possit* (Geneva: Robert Estienne, 1559); Grant Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament*, esp. 77-78 & 97-98; Chester, 'When the Old Was New', 329; and Stephen J. Chester, 'Paul and the Galatian Believers', in *The Blackwell Companion to Paul* (ed. Stephen Westerholm; Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 69-70.

<sup>29</sup> Luther, *Galatians*, 137, 140-41. Calvin, *Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*, 7, 39, cf. 144; Calvin, *Inst* 2.16. 3; 2.17.5; 3.3.1; 3.4.27; 3.11.19-20; 3.14.17

real concern to account for the historical unfolding of God's promises and covenant with Israel fulfilled in Christ as the Messiah, prophet, priest of his people. However, historical questions regarding the emergence of Christianity as distinct from Judaism and the sociological issues surrounding how Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ related to each other were hardly probed and priority was given to soteriological issues.<sup>30</sup>

The Reformation reading of Paul has remained influential in the church despite being long assailed in the academy. Even where Baur's criticism was taken seriously, attempts to recover a broadly 'Lutheran' reading of Paul commanded wide assent, especially amongst those influenced by Ritschl in the mid late 19th century and Bultmann in the mid 20th. However, both the Ritschlian and Bultmannian 'Lutheran' readings were deeply infected by philosophical frameworks alien to those of the Reformation, tending to emphasise the role of the human subject and the analysis of their psychological states.<sup>31</sup> Conversionist Evangelicalism in the English speaking world, whilst typically quite opposed to the overall frameworks of Ritschl and Bultmann and perceiving itself in continuity with the Reformation, also in its own

---

<sup>30</sup> Though note Chester, 'When the Old Was New', 323; and Chester, 'Paul and the Galatian Believers', 69.

<sup>31</sup> Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 40ff.; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (3rd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 383-84, 391, 409-11.

way emphasised the role of the human subject and the place of human dispositions and decisions in a way that was less characterisitic of the Reformation.<sup>32</sup>

The large scale re-evaluation of the character of Second Temple Judaism that occurred in the wake of E. P. Sander's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977) launched a new phase of Pauline scholarship often dubbed 'the New Perspective on Paul.' Much of this new phase of scholarship was in self-conscious reaction to 'Lutheran' readings, sometimes clearly aimed at the 19th and 20th century 'Lutherans,' sometimes mingling its criticism of them with criticism of the Reformation and popular Evangelicalism.<sup>33</sup> In essence the NPP understood Second Temple Judaism, widely conceived, as a religion of God's gracious covenant given to Israel who were then called to live faithfully to the Torah. Paul was no longer understood to be reacting to Jewish meritorious 'legalism' but rather to Jewish misunderstanding of the place of law, the role of Jesus as the Messiah, and how the Gentiles might be included within the covenant. The Reformation reading of Paul was typically accused of failing to distinguish between late Medieval Pelagianism and Second Temple Covenantal

---

<sup>32</sup> Trueman, 'Simul Peccator et Justus: Martin Luther and Justification', 97; Nicholas Thomas Wright, 'Justification: Its Relevance for Contemporary Evangelicalism (1980)', in *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul 1978-2013* (London: SPCK, 2013), 38. Excerpt from *The Great Acquittal: Justification by Faith and Current Christian Thought* (ed. Gavin Reid; London: Collins, 1980), 13ff.

<sup>33</sup> Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 1-26 is sensitive to these issues.

Nomism, of inappropriately subordinating Paul's concern with the relationship of Jew and Gentile to issues of individual soteriology, and of misconstruing the nature of justification. However, the New Perspective has resulted in a highly diverse set of renderings of Paul's soteriology that are far from being mutually compatible.<sup>34</sup> With respect to the question of faith and justification, certainly James Dunn and Tom Wright both would want to emphasise the decisive role of human *faith in* God, though understanding faith in a way that elides with human *faithfulness to* God within the covenant.<sup>35</sup>

The Apocalyptic Reading of Paul, and particular the Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians pioneered by Martyn, defended by de Boer and developed by Campbell positions itself both in contrast with the Reformation reading of Paul and as being beyond the New Perspective. At this point we will attempt to place Martyn, de Boer and Campbell within the twentieth century stream of scholarship from Schweitzer to the present that has focussed on the Apocalyptic Paul. The story has oft been told of how early twentieth century New Testament scholarship rediscovered an uncomfortably apocalyptic apostle, then scholars spent a good part of the mid-century trying to

---

<sup>34</sup> Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 9, 12-26.

<sup>35</sup> Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 920, 1470-71. But see J. M. G. Barclay, review of Nicholas Thomas Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, *SJT* (forthcoming).

come to terms with this Paul, before a final turn in which an apocalyptic perspective was not only seen as a plausible account of Paul himself, but increasingly as a real option for our current theologising.<sup>36</sup>

## 1.2 The Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians and Justification

### 1.2.1. Albert Schweitzer

The fountainhead of the Apocalyptic Reading is certainly Albert Schweitzer. Schweitzer was fundamentally interested in providing a rigorously historical account of how the message of Jesus of Nazareth led to a movement which would eventually become the largely Hellenised church of the Second Century. Schweitzer was highly critical of what he saw as a-historical interpretations of Jesus and Paul offered by the Reformation, and Nineteenth century readings that were too beholden to theological and/or philosophical concerns.<sup>37</sup> Schweitzer agreed to a significant degree with Wrede's strongly participationist account of Paul's soteriology that privileged the

---

<sup>36</sup> R. Barry Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism* (JSNTSup 127; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), is a history of Paul and his apocalyptic interpreters, and a critique of the dominant uses and understanding of apocalyptic and apocalyptic eschatology. David E. Aune, 'Understanding Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic', *Word & World* 25/3 (2005): 233–45.

<sup>37</sup> Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 2, 237ff.

soteriology believed to lie behind Romans 6-8.<sup>38</sup> Schweitzer, however, disagreed with Wrede's account of the background to Paul's thought, and turned instead to Kabisch's apocalyptic account.<sup>39</sup> Schweitzer's Paul was apocalyptic and participationist. This enabled Schweitzer to see a high degree of continuity between Jesus and Paul, and to explain Paul's lack of reception in the second century.<sup>40</sup>

Schweitzer's understanding that being-in-Christ, or Christ-Mysticism, lay at the centre of Paul's theology resulted in the depreciation of forensic and legal themes. Unlike Wrede though, these were not reduced to being mere *Kampfeslehren*.<sup>41</sup> Though it had its origin in Paul's polemical situation, justification was not treated as a handy argument with which to attack judaisers, but was integrated by Paul within his participatory account. It was a 'subsidiary crater . . . within . . . the main crater.'<sup>42</sup>

Salvation was ultimately the cosmic victory of Christ over the powers of evil. Paul was

---

<sup>38</sup> William Wrede, *Paul* (trans. Edward Lummis; London: Philip Green, 1907), 97-109, 113, 119-22; trans of *Paulus* (2nd ed.; *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart*; Tübingen: Mohr, 1907); Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 167; Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (2nd ed.; trans. William Montgomery; London: A & C Black, 1953), 219-226; trans. of *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1930.

<sup>39</sup> Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 58-63, 168, 174-78, 222, where he refers to Richard Kabisch *Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893).

<sup>40</sup> Brian John Arnold 'Justification One Hundred Years After Paul', Ph.D. Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., 2013, challenges the idea that Paul was neglected and comprehensively misunderstood in the second century.

<sup>41</sup> Wrede, *Paul*, 123 ff.; Wrede, *Paulus*, 73 ff.

<sup>42</sup> Albert Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 225.

thus seen as being largely within the broad stream of 'late Jewish eschatology.' What set Paul apart in particular was his identification of Jesus as the Messianic head of his people, with the consequent alterations to his eschatological scheme brought about by the death and resurrection of Jesus and the delay of the parousia.

Some of the details of Schweitzer's account have been abandoned by those who self consciously follow him. For instance his account of a Messianic Interregnum (Millennium) has not been followed by J. L. Martyn and M. C. de Boer. And while Schweitzer himself interpreted Paul to imply that it was only a relatively restricted number of elect who would be saved,<sup>43</sup> the Martyn school hardly touches on the language of election and tends rather towards a more or less explicit universalism.<sup>44</sup>

### 1.2.2. Ernst Käsemann

Schweitzer's synthesis of Paul's theology put his 'late Jewish eschatology' with its apocalyptic expectations of an imminently returning Christ, cosmic catastrophe, and the end to enslaving powers firmly in the centre of Paul's thought. Paul was inescapably apocalyptic. Bultmann's 'coming to terms' with the apocalyptic Paul was

---

<sup>43</sup> Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 215-16; Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 9, 101ff., passim.

<sup>44</sup> de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology' 371ff.; Campbell in Tilling ed., *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul*, 126.



to employ the tools of demythologization and *Sachkritik*.<sup>45</sup> It was Bultmann's student Käsemann who was to turn the tide and lead the current acceptance of the Apocalyptic Paul, in particular resisting the anthropological tendency in Bultmann with a focus on the theocentric and cosmological aspects of Paul's theology. Käsemann stressed the apocalyptic character of Paul's understanding of the righteousness of God, and claimed that this apocalyptic understanding of God's righteousness was both the 'nucleus' of Paul's message and its distinctive characteristic relative to the rest of the New Testament.<sup>46</sup>

Käsemann's primary contribution to the apocalyptic interpretation of Paul was a number of lectures and papers presented and published during 1960-62 defending the thesis that primitive Christian 'apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology'<sup>47</sup> Paul was indebted to some of the key ideas of this early Christian apocalyptic, sharing with much of the early church the understanding of 'the Righteousness of God' as God's saving faithfulness. In Paul this saving faithfulness could not be restricted narrowly to God's covenant faithfulness to Israel, but was his saving faithfulness

---

<sup>45</sup> Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. Kendrick Grobel; 1st cheap ed.; 2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1965), 2:238; trans. of *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Neue theologische Grundrisse; Tübingen: Mohr, 1951).

<sup>46</sup> Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (trans. W. J. Montague; London: SCM, 1969), 168; trans. of selections from *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965)

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid*, 102.

towards the whole of humanity in Adam. The righteousness of God is then a Power that liberates enslaved humanity. By it God is recapturing the world to his sovereignty.<sup>48</sup> Crucial for Käsemann was Paul's handling of the Corinthian 'enthusiasts' and his insistence on an eschatological reservation, that there was yet to be an apocalyptic resurrection.<sup>49</sup> Present eschatology can only be properly understood within the framework of future eschatology. The turn of the ages may have come, but there was still an imminent expectation of the coming and enthronement of the Son of Man. However, Käsemann made relatively little use of Galatians as its concerns were focussed on the present aspect of justification.<sup>50</sup>

Käsemann's work has been enormously influential, even on those who would not describe themselves *primarily* as apocalyptic interpreters of Paul. His essay on the 'Righteousness of God' prompted much reevaluation of Paul's δικαιο- language. It needs to be noted, however, that Käsemann still believed that Paul's doctrine of justification had an indubitable forensic element.<sup>51</sup> However, Käsemann's widest influence has been on the rejection of the focus on anthropological concerns that was

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, 162–82.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid, 124–137.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, 170, 173, 178.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, 171.

so central to Bultmann's interpretation of Paul. In this, Käsemann has largely carried the day.

### 1.2.3. J. Christiaan Beker

J. Christiaan Beker's *Paul the Apostle* can be seen as the mature fruit of the seeds planted twenty years earlier by Käsemann. Developing Käsemann's perspective, Beker presented a theology of the 'authentic letters' of Paul which found in *apocalyptic* the coherent theme of all the contingent expressions of Paul's theology in his letters.<sup>52</sup>

Beker seeks to demonstrate in extenso that the letters of Paul represent the contingent application of Paul's coherent theology, a theology that had an inescapably apocalyptic structure. Beker isolates three elements that constitute Paul's apocalyptic: (1) historical dualism (2) universal cosmic expectation; and (3) the imminent end of the world.<sup>53</sup> These three elements are understood theocentrically and Christologically, and these elements are really the expression of the triumph of divine faithfulness. That faithfulness is seen primarily, but not exhaustively, in the life, death, resurrection and future coming of Christ. Historical dualism indicates that through the death, and in particular the resurrection of Jesus, there has been a

---

<sup>52</sup> Beker, *Paul the Apostle*; Beker, *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982); Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, (1984); Beker, 'Paul the Theologian: Major Motifs in Pauline Theology', *Int* 43/4 (1989): 352–65.

<sup>53</sup> Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 136.

decisive in-breaking of the new age of God's untrammelled rule into the present age that is characterised by hostile anti-God powers. Paul's apocalyptic is cosmic in scope, in that God's eschatological actions are not limited to individuals, nor only to the nation of Israel, nor to some reality beyond history, but take the whole human world and history into view. However, though Christ's death and resurrection are decisive, they are proleptic, in that the full extent of God's triumph is yet to be seen when the world of this present age is brought to an end. Thus Paul maintains a strong future expectation.<sup>54</sup>

Beker's understanding of apocalyptic was in many ways quite conventional for his time. He preferred Koch's to Vielhauer's characterisation of apocalyptic eschatology as a historical rather than a radical dualism and rejects a too absolute disjunction between a salvation-historical prophetic eschatology and a radically dualistic apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>55</sup> He saw Paul's apocalypticism as part of his Pharisaic worldview, though now crucially modified by Christ.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid, 146–48.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid, 135–136, citing Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Studies in Biblical Theology Second Series 22; London: SCM, 1972); trans. of *Ratlos ver der Apokalyptik* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1970); and Philipp Vielhauer, 'Apocalypses and Related Subjects: Introduction', in *New Testament Apocrypha Volume 2: Apostolic and Early Church Writings* (ed. Robert McLachlan Wilson; trans. David Hill; 1st ed.; London: Lutterworth, 1965), 581–607; trans. of

Beker's distinctive contribution is twofold. First, Beker's *Paul the Apostle* demonstrates the pervasive impact of Paul's coherent apocalyptic theme on every aspect of his thinking, even while that thinking was expressed in highly contingent letters.<sup>57</sup> Second, he underlines the cosmic and future aspects of Paul's eschatology in contrast not only to the church's consistent tendency to deapocalyptise Paul, but also to Bultmann's and Barth's approaches. Bultmann and many who followed him attempted to neuter Paul's indubitable apocalypticism by means of demythologization and *Sachkritik*. In Beker's mind the result is an over-realised and individualised eschatology.<sup>58</sup> Beker criticises Barth's Christocentric approach for falling into a Christomonism that fails to account for as-yet-unfulfilled promises to Israel and the concrete character of Paul's hopes for a coming kingdom of God.<sup>59</sup> Beker chooses the term 'apocalyptic' as a polemical alternative to the overused and increasingly non-specific 'eschatological'.<sup>60</sup> Further, in contrast to Schweitzer who articulated but

---

*Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Volume II (ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher; Tübingen: Mohr, 1964).

<sup>56</sup> Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 144.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid*, 33-35, 181.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid*, 18, 140-41.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid*, 142-43.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid*, xiv.

rejected Paul's eschatology, it is clear that Beker sees Paul's apocalyptic as a viable and vital present theological option.<sup>61</sup>

#### 1.2.4. J. Louis Martyn

J. Louis Martyn, another student of Käsemann,<sup>62</sup> criticised Beker's over-emphasis on the future aspect of Paul's apocalyptic, and for neglecting Paul's apocalyptic as expressed in particular in Galatians.<sup>63</sup> In Martyn we see a strong stress on God's invasive action in and through Christ to rescue humanity enslaved by hostile Powers.<sup>64</sup> In this reading of Paul, justification is not so much focussed on the forensic issues of being right before God's judgment seat, a righteous status that is somehow appropriated by means of faith in Christ. Rather, justification is a way of expressing

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid, 362.

<sup>62</sup> See Martyn's own reflection on studying with Käsemann in Davis and Harink, *Apocalyptic and the Future of Theology*, xiii-xv.

<sup>63</sup> J. Louis Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), 177-79; Martyn's other principal works on Galatians and apocalyptic to the present are: Martyn, 'Events in Galatia'; Martyn, *Galatians*; Martyn, 'The Apocalyptic Gospel in Galatians', *Interpretation* 54/3 (2000): 246-66; Martyn, 'De-Apocalypticizing Paul: An Essay Focused on Paul and the Stoics by Troels Engberg-Pedersen', *JSNT* 86 (2002): 61-102; Martyn, 'Epilogue: An Essay in Pauline Meta-Ethics', in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (ed. John M. G. Barclay and Simon Gathercole. LNTS 335. London: T & T Clark, 2006), 173-83; Martyn, 'The Gospel Invades Philosophy', in *Paul, Philosophy, and the Theopolitical Vision: Critical Engagements with Agamben, Badiou, \*Zi\*zek and Others* (ed. Douglas Karel Harink; Theopolitical Visions 7; Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2010), 13-33; Martyn, 'Afterword: The Human Moral Dilemma'.

<sup>64</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 95ff.

the liberating work of Christ in his defeat of the Powers, and faith is at most a reflex to that work and not a means of appropriation.

What is especially striking about Martyn's proposal is that Galatians has often been considered the least apocalyptic of Paul's 'undisputed' letters. However, Martyn champions the view that Galatians is imbued with a *revealed, irruptive, cosmological apocalyptic eschatology* that shapes the entirety of Paul's theology there, and elsewhere. By describing Martyn's understanding of Paul's *apocalyptic* as a *revealed irruptive cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*, we're indicating the mutual influence Martyn and M. C. de Boer have had on one another. De Boer, a student of Martyn's, has not only provided us with the most comprehensive overview of Martyn's and his apocalyptic approach to Paul, but he has also provided Martyn with a key argument for interpreting Galatians in an apocalyptic manner. Martyn and de Boer's apocalyptic project is currently the most influential of attempted revisions of Albert Schweitzer's interpretation of Paul. Paul is an apocalyptic theologian because his theology is thoroughly eschatological in character, and his eschatology is fundamentally apocalyptic. Schweitzer's thesis of a Pauline messianic interregnum is denied by Martyn and de Boer, and his emphasis on Paul's expectation of an imminent end is both modified and attenuated, but they underscore and develop Schweitzer's claims

that salvation according to Paul is from enslaving cosmic powers, and that Paul's δικαιο- language is polemically conditioned and ultimately to be interpreted in terms of cosmic redemption.

What then is the shape of Paul's apocalyptic theology according to Martyn? And why does Martyn call this theology *apocalyptic*? First, there are four key elements to Paul's *apocalyptic*: (a.) 'the turn of the ages,' an apocalyptic dualistic eschatology;<sup>65</sup> (b.) 'a new way of knowing,' a concomitant apocalyptic epistemology;<sup>66</sup> (c.) a 'punctiliar' and not 'linear' hermeneutic;<sup>67</sup> (d.) 'a three actor drama,' a theory of divine action that requires not so much divine response to human action but rather divine initiative and victory over hostile powers which enslave humanity.<sup>68</sup> Second, why adopt the term *apocalyptic*? Thereby, Martyn is indicating he is aligning himself with Käsemann's *cosmological* as opposed to Bultmann's *anthropological* approach to Paul,<sup>69</sup> and a key

---

<sup>65</sup> Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 89ff. & cf. 117-18 on 'the death of one world, and the advent of another.'

<sup>66</sup> Ibid, ch. 6 'Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages', 89-110.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid, ch. 10 'The Abrahamic Covenant, Christ and the Church', 161-175.

<sup>68</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 255. 'Three actor drama' is from Martyn, 'Epilogue: An Essay in Pauline Meta-Ethics', 177-78; but cf. Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 152 where the same point is made in terms of a *four* actor drama.

<sup>69</sup> Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 177-78; cf. de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 361-66; de Boer, 'Paul's Mythologization Program in Romans 5-8', in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5-8* (ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013), 1-20.



justification for calling this *apocalyptic* is found in Paul's use of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις especially in Galatians.<sup>70</sup>

Martyn recognises the common debt he and Beker owe to Käsemann.<sup>71</sup> However, Beker observed that Paul's apocalyptic seemed 'suppressed' in Galatians, taking that suppression as a key example of the contingent character of Paul's letters and their expressed theology.<sup>72</sup> Martyn questions whether Beker has penetrated sufficiently into Paul's thought to see just how pervasive Paul's apocalyptic is.<sup>73</sup> He, in contrast, sees Paul's apocalyptic cropping up throughout Galatians. Beker's error, Martyn thinks, is to focus too narrowly on Paul's *future* expectations, and to fail to observe how apocalyptic historical dualism frames the entire letter, from the deliverance from 'the present evil age' in Galatians 1:4 to the 'new creation' of 6:15, and how Paul has described the change in the sets of antinomies that characterise the cosmos that has occurred through the apocalypse of Christ (Gal 3:23-29).<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 254.

<sup>71</sup> See footnote 4 above.

<sup>72</sup> Beker, *Paul the Apostle* (1984), x, 57-58.

<sup>73</sup> Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 177-179. Beker's positive response in the first paperback edition Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, (1984), xix; as Martyn recognised, *Theological Issues*, 113, 179 n.38.

<sup>74</sup> Martyn, *Theological Issues*, ch. 10 'Apocalyptic Antinomies', 112-13, 118-19.

While Martyn himself has a limited interest in demonstrating links between the apocalyptic Paul and the apocalyptic genre, it is Paul's *apocalyptic* that Martyn is interested in articulating and highlighting. He hesitates to provide a definition of *apocalyptic* but his use is fairly clear.<sup>75</sup> God's gracious invasive movement into a cosmos dominated by the hostile powers of Sin and Flesh, to free enslaved humanity, and his ongoing war with those powers ever since the cross and resurrection of Jesus form the heart of Paul's apocalyptic theology. 'The root problem lies not in our sins, but in the power called the present evil age, for the present evil age has the strength to enslave us, indeed to enslave us all.'<sup>76</sup> Leaning heavily on the work of de Boer,<sup>77</sup> Martyn gives an apocalyptic spin to Paul's use of δικαιώω, interpreting it to mean the 'rectification of the cosmos.' The coming of Jesus, and his death and resurrection in particular, are apocalyptic events with cosmic-eschatological significance. There is now a *before* and an *after*. There has been cosmic change. God's eschatological war has begun with Jesus, and is ongoing with the conflict of the Spirit and the Flesh, until Christ's future coming. True understanding of the significance of Jesus comes through ἀποκάλυψις – that is, through his irruptive revelation of himself. The key questions of

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, 113, 177-78. Note his comment on following Käsemann. Martyn, *Galatians*, 96 n. 47 'I use the term 'apocalyptic' to refer to a theological pattern of thought, not to a literary genre.'

<sup>76</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 253. In this respect Martyn's apocalyptic is different to Beker's, who refuses to downplay the significance of human sin, whatever role the powers have and whatever victory Christ wins over them, Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 209.

<sup>77</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 97-98 n. 51.

Galatians and of Paul's apocalyptic theology are "What time is it?" and "In what cosmos do we actually live?"<sup>78</sup> On Martyn's reading there can be no preparation for this irruptive disclosure of God's grace and thus there is strong discontinuity between God's act in Christ and preceding history. Salvation-history is excluded. Both history and epistemology are understood in strongly discontinuous ways, and the decisiveness of divine action is stressed.<sup>79</sup> Of the stream of apocalyptic interpreters of Paul from Schweitzer, through Ernst Käsemann, to J. Christiaan Beker, it is Martyn's view that has stimulated some of the most provocative interpretations of Paul among current New Testament scholars and theologians.

#### 1.2.5. Martinus C. de Boer

De Boer follows Martyn's lead, though formulating it slightly differently. He adopts a contemporary scholarly convention of calling the radical dualism of two world ages that he detects in Paul an *apocalyptic eschatology*.<sup>80</sup> Further, he argues that Paul's use of ἀποκαλύπω / ἀποκάλυψις approximates to this scholarly convention.<sup>81</sup> Finally, after considering the apocalypses on the one hand, and Paul's argument in Romans and Galatians on the other, he concludes that Paul holds to a specific form of apocalyptic

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, 23; Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 121.

<sup>79</sup> Martyn, 'Events in Galatia', 165 n. 12, 179.

<sup>80</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 348–350.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid, 356–357; cf. de Boer, 'Theologian', 25ff.

eschatology, namely *cosmological* apocalyptic eschatology, in contrast to *forensic* apocalyptic eschatology which is found in some of the apocalypses.<sup>82</sup> De Boer concludes, 'A full account of Paul's apocalyptic eschatology would thus have to be a full account of Paul's theology.'<sup>83</sup>

In 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology' de Boer relates Martyn's apocalyptic Paul to current discussion of the apocalypses as a genre, apocalyptic eschatology as an ideology, and apocalypticism as a socioreligious movement, noting that strictly what is under discussion is Paul's apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>84</sup> He defends the appropriateness of *apocalyptic* in *apocalyptic eschatology* against the arguments of Christopher Rowland that apocalyptic should be reserved to describe the revelation of divine mysteries and experiences such as Paul's reticent heavenly ascent report of 2 Corinthians 12:1ff.<sup>85</sup> While recognising that apocalyptic eschatology is a scholarly construct, de Boer with Martyn sees some significance in Paul's use of ἀποκάλυψις and its cognates.<sup>86</sup> He also interacts more closely with the Jewish apocalypses, mainly The Book of the Watchers

---

<sup>82</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 357–366; Martinus Christianus de Boer, 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology', in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (JSNTSup 24; ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 172–80.

<sup>83</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 379.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid, 348.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid, 351–54; de Boer, 'Theologian', 21–25.

<sup>86</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', esp. 356; de Boer, 'Theologian', 25 ff.

(1 Enoch 1-36) and 2 Baruch, in order to observe two distinct patterns of apocalyptic eschatology, one in which salvation is a cosmic drama where God rescues an enslaved cosmos from supra-human powers, and the other in which condemnation and salvation are contingent upon free human choices. The first pattern, cosmological apocalyptic eschatology, is concerned with enslavement to hostile powers and the liberation of humans and the cosmos from them, while the second pattern, forensic apocalyptic eschatology, is more concerned with matters of individual destiny, free will and human responsibility.<sup>87</sup> De Boer admits that this distinction is idealised, but ultimately argues that Paul ‘circumscribes the forensic apocalyptic eschatology of the Galatian Teachers with a cosmological apocalyptic eschatology of his own.’<sup>88</sup> Martyn and de Boer claim that Paul reframes the normally forensic δικάιόω within the context of a cosmological apocalyptic eschatology, so that it now signifies the rectification of the entire cosmos to God through Christ. Further, Beker is not only incorrect in asserting that Paul had suppressed his apocalyptic theology in Galatians, but also, de Boer claims, he has misconstrued the way Paul had retained his particularistic Jewish apocalyptic framework. It is not so much that Paul retained a

---

<sup>87</sup> De Boer, ‘Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology’, 357-366; de Boer, ‘Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology’, 180-81.

<sup>88</sup> De Boer, ‘Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology’, 185. Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 154 quotes de Boer, ‘Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology’, but in his enthusiasm for Paul the apocalyptic *theologian* he shifts de Boer's ‘apocalyptic eschatology’ to ‘apocalyptic theology’ twice in one sentence. Similarly in Martyn, ‘Epilogue: An Essay in Pauline Meta-Ethics’, 178 n. 12 he re-titles de Boer's ‘Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology’ ‘Paul and Apocalyptic Theology’; cf. Martyn, ‘Events in Galatia’, 165 n. 12.

Jewish apocalyptic worldview that he sees fulfilled in Christ, but rather, according to de Boer, the revelation of Christ is the criterion by which Paul appropriates Jewish apocalyptic categories.<sup>89</sup>

#### 1.2.6. Douglas A. Campbell

Douglas Campbell's massive *The Deliverance of God* is subtitled *An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* and is the literary apotheosis of the theological trajectory marked out by Martyn and de Boer. Standing squarely in the Martyn tradition,<sup>90</sup> Campbell seeks to apply an apocalyptic interpretation to a ten letter Pauline canon<sup>91</sup> focusing on justification and righteousness texts.<sup>92</sup> Though Campbell has some technical cautions about the use of *apocalyptic*,<sup>93</sup> he uses the term with some abandon, and in two related ways. First, *apocalyptic* means 'simply that the visible world is understood to be

---

<sup>89</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 367-68.

<sup>90</sup> 'The signifier "apocalyptic" is a useful label at an introductory level of discussion when broad loyalties and orientations are being sketched in relation to different basic approaches to Paul; it denotes fairly that an approach to Paul is being pursued that ultimately aligns with the concerns and readings of – in this context in particular – Lou Martyn.' Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 191, cf. 189-90 esp. n. 40. For Campbell's dependence on Martyn and de Boer regarding Galatians, *The Deliverance of God*, 1076 n. 5.

<sup>91</sup> Campbell, *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography* is an iconoclastic study of Pauline canon and chronology that vigorously defends a ten-letter canon and surprisingly early dates for many Pauline letters.

<sup>92</sup> The focus of Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, is on Romans, with a substantial chapter on Galatians, and smaller sections on the rest of a ten letter Pauline canon.

<sup>93</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 190-91.

dominated by superhuman forces.<sup>94</sup> Second, it is the name of the interpretive tradition from Käsemann to Martyn.<sup>95</sup>

Campbell, while critical of some of Martyn's and de Boer's exegetical and historical judgments, affirms their central contention that justification in Paul refers to a liberating act of God in which he rescues humans from oppression by evil powers. In a manner more radical than Martyn, Campbell emphasises that the apocalyptic moment for the individual is the entirely gracious act of God in which they come to see that they have been rescued. Salvation is understood as being entirely unconditional and largely revelational. Campbell suggests that ultimately God's rescue will be universal in scope, in that none will be subject to wrath. Campbell's work has been criticised from various angles, but he has continued to vigorously articulate and defend his reading of Paul.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, 952 n. 52.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 191.

<sup>96</sup> Douglas Aitchison Campbell, 'An Attempt to Be Understood: A Response to the Concerns of Matlock and Macaskill with *The Deliverance of God*', *JSNT* 34/2 (2011): 162–208. See also his chapter in Thomas R. Schreiner et al., *Four Views on the Apostle Paul* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012).

### 1.2.7. Other Apocalyptic Readers of Galatians

More loosely associated with Martyn, a number of other scholars have drawn on his, Käsemann and Beker's approach to Paul. Amongst the most notable would be Beverly Gaventa who has also published on Galatians and justification, but whose more recent focus has been on the letter to the Romans.<sup>97</sup> Douglas Harink is a systematic theologian who has sought to apply the insights of contemporary Pauline scholarship, especially that of Martyn to constructive theology. He is especially critical of Reformation readings of Paul, accusing them of critical misreadings of Paul's doctrine of justification.<sup>98</sup> On the one hand, justification has been misunderstood in forensic terms when it should have been understood as the rectification of the cosmos. And on the other, there has been an unwarranted emphasis on the faith of believing human subjects, where the emphasis in fact lies on God's action in and through Christ. Harink's account emphasises the 'Christological'<sup>99</sup> and anti-individualistic aspects of

---

<sup>97</sup> Beverly Roberts Gaventa, 'The Singularity of the Gospel: A Reading of Galatians', in *Pauline Theology, Vol 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon* (ed. Jouette M. Bassler; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 147–59; Gaventa, *Apocalyptic Paul*; Gaventa, *Romans*, (forthcoming).

<sup>98</sup> Harink, *Paul among the Postliberals*, 25ff. Harink is appreciative and critical of the 'New Perspective,' but an avid promoter of Martyn; Harink ed., *Paul, Philosophy, and the Theopolitical Vision: Critical Engagements with Agamben, Badiou, Žižek and Others* (Theopolitical Visions 7; Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade Books, 2010). Joshua B. Davis and Douglas Karel Harink, *Apocalyptic and the Future of Theology: With and beyond J. Louis Martyn* (Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade Books, 2012).

<sup>99</sup> It has become customary to designate the subjective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ as the 'christological' rendering and the objective rendering as 'anthropological.' We will retain this common tendentious terminological distinction to reflect the literature, but place the terms when used thus within quotation marks to register our protest. Both renderings are fundamentally christological, a



the Käsemann-to-Martyn reading. Harink has continued to actively promote the theological and theo-political aspects of Martyn's reading of Paul.<sup>100</sup>

### 1.2.8 Apocalyptic Claims

At this point it is worth summarising a series of claims made by our chosen Apocalyptic Readers of Galatians as a way of focusing on their distinctive approach to Paul's theology as expressed in Galatians:

(i.) Paul's thought as a whole is dominated by the categories of apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>101</sup>

(ii.) There are two predominant 'tracks' of apocalyptic eschatology, forensic apocalyptic eschatology, which is centrally concerned with individual human action and accountability, and cosmological apocalyptic eschatology, which is centrally concerned with divine action to rectify the cosmos.<sup>102</sup>

---

point highlighted by Francis Watson, 'By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and Its Scriptural Solution', in *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (eds. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), 159. The so-called 'anthropological' rendering is after all faith *in Christ* and his self-giving love seen in the cross (Gal 2:16; 2:20-3:1).

<sup>100</sup> Harink, *Paul, Philosophy, and the Theopolitical Vision*; Davis and Harink, *Apocalyptic and the Future of Theology*.

<sup>101</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 97-98 n. 51; de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 379; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 191 & 978 n. 41.

<sup>102</sup> See previous footnote, and especially de Boer, 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology', 180-81.

(iii.) Paul's opponents in Galatia, the Agitators,<sup>103</sup> are committed to a forensic apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>104</sup>

(iv.) Paul's thought in Galatians is thoroughly dominated by or imbued with the categories of cosmological apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>105</sup>

(v.) Paul's use of δικαιώω / δικαιοσύνη in Galatians is the consequence of the Agitators' use of shared early church tradition.<sup>106</sup>

(vi.) Paul reframes the Agitators' use of δικαιώω / δικαιοσύνη within the context of his cosmological apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Martyn's, *Galatians*, opts for *Teachers*, 14; de Boer, *Galatians*, for 'the new preachers,' 50-61; and Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 1140 n. 2, provides a survey of the options but follows Martyn's usage. *Agitators* has the advantage of reflecting Paul's perspective on those whose influence he's combating in Galatians (5:10; cf. 1:7).

<sup>104</sup> So Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 154; and de Boer, 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology', 184-85; de Boer, *Galatians*, 163-64 & 186; however, Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 842-46 is more circumspect.

<sup>105</sup> See previous footnote.

<sup>106</sup> So Martyn, *Galatians*, 25, 249-50, & 264-69; de Boer, *Galatians*, 143-44; but criticised by Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 846-47.

<sup>107</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology'; de Boer, *Galatians*, 186; followed by Martyn, *Galatians*, 97-98 n. 51; and Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 706, 1119 n. 82, 1120 n. 83.

(vii.) δικαίωω / δικαιοσύνη in Paul's use is better thought of in terms of the liberation, or the rectification, of the cosmos by the faithful Christ, rather than in terms of the acquittal / acceptance of believers on the basis of Christ's work.<sup>108</sup>

(viii.) Paul is not focussed on human action in Galatians but on the divine action of rectifying the cosmos through Christ, and announced in the gospel.<sup>109</sup>

(ix.) Paul's πιστεύω / πίστις language in Galatians refers almost always to Christ's action and never to the believer's trust functioning instrumentally with respect to δικαίωω / δικαιοσύνη.<sup>110</sup>

In the course of this dissertation we will have reason to either seriously qualify or to reject each of these claims.

---

<sup>108</sup> Martyn, 'Events in Galatia', 165 n. 12; Martyn, *Galatians*, 249-50, 270-73; de Boer, *Galatians*, 164-65, 186, 190-91, 241-42; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 844, 1148 n. 33.

<sup>109</sup> Martyn, 'Events in Galatia', 165 n. 12; Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel'; de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 364ff.; de Boer 'Paul Theologian of God's Apocalypse'; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 846, 1148-49 n. 38 endorsing Martyn at this point. See especially Harink's, *Paul among the Postliberals*, 16-17, appropriation of Martyn, quoted at footnote 14 above.

<sup>110</sup> Argued most forcefully by Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, e.g. 1149 n. 39; with some qualification by de Boer, *Galatians*, 319; and with greater reserve by Martyn, *Galatians*, 275-77. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 1155 n. 84 complains of Martyn's "both-and" position,' 1151 n. 61.

### 1.3 Our Thesis

Although reading Galatians in the light of a putatively *apocalyptic* eschatology presents an advance on over-individualised readings of that letter, nevertheless neither the forensic aspects of Paul's δικαιο- language nor the subjective role of Christian faith in Christ can be eliminated from Galatians, because Paul's eschatology remains irreducibly forensic while being cosmological, and his deployment of ἐκ πίστεως expressions is best understood as referring to the believer's trust in God/Christ. We will approach our critique of the Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians (ARG) by first examining the way Galatians and the Apocalypses are related to one another, especially in the work of de Boer, upon whom Martyn and Campbell are so reliant. Then in three exegetical chapters on Galatians 2:15-21; 3:1-4:7 and 5:2-6 we will consider in turn Paul's use of πιστ- and δικαιο- terms in each of those contexts, before summing up our argument.

## Chapter 2

### Reading Galatians Apocalyptically

The former and future comings of Christ determine not only Paul's self-understanding, but his understanding of history, the cosmos, and ultimately of God. 1 Corinthians 1:7 speaks of the future revelation (ἀποκάλυψιν) of Jesus Christ, and Galatians 3:23 of *faith* being revealed (ἀποκαλυφθῆναι), an event which was contingent upon, maybe identical to, the 'first' coming of Christ. The two christological, revelatory events depicted thus play absolutely pivotal roles in Paul's thought. So when J. Louis Martyn translates these two Greek terms respectively as *apocalypse* and *apocalypsed*, he wants to underline for us that we're entering 'the strange world of apocalyptic.'<sup>111</sup>

Four texts illustrate the variety of approaches to Paul and *apocalyptic*. In 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17 Paul depicts Christ's future coming in terms reminiscent of the apocalypses (cf. *Apocalypse of Abraham* 31:1ff.).<sup>112</sup> Whether or not Paul was an

---

<sup>111</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 252.

<sup>112</sup> Though note the caution about the character of the text of *The Apocalypse of Abraham* in Richard Bauckham, 'Apocalypses', in *Justification and Variegated Nomism Volume 1, The Complexities of Second Temple*

apocalyptic theologian, such texts require us to reckon with traces of apocalyptic eschatology in his letters, even if relegated to 'transitional thinking.'<sup>113</sup> While 1 Corinthians 15:50-57 (cf. 1 Cor 15:20-23) is clearly another apocalyptic scenario, it raises further important questions about how fundamental apocalyptic eschatology is to Paul's theology as a whole. Paul's commitment to apocalyptic terminology and themes in a letter to a predominantly Greek church led J. Christiaan Beker to conclude that 'far from considering the apocalyptic worldview a husk or discardable frame, Paul insists that it belongs to the inalienable coherent core of the gospel.'<sup>114</sup> A third alternative takes as its starting point 2 Corinthians 12:1-7 with Paul's reticent non-descriptive description of a heavenly ascent to become a recipient of heavenly mysteries. Christopher Rowland connects that text with a broader understanding of *apocalyptic* that places less emphasis on matters eschatological and a greater emphasis on revelation. Paul, then, is a theologian of revealed mysteries.<sup>115</sup> Of particular interest to us is Martyn's understanding of Galatians 1:3b-4a, 'the Lord Jesus Christ who gave himself for our sins to rescue us from the present evil age.' There might seem to be little to commend this brief clause as a pivotal text for establishing a

---

*Judaism* (ed. Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 160-61.

<sup>113</sup> Vincent P. Branick, 'Apocalyptic Paul', *CBQ* 47/4 (October 1, 1985): 664-75, esp. 664, 670; Aune, 'Understanding Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic', 241.

<sup>114</sup> Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 171.

<sup>115</sup> Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 374-86. Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*, 51-53.

fourth distinctive approach to the apocalyptic Paul. Mention of 'the present evil age' reflects one aspect of apocalyptic eschatology, but according to Martyn it is the fact that Paul adds this extra apocalyptic note to an early church formula about the forgiveness of sins that signals that Paul has reframed an early Christian tradition within the context of *cosmological apocalyptic*. Paul's *apocalyptic* is not merely about forgiveness and a future coming of Christ, but more fundamentally about an invasion and transformation of the cosmos already begun in Christ.<sup>116</sup>

This chapter will argue that, while Martyn and de Boer have demonstrated Paul's theology is thoroughly shaped by a cosmic eschatology even in a letter, Galatians, that has normally been seen as a bastion for a more *realised* eschatology and an 'anthropological' reading of Paul, their arguments for the specifically apocalyptic character of his theology are suspect. After outlining their case for reading Galatians apocalyptically (2.1 below), we will query the clarity of Martyn and de Boer's use of the categories *apocalyptic* and *apocalyptic eschatology*, and the way they relate Paul's thought to the Jewish *apocalypses* (2.2). Then we will investigate their argument that Paul's use of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις in Galatians approximates to the conventional scholarly understanding of *apocalyptic* and *apocalyptic eschatology* (2.3).

---

<sup>116</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 253-54.

Finally, we will probe the evidence de Boer presents for isolating and contrasting alleged *cosmological* and *forensic apocalyptic eschatologies* in Second Temple sources, and question his and Martyn's application of that distinction to Paul's δικαιο- language in Galatians (2.4).

## 2.1 Martyn & de Boer's apocalyptic reading of Galatians and cosmological aspects of Paul's eschatology

Given that prior to Martyn's work Galatians was seen as one of the least apocalyptic of Paul's letters both in terms of its language and message, what was it about the letter that indicated to Martyn that it was indeed thoroughly apocalyptic? Martyn usefully summarises the apocalyptic features or 'expressions' of the letter in his excursus, 'Apocalyptic Theology in Galatians.'<sup>117</sup>

First, by speaking of 'the present evil age' in Galatians 1:4b Paul reveals his commitment to a *radical temporal dualism*. Second, Paul uses ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις at Galatians 1:12, 16; 2:2 and especially 3:23 to describe *disjunctive* and

---

<sup>117</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 97-105; cf. de Boer, *Galatians*, 31-35.



*invasive* divine actions, not mere *revelation*. Third, 'the fullness of time' of Galatians 4:4 fits the temporal dualism implicit in Galatians 1:4. The wrinkle introduced by Paul in Galatians 3:23-25 and Galatians 4 is that the temporal dualism is not simply a case of linear succession but that the new creation has *invaded* the evil present. Fourth, the contrast of Flesh and Spirit seen most clearly in Galatians 5:17 is indicative of the situation of *warfare* between the evil present age and the new creation, a situation of warfare underlined by the contrasting sets of antinomies that define the respective ages or worlds. Fifth, the death and resurrection of Christ (cf. Gal 1:1) are described in apocalyptic terms of *snatching from an age* (1:4) and redeeming from the curse of a *power* (3:13-14) that has *already occurred*. Sixth, Christian participation in Christ's cross (Gal 2:19; 5:24; 6:14) is part of an *ongoing* apocalyptic war. Seventh, Galatians 5:5-6 with its *hope* of rectification demonstrates that, despite the heavy emphasis on the victory already won by Christ, God's *invasive war* is *not yet over*. Eighth, the ability to see that the victory is won but yet to be fully realised is brought about by an apocalyptic *epistemological crisis*, and otherwise unknowable by natural perception or cognition, Galatians 1:11-12. Ninth, given the apocalyptic frame of reference, or 'bifocal vision' of Christ's faithful victorious death and God's assured future, then everything else is *redefined* by its terms. Finally, given that everything is seen in new light, then *time in*

*particular* must be seen afresh and the central question becomes, 'what time is it?' It is the time of God's invasive war.

God would not have to carry out an invasion merely to forgive erring human beings. The root trouble lies deeper than human guilt, and it is more sinister. The whole of humanity — indeed the whole of creation (3:22) — is, in fact, trapped, enslaved under the power of the present evil age. That is the background of God's invasive action in his sending of Christ, in his declaration of war, and in his striking the decisive liberating blow against the power of the present evil age.<sup>118</sup>

Martyn was right to push Beker into seeing the role that cosmology and eschatology played in Galatians. The evidence that Martyn adduced for positing the central role of what he calls *apocalyptic* in Galatians is substantial though some of it is open to criticism. Even Beker allowed that future apocalyptic references were to be found in the letter (Gal 5:5).<sup>119</sup> However, it was Martyn who pointed out how cosmological categories, 'the present evil age' and 'new creation' framed the whole letter (1:4; 6:15). Further, the idea of change of cosmos lies implicit behind a statement such as, 'May I

---

<sup>118</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 105.

<sup>119</sup> Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 142.

never boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world' (6:14; cf. 2:20, 5:24). Famously Martyn has proposed that Paul in Galatians posited a change in the sets of definitive cosmological antinomies, and also that the 'elements of the cosmos' (4:3, 9) were further evidence of cosmological change. The description of Sin and Law in Galatians might seem to point in the direction of them being seen as personified enslaving powers, with Flesh rounding out an unholy trinity. The key role time plays in the argument of the letter, not only in 1:4, but especially the 'fullness of time' (4:4; cf. 3:23, 25) points towards the historical dualism characteristic of *apocalyptic eschatology*. Even if one were to question some of the cosmological aspects — Is Martyn right about Sin, Law and Flesh? Are the antinomies really that well established and would their change be *ipso facto* 'apocalyptic'? Is his interpretation of the elements the most plausible? — even then, it would be hard to dispute the key role that issues of time and world play in the letter. Even if we question the appropriateness and utility of *apocalyptic*, as we will in a moment, it is necessary to read Galatians in the light of a *cosmological eschatology*, and it is right to highlight the pervasiveness of eschatological concerns throughout the Pauline corpus.

As indicated earlier, Martyn's apocalyptic reading is self-consciously in the tradition of Schweitzer and Käsemann.<sup>120</sup> Building on Käsemann and Beker, Martyn and de Boer are right to see the fundamental role of eschatology for the entirety of Paul's theology and that that eschatology has some kind of cosmological reference. Whether or not one might agree with every detail of their reconstruction of Paul's *apocalyptic eschatology*, whether one agrees with all of the textual indications that they have adduced for an apocalyptic interpretation, or whether one would want to follow every one of the inferences they make, it remains the case that an eschatology of cosmological transformation, in which Christ's death, resurrection and future coming are determinative, plays a central role in Paul's theology. Martyn and others have criticised Beker's heavy emphasis on the *imminent* end of the world as a key defining element of Pauline *apocalyptic*. Where others like Vincent Branick have used Beker's over-emphasis on an imminent end as a way of displacing apocalyptic concerns from the centre of Paul's mature thought,<sup>121</sup> Martyn and de Boer choose instead to highlight the way Pauline *apocalyptic* is used to characterise the *already* as well as the *not yet*.<sup>122</sup> Beker, Martyn and de Boer's concentration on the so-called seven authentic letters, however, has meant that they have neglected other evidence of the

---

<sup>120</sup> Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 177-78.

<sup>121</sup> Branick, 670, 675.

<sup>122</sup> Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 121-22; de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 34, 356-57.

cosmological scope of eschatology in the disputed or allegedly deuterio-Pauline letters.<sup>123</sup> Consideration of them might not point in the direction of a development away from *apocalyptic eschatology* (so Branick) but they might clarify the contours of the cosmological theology/eschatology held by Paul (cf. inter alia: 2 Thess 1:7-10; 2:1-12; Col 1:13-14; 3:4, 6; Eph 1:20ff.; 2:1; 6:10ff.; 1 Tim 6:14-15, 17, 19; 2 Tim 2:18; 4:1, 8; Tit 2:12-14).

## 2.2 How much clarity does the shift from *apocalyptic* to *apocalyptic eschatology* bring?

Martyn and de Boer's use of *apocalyptic* and *apocalyptic eschatology* suffer from the ambiguities and obscurities that have beset a significant part of Pauline scholarship in the last century or so as identified by R. Barry Matlock in his *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul and his apocalyptic interpreters*. One of de Boer's refinements of Martyn's reading of Paul is the general abandonment of the use of *apocalyptic* as a substantive in favour of the less ambiguous phrase *apocalyptic eschatology*, putting it in the context of

---

<sup>123</sup> Note Campbell's, *Framing Paul*, defence of a ten-letter Pauline canon, as well as N. T. Wright's defence of even some of the 'pastorals' in Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 56-63.

the well known three-fold distinction of the *apocalypses* as a genre, *apocalyptic eschatology* as an ideology, and *apocalypticism* as a socio-religious movement. That three-fold distinction had been pioneered by Paul Hanson and championed by John J. Collins during the 1970s. There can be little doubt that de Boer's shift of terminology is an advance over Martyn's usage that reflects an earlier stage of scholarship, in that it avoids the 'semantic confusion engendered by the use of "apocalyptic" as a noun.'<sup>124</sup> In a major article<sup>125</sup> and a published lecture<sup>126</sup> de Boer has felt the need to give significant space to defend his use of the concept *apocalyptic eschatology* against what he would consider the revisionist arguments of Christopher Rowland, noting in passing Rowland's influence on Matlock.<sup>127</sup>

Without rehearsing the complex history of the use of the term *apocalyptic* in Old Testament, Second Temple, and New Testament studies during the twentieth century, it would be accurate to say that *apocalyptic*, with its cognate and derived terminology, has been as contested as it was significant. The fact that the terminology was being used in a number of fields to describe various, albeit related, phenomena, without an

---

<sup>124</sup> John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 2.

<sup>125</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology'.

<sup>126</sup> De Boer, 'Theologian'.

<sup>127</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 352; de Boer, 'Theologian', 22.

agreed set of definitions has not aided clarity of thought. Hanson and Collins' three-fold distinction, however, provides some semblance of order to a confused discussion. What it does not do, despite the best efforts of its originators, is provide us with universally agreed definitions or descriptions of the three key terms themselves. Collins and others have laboured to provide a description of the genre *apocalypse* that, while widely accepted, is also contested by significant specialists in the field. Likewise, there are substantial debates about the senses to be given to *apocalyptic eschatology* and *apocalypticism*, with some well known specialists going so far as to deny the existence or utility of one, or the other, or even both.<sup>128</sup> Moreover, the relationships between the *apocalypses*, *apocalyptic eschatology* and *apocalypticism* are a matter of ongoing debate, both methodologically and in terms of historical description. For instance, as a matter of method, should a putative *apocalyptic eschatology* be used as one of the criteria for the description of the *apocalyptic* genre, or rather should the genre be described without reference to eschatology? Further, as a matter of history, were the *apocalypses* generated by *apocalypticism(s)*, or did various *apocalypticisms* adopt *apocalypses*? These are only a couple amongst many unresolved questions.

---

<sup>128</sup> Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 261-78 repeatedly citing Michael Stone and Christopher Rowland.

The sketch above of some of the difficulties surrounding *apocalyptic eschatology* serves as an introduction to de Boer's debate with Christopher Rowland. De Boer is clear that Paul wrote no *apocalypses*, though he may have been influenced by some. He is also clear that Paul did not share many of the characteristics of *apocalypticism*, in that his socio-political alienation was a consequence of his theology, not the cause of his eschatology.<sup>129</sup> De Boer is also clear that Paul's *apocalyptic eschatology* is a revealed radical dualism, cosmologically conceived, deriving this definition from Philip Veilhauer.<sup>130</sup> Having adopted Hanson and Collins' three-fold distinction, and Veilhauer's definition of *apocalyptic eschatology*, de Boer is aware that this view needs defence from Rowland's criticism of both the distinction and the definition.<sup>131</sup>

Rowland in *The Open Heaven* famously asserted that, 'Apocalyptic is as much involved in the attempt to understand things as they are now as to predict future events,' and endorsed Gunther Bornkamm's conclusion that 'the disclosure of divine secrets is the true theme of later Jewish apocalyptic.'<sup>132</sup> These conclusions are driven in part by the observations that the eschatologies of the apocalypses are (1) too diverse, (2)

---

<sup>129</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 348.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid, 348.

<sup>131</sup> More recently at SBL/AAR 2014 de Boer and N. T. Wright, who has been influenced by Rowland, debated these issues.

<sup>132</sup> Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 2, 9; see also Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*, 51; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 414.



sometimes quite marginal to the concerns of the apocalypses themselves, and (3) not especially distinctive relative to Rabbinical Judaism. Hence, a putative *apocalyptic eschatology* cannot be used as a criterion for identifying the genre.<sup>133</sup> Further, Rowland suggests that 'to many the word apocalyptic is really little more than a particular kind of eschatology prevalent in the early Jewish and Christian traditions' and he denies that 'the emphasis on the future breaking into the present' is 'a hallmark of apocalyptic,' taking aim as he does so at scholars such as Vielhauer.<sup>134</sup> Since he claims 'Apocalyptic seems essentially to be about the revelation of the divine mysteries through visions or some other form of immediate disclosure of heavenly truths,' it is not surprising then that for Rowland, Paul's *apocalyptic* is seen most clearly in a passage such as 2 Corinthians 12:2-4 where Paul adumbrates with some reticence a heavenly ascent he experienced.<sup>135</sup> Rowland would thus question the value of calling Paul's eschatology apocalyptic.

De Boer is appreciative of Rowland's emphasis on *apocalyptic* as focussed on revelation of the present as much as of the future, as this supports his and Martyn's view that *apocalyptic / apocalyptic eschatology* should not be restricted to Paul's concern with the

---

<sup>133</sup> Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 26, 28-48, 70-72.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid, 24-25.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid, 378-86.

*future*, and that knowledge of the character of the *present* is dependant on apocalyptic revelation. He objects, however, to Rowland's restriction of the use of *apocalyptic* to revealed mysteries on four grounds:<sup>136</sup> (i.) de Boer asserts that *apocalyptic eschatology* is a standard conventional scholarly construct for the revealed dualism of two world ages; (ii.) following Collins, de Boer believes eschatological concerns cannot be marginalised in the apocalypses; (iii.) he believes Rowland's definition of *apocalyptic* reduces it to something 'mystical' and 'individualistic'; and (iv.) *apocalyptic* is not the mere disclosure of information, but God's rectifying action.<sup>137</sup>

In part the debate is semantic and perspectival: de Boer approaches the Jewish *apocalypses* from the perspective of Paul; Rowland approaches Paul from the perspective of the Jewish *apocalypses*. De Boer's strongest arguments are clearly his second and fourth. Collins and de Boer are on firm ground in saying that eschatology cannot be marginalised since even the disclosure of the heavenly perspective on various events and realities in the *apocalypses* serves their eschatologies. De Boer is also correct insofar as the language of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις is used *on occasion* by Paul to describe cosmically significant eschatological events.

---

<sup>136</sup> De Boer, 'Theologian', 23-24; cf. de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 352-54 has six grounds, but de Boer dropped his weakest counter-argument and combined two others in 'Theologian.'

<sup>137</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 351-54; de Boer, 'Theologian', 21-24.

The fact that de Boer is most troubled by what he describes as Rowland's individualism and mysticism highlights an aspect of de Boer's approach to apocalyptic eschatology. Rowland's point is hard to deny; in the *apocalypses* revelation is imparted to a particular individual, who given the appropriate permission or circumstances may pass on that revelation to others. De Boer, in contrast, is concerned to maintain the cosmic scope of the events revealed, and is disturbed by the idea that the revelation might be confined to a few. God acts cosmologically, and with reference to all. However, de Boer seems to be confusing the *mode* of revelation with the *scope* of what is revealed. The fact that a revelation is given to one in no way precludes the possibility that what is given has relevance for all. In fact the use of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις in Galatians 1:12, 16 as Paul unfolds his biography suggests precisely the idea of a revelation to an individual that has wide significance.<sup>138</sup>

De Boer's counter to Rowland that 'the definition of apocalyptic eschatology is partly a matter of scholarly tradition and convenience even though it is based, as it ought to be, upon the data of the available sources, namely, such books as Revelation, Daniel, 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch, and 4 Ezra' is of particular interest.<sup>139</sup> According to de Boer

---

<sup>138</sup> Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001); 54, comments on election and universal revelation in 1 Enoch.

<sup>139</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 353.

*apocalyptic eschatology* is a conventional scholarly construct, but one which is based on sources. Rowland's point is that an examination of the *apocalypses* reveals considerably less unanimity and distinctiveness of eschatological perspective than much of post-Schweitzer scholarship seemed to assume. Against this, de Boer asserts that *apocalyptic eschatology* does not necessarily have to reflect the eschatology of *all* the *apocalypses*, or *only* that of the *apocalypses*. De Boer's position raises a number of questions: To what extent is apocalyptic eschatology a *conventional* as opposed to a *corrigible* category? If it is conventional, then who defines it? Is there a consensus? If it is corrigible, then which range of data is the category meant to cover, all, or only some of the *apocalypses*? How much of the rest of the literature of Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity is relevant in defining *apocalyptic eschatology*, and why? What relationship does it have to other eschatological options within that milieu?<sup>140</sup>

De Boer's one sentence reference to Matlock's work represents a lost opportunity since it is precisely these sorts of methodological questions that Matlock presses.<sup>141</sup>

Matlock is no uncritical follower of Rowland who simply applies Rowland's model to

---

<sup>140</sup> Sanders, *Judaism*, 8-10, 279-303.

<sup>141</sup> De Boer, 'Theologian', 22; Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, ch. 4 in particular. Matlock's thesis has been criticised for being self-indulgent by Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 297 n. 17, and overly skeptical of objectivity by Francis Watson, review of Barry Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*, *JTS* 48 (1997): 613. However, Matlock's arguments about the naïve or obfuscationary use of 'apocalyptic' have been unjustly neglected. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 190-91 shows the greatest sensitivity to Matlock's case.

Pauline scholarship,<sup>142</sup> but rather he presents a lengthy case against the unreflective use of *apocalyptic* as an explanatory category in Pauline scholarship and the utter inadequacy of a mere terminological updating of *apocalyptic* to *apocalyptic eschatology* post-Hanson.<sup>143</sup> Not even Rowland is free from criticism as Matlock questions the usefulness of substituting one 'essence,' the dualism of two world ages, with another, the revelation of heavenly mysteries.<sup>144</sup> Matlock's methodological concern is that *apocalyptic* or *apocalyptic eschatology*, if used at all, should be accountable to the *apocalypses*. He demonstrates that the tacit consensus as to what *apocalyptic eschatology* is more apparent than real,<sup>145</sup> that the origins of the genre are contested,<sup>146</sup> that the definition of the genre is in question,<sup>147</sup> and following E.P. Sanders and J. Barton, that there is cause to question whether there were any distinct apocalyptic movements at all.<sup>148</sup> De Boer's earlier work, in which he distinguishes between different tracks of apocalyptic eschatology, is sympathetically but critically reviewed by Matlock, who points out that de Boer simply heightens our increasing awareness of the diversity of

---

<sup>142</sup> One could argue that that is what is done by Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*, 51-52; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 414.

<sup>143</sup> Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, esp. 288-89 fn. 95.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid, 287-88. In a sense, Matlock 1996 is still ahead of the 2014 de Boer vs. N.T. Wright SBL/AAR debate.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid, 250-56, esp. 256.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid, 273-78.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid, 270-73. See also Richard Baulkham's review of Charlesworth, 'The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha', *JSNT* 26 (1986): 111-14.

<sup>148</sup> Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 292-99; Sanders, *Judaism*, 279-303; John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: DLT, 1986), 200-02, 254.

eschatological expectations in the *apocalypses* and within the broad stream of Second Temple Judaism.<sup>149</sup> Despite noting Matlock's work, de Boer simply does not address these questions or the issues raised by Matlock.

In sum, de Boer assumes without argument the correctness of Veilhauer's definition of radical apocalyptic dualism, despite the counter-arguments of Koch, Beker and Rowland.<sup>150</sup> He adopts and adapts Rowland's emphasis on revelation, even though it is hardly part of a conventional definition of *apocalyptic eschatology*. He loosens the linkage between *apocalyptic eschatology* and the *apocalypses*, but when it comes to listing the relevant sources for its definition he lists only *apocalypses*. When he sets out to delineate the two patterns of *apocalyptic eschatology* he turns first and foremost and crucially to the *apocalypses*, but has already denied that the *apocalypses* should have the determinative role in defining what *apocalyptic eschatology* is. De Boer has quietly passed over the fact that there is no real consensus as to the *conventional* meaning of *apocalyptic eschatology*, and he has not given any real guidance as to the selection of relevant sources for defining '*apocalyptic eschatology*' *historically*, or for relating it,

---

<sup>149</sup> Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 313-15.

<sup>150</sup> Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 29-30; Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 135-36; Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 29. Though in places Collins does define apocalyptic eschatology in terms reminiscent of Veilhauer (e.g. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 261), in another place he points out that just about the only eschatological constant in the apocalypses is 'retribution beyond the bounds of history' (p.11), a datum hardly congenial to de Boer's overall thesis.

whatever it is, to other Second Temple eschatological options. What we are given by de Boer is the impression of significant consensus coupled with historical substance that is used to bolster a particular reading of Paul. Matlock has given us reason to wonder about the consensus, and pause before facile acceptance of putatively historical claims about the content of the apocalypses and their relation to Paul's thought world.<sup>151</sup>

### 2.3 Does the language of ἀποκάλυψις in Paul properly evoke *apocalyptic eschatology*?

Unlike Beker, who places no great weight upon Paul's use of ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀποκάλυψις,<sup>152</sup> Martyn and de Boer argue that their presence in Paul signals his distinctive apocalyptic epistemology and eschatology.<sup>153</sup> Both would argue that there are other important indicators of Paul's apocalyptic theology, but that in Galatians in particular the use of these cognate terms plays a vital role in demonstrating the

---

<sup>151</sup> See also Leander E. Keck, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Theology', *Int* 38/3 (1984): 229–41; Bruce W. Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 5–23, esp. 22 on hesitations about the use of 'apocalyptic.'

<sup>152</sup> Beker, *Paul the Apostle* (1980). Cf. Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 310–11 n. 137, where he points out Beker, *Paul the Apostle* (1984), xviii–xix, shifting towards Martyn.

<sup>153</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 98–99; see de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 356; de Boer, 'Theologian', 21–33, 25ff; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 191 is more circumspect.

*irruptive* or *invasive* character of Paul's revealed cosmological dualism. Martyn translates the two occurrences of the verb in Galatians thus:<sup>154</sup>

1:15-16        So when it pleased him *apocalyptically to reveal* his son to me

3:23            Before faith came, we were confined under the Law's power,  
imprisoned during the period that lasted until, as God intended, faith  
*was invasively revealed.*

And the two occurrences of the noun thus:

1:12            it came to me by *God's apocalyptic revelation* of Jesus Christ.

2:2             I went up as a result of *revelation*.<sup>155</sup>

Paul's terminology, Martyn claims, takes us 'into the strange new world of apocalyptic'.<sup>156</sup> Martyn later revised his translation of 3:23 to read, 'faith was *apocalypsed*' and regularly uses the expression 'the *apocalypse* of Christ' as an equivalent to his translation of 1:12.<sup>157</sup> He goes on to argue that the verb 'means more than its literal equivalent, "to be unveiled"' because in the context of Galatians 3:23 Paul uses ἔρχομαι as a synonym to explicate ἀποκαλύπτω. Both ἀποκαλύπτω and

---

<sup>154</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 3-6.

<sup>155</sup> De Boer, 'Theologian', 28-29 makes heavy weather of attempting to demonstrate the apocalyptic-eschatological character of this particular revelation.

<sup>156</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 252.

<sup>157</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 254; Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*, 115.



Paul's apocalyptic theology involve an 'invasive movement from beyond'.<sup>158</sup> Whatever the merits of this account of Galatians 3:23, we ought to be cautious about importing aspects of the *particular reference* of the verb in the context of Galatians 3:23 into the normal *sense* of Paul's usage of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις in the rest of Galatians, let alone his remaining letters. To do so would be to commit the semantic fallacy identified by Barr as illegitimate totality transfer.<sup>159</sup> Neither the verb, nor the noun, typically bear the sense of something 'invasively coming' elsewhere in secular Greek nor in the LXX. In both cases it frequently means 'to uncover,' not narrowly 'to unveil,' as demonstrated by examples of people uncovering their chests or loins. The metaphorical extension of it to mean the revealing of thought or intention is attested as early and as widely as Plato, the LXX and in the rest of the NT. The revelation does not necessarily have to have any kind of eschatological or *invasive* character, though of course it can be used thus.

De Boer asks the key question: 'how does Paul himself use the language of revelation, what we may call his "apocalyptic language," the noun *apokalypsis* and the verb *apokalypso*?'<sup>160</sup> and goes on to mount a case that while Paul is of course not using either

---

<sup>158</sup> Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 254.

<sup>159</sup> James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 218.

<sup>160</sup> De Boer, 'Theologian', 24.

term as a genre description, his usage does begin to 'approach the technical usage of modern scholars when they talk about apocalyptic or apocalyptic eschatology.'<sup>161</sup> As de Boer points out, there are clear cases where this 'apocalyptic language' is used with respect to the Parousia (e.g. 1 Cor 1:7). Following Martyn's exegesis of Galatians 3:23, de Boer claims that 'apocalyptic language' (i.e. ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις) is used of Christ's first coming and so he asserts, 'Paul uses the language of revelation to characterize the whole of God's eschatological saving *activity* in Christ, from beginning to end.'<sup>162</sup> One can also appreciate his attempts to highlight the eschatological aspect of the gospel word in the present (e.g. Rom 1:16). When de Boer turns to the Corinthian correspondence, however, the weakness of his case is apparent since the uses of these terms there (1 Cor 2:10; 3:13; 14:6, 26, 30; 2 Cor 12:1, 7), while indicating revelation of divine origin, are not clearly eschatological, let alone specifically *apocalyptic* in each case. Appealing to the Spirit as an 'apocalyptic-eschatological' presence, while possibly correct, seems like clutching at straws, since the eschatological character of the revelations *themselves* has to be assumed by de Boer, and de Boer has not established the specifically apocalyptic character of Paul's doctrine of the Spirit. A further observation may be made, and that is while Paul can use ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις to describe both past and future cosmological-

---

<sup>161</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 356.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid, 367.

eschatological events, he can equally describe them without recourse to revelatory or 'apocalyptic language.'

Paul, does not use the language of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις with the consistency Martyn and de Boer require, and he uses alternatives such as φανερόω with a similar range of usages and referents, that are not as suggestive of the modern construct *apocalyptic*, nor having an inherently *irruptive* or *invasive* sense.<sup>163</sup> One has the suspicion that an anachronistic fallacy is lurking in this area. Taking a scholarly convention, the idea of *apocalyptic* or *apocalyptic eschatology*, Martyn and de Boer are attempting to root it in Paul's text, though of course the name of the genre only began to be applied consciously to *apocalypses* in the century following Paul at the earliest,<sup>164</sup> and nobody isolated *apocalyptic* (theology or eschatology) until the later 19<sup>th</sup> Century.<sup>165</sup> The language of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις does not connect us to the *apocalypse* genre, nor necessarily to *apocalyptic eschatology*, and the paucity of references which even potentially require an *invasive* interpretation suggest that the terminology itself cannot bear the weight of an apocalyptic reading, without that

---

<sup>163</sup> Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*, 53, 55.

<sup>164</sup> Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 310 n. 137, disputes this, suggesting the titles 'Apocalypse of X' may come from a considerably later date.

<sup>165</sup> Jewish and Pauline 'apocalyptic' seems to be a discovery of the 1890's: Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 24, 45, 61, 162; cf. Matlock, *Unveiling*, 47 n. 44, suggests Schürer as a key source.

reading being substantially confirmed on other grounds. Paul's usage of ἀποκαλύπτω / ἀποκάλυψις throughout his letters does not invariably signal apocalyptic eschatological concerns.

#### 2.4 To what extent can *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology* be distinguished from *forensic apocalyptic eschatology*?

As already mentioned, the key contribution de Boer has made to Martyn's developing work on Paul's *apocalyptic eschatology*, especially as found in Galatians, is the distinction between two patterns or 'tracks' of *apocalyptic eschatology* in the Jewish *apocalypses*. Martyn claims that identifying which pattern of eschatology Paul adopts is crucial for the interpretation of Galatians<sup>166</sup> and de Boer has himself applied this heuristic model to the interpretation of Romans.

De Boer's first move is to observe that Schweitzer's influential *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* was insufficiently sensitive to the variety of theologies inherent to the *apocalypses*. Though Schweitzer drew mainly on four documents (1 Enoch, Psalms of

---

<sup>166</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 97-98 n. 51.

Solomon, 2 Baruch & 4 Ezra),<sup>167</sup> even within them there were significantly different protologies, angelologies, hamartologies, and consequent eschatologies. In particular, the role of fallen angels in the origin, spread and power of sin was not identical in these works, and therefore the picture of God's future putting-to-rights of his world and the salvation of the righteous or the elect differed depending on whether he had to deal with enslaving powers or in punishing and rewarding human action. J. H. Charlesworth had already pointed out this difference in his introduction to his *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*,<sup>168</sup> but de Boer points out that this left apocalyptic accounts of Paul in the tradition of Schweitzer vulnerable to the criticism that, even though some *apocalypses* envisaged a cosmological victory of God liberating humans from enslavement to supra-human powers, the fact that others did not, and instead emphasised the role of human responsibility for sin, meant that simply identifying Paul's debt to *apocalyptic* in general would be insufficient to demonstrate that he held to some kind of eschatology and soteriology of cosmic liberation. Further investigation of the *apocalypses* leads de Boer to isolate two 'tracks' or patterns of eschatology found in them, labeling the one *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology* and the other *forensic apocalyptic eschatology*. Evidence of *apocalyptic eschatology* in Paul can no

---

<sup>167</sup> Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 54.

<sup>168</sup> James Hamilton Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), xxx-xxxi; cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 69-70.

longer be assumed to be evidence of an eschatology of cosmological warfare and deliverance. The question has to be asked, did Paul hold to a forensic or to a cosmological apocalyptic eschatology, or might he have held some mediating view? As Martyn puts it: ‘the distinction between two “tracks” of Jewish apocalyptic is essential to the reading of Galatians.’<sup>169</sup> Martyn and de Boer are of the view that Paul in Galatians had reframed the tradition of the early church within a framework of *cosmological apocalyptic* in contrast to the Agitators who had cast it within a *forensic apocalyptic* framework.

Though de Boer works through a much expanded corpus of *apocalypses* in comparison to Schweitzer, he finds that two texts within Schweitzer's limited corpus represent the poles of the spectrum of apocalyptic eschatologies. 1 Enoch 1-36 (The Book of The Watchers) represents *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology* in its purest form, and 2 Baruch is a particularly clear example of *forensic apocalyptic eschatology*. According to de Boer, the picture in 1 Enoch is of fallen angelic beings usurping the sovereignty of God on earth, and having dominion and enslaving humankind, leading them into sin. God will invade the cosmos to rescue his patient righteous by defeating the evil powers and establishing a new earth. The present is then a time of patient waiting for

---

<sup>169</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 97 n. 51.

the faithful. By contrast, 2 Baruch presents a picture where sin enters by Adam and responsibility for sin is upon each individual, who, as the book famously puts it, 'has become his own Adam' (2 Baruch 54:19). Here future salvation depends on obedience to the Torah. The present is then a time of decision and human action.

A thorough survey of the *apocalypses* is beyond the scope of this chapter, and even more so would be a proper review of the range of eschatological alternatives within Second Temple Judaism.<sup>170</sup> However, a more modest and achievable goal is to test the cogency of de Boer's proposal against the primary evidence he cites, namely 1 Enoch and 2 Baruch. His interpretation of 1 Enoch is not free from problems as we will see as we conduct a brief reading of these two *apocalypses*.

First, Schweitzer and de Boer are right in seeing in 1 Enoch a picture of God as Warrior invading the earth and executing his judgment, rescuing the 'elect'/'righteous' (1 Enoch 1:3-9).<sup>171</sup> It is, however, an open question as to what it is that makes the 'righteous' righteous, and the 'elect' elect. There are few clues in the text as to which view 1 Enoch requires. Do the righteous do righteous deeds because

---

<sup>170</sup> Sanders, *Judaism*, 279-303.

<sup>171</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 37.

they are righteous, or are the righteous righteous because they do righteous deeds?<sup>172</sup>

Are the elect elect because of something in them or solely because of something within God?<sup>173</sup> On these questions the text is largely silent, and we cannot assume an answer.

Second, however, we are immediately introduced to 'wicked ones' (1:1), those who do not do the commandments of the Lord, who have transgressed, and are hard-hearted (5:4ff). They are contrasted with the elect and righteous (5:6ff.) who through a gift of wisdom will not sin any longer after God judges and rescues.<sup>174</sup> The description of these 'wicked' and later of the 'accursed ones' who speak against the Lord (ch. 27), and the distinction of the places of judgment and waiting for respective sinners (ch. 18-36) make it clear that these are humans. The wicked ones will be destroyed 'on account of everything they have done' (1:9). The language of commandment, transgression and hard-heartedness is both recognisable from the OT and common with 2 Baruch. There seems little in the text to mitigate their responsibility and little to suggest that they are enslaved by supra-human powers. In 1 Enoch's opening chapter the holy war is

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid, 147, opts for the latter within a covenantal framework. Bauckham, 'Apocalypses', 143-44, is more confident of a Torah-oriented nomism.

<sup>173</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 147 only begins to raise this question without resolving it, as does Bauckham, 'Apocalypses', 144.

<sup>174</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 160, 164.



not directed against the fallen angels/watchers or their progeny, but against wicked humanity.<sup>175</sup>

Third, we are soon introduced to the story of the Angelic fall patterned on the account of Genesis 6:1ff.<sup>176</sup> (1 Enoch 6). It is not at all clear from this account that humankind is considered free from sin or transgression prior to the arrival of the angels. Though the angels teach humans various skills and mysteries that lead to multiplied human sins (cf. ch. 16), and though their gigantic progeny and their evil spirits continue to oppress humans, there is little to suggest that humanity is utterly in their thrall (ch. 15). The language of teaching and leading is more prominent than the language of oppression (8:2; 10:7; 13:2 *passim*).<sup>177</sup> 1 Enoch 9 is the closest that the account gets to attributing human sinfulness to the angels.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> Ibid, 47, admits that in the form we have *The Book of the Watchers* human culpability for sin is emphasised. Bauckham, 'Apocalypses', 139 insists that we treat *The Book of the Watchers* as an unity on text-historical grounds.

<sup>176</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 166-68.

<sup>177</sup> It is worth noting that the language of 'oppression' in the Ethiopic text is not clearly reflected in the Greek - see for instance 1 Enoch 9:6 where the Greek has ἀδικίας, which could possibly convey the idea of oppression but does not necessarily do so.

<sup>178</sup> Note Nickelsburg's, *1 Enoch*, 37 carefully phrased conclusion, 'Thus scarcely a page of 1 Enoch is not in some sense related to the expectation of an impending judgment that will deal with human sin and righteousness and the angelic rebellions that are related to them.'

Fourth, it seems entirely plausible that 1 Enoch 1-36 is aware of, and dependant upon, canonical Genesis,<sup>179</sup> referring to the eating of the fruit and expulsion from the garden of humanity's 'old father and aged mother' (32:6), the murder of Abel by Cain (22:7ff.), and the flood narrative (10:1ff.). 1 Enoch's account of the hiding of Enoch (12:1) is clearly a development of Genesis 5:24. This makes any claim of the angelic *origin* of sin implausible. The fallen angels are part of the *intensification* of the problem of wickedness, not its origin.

Fifth, though the picture that develops is one of divine intervention on behalf of humankind, at least for the righteous elect, issues of justice, judgment and forgiveness are hardly absent, which qualifies the strong contrast of *cosmological* and *forensic* apocalyptic. The Watchers who have fallen are accused of injustice (10:16 passim), they will be judged (9:3) on the basis of those who bring suit against them (9:10), hardly a picture devoid of forensic overtones. Further, the fallen watchers plead for forgiveness, though it is not granted (ch 12-14). Many of the judgments upon the fallen angels are protological, occurring it seems some time around the flood, though

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibid, 57.

the narrative and chronological sequences are opaque at this point in 1 Enoch (ch. 10-14).<sup>180</sup> A final judgment seems to be pending (10:7ff.).<sup>181</sup>

Turning to 2 Baruch, de Boer is on firm ground in claiming that this *apocalypse* is clear in its insistence on the Adamic initiation of sin, of ongoing human culpability in sin, on the necessity and possibility of keeping the Torah, and on obedience to the Torah as the criterion of final judgment.<sup>182</sup> Even further, 2 Baruch pictures treasures of human righteousness (14:12; 24:1ff. *passim*). 2 Baruch provides a snapshot of a kind of salvation-historical hyper-nomistic messianism. Second, 2 Baruch interprets the Genesis 6:1ff account in terms of how the angels are tempted and corrupted by humanity (55:11-17). This seems to be in contrast with 1 Enoch, and could be considered an example of 2 Baruch 'correcting' a viewpoint similar to that of 1 Enoch. However, depending on how one punctuates the Ethiopic of 1 Enoch 12:4, then it too reflect the position of 2 Baruch: the angels defiled themselves by doing as people do.<sup>183</sup> Third, the 'elect' and the 'righteous' appear in 2 Baruch also, though it should be clear from what has already been said that the righteous are so on the basis of their deeds

---

<sup>180</sup> Bauckham's, 'Apocalypses', 139-140 is persuasive, but Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, is more cautious about imposing chronological sequences.

<sup>181</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 37 & 55; Bauckham, 'Apocalypses', 140.

<sup>182</sup> Bauckham, 'Apocalypses', 182.

<sup>183</sup> See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 234; cf. Charlesworth's, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, notes on this text, 19 n. 12h.

which will appear on the last day. The elect (48:20) seem to be the nation, and their preservation and blessing are conditional on their keeping the statutes of the Torah. Fourth, however, the *apocalypse* is cosmic in scope and not devoid of elements of irruptive conflict - especially in the Apocalypse of the Forest, Vine, Fountain and Cedar in ch. 35-40,<sup>184</sup> which suggests that the terminological contrast of *cosmological* and *forensic* is not the most felicitous.

On further investigation of both these *apocalypses*, it emerges that de Boer's isolation of the two patterns is overdrawn, somewhat skewed, and poses a false dilemma. As de Boer acknowledges in his original article, strictly speaking both these *apocalyptic eschatologies* are cosmological and theocentric. There is a clear difference of emphasis with 2 Baruch emphasising the role of Torah and obedience in a way 1 Enoch 1- 36 does not (though 1 Enoch has a forensic role for the Lord's commandments and their transgression, 5:6).<sup>185</sup> But having said that, there is little in 1 Enoch 1-36 to suggest that its author would have disputed 2 Baruch's account, it's simply not the centre of his interest. Further, it is not the case that in 1 Enoch 1-36 'all sin and evil are

---

<sup>184</sup> The characterisation of Sin, Law, and Flesh as supra-human powers is of course unparalleled in either of these sources. 2 Baruch is aware of fallen angels, and 1 Enoch is replete with numerous named ones. None are called 'Sin,' 'Law' or 'Flesh,' or have names that readily suggest themselves as analogies.

<sup>185</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 50-51. However, Bauckham, 'Apocalypses', 140-41, argues that 1 Enoch's stance towards the Torah is more positive.

attributed to the fallen angels and their demonic progeny';<sup>186</sup> humanity's parents had already sinned (32:6) and the ongoing impact of Abel's murder was already felt (22:7). Neither is it clear that this age is in 'subjection' to supra-human powers. They have, in part, already been judged and imprisoned, and their influence is as much by their teaching and the ramifications of their actions; there is little to suggest that humans are under their control. Wicked humans, not the powers, seem to be the target of the final eschatological war. The responsibility of these 'wicked' is not significantly mitigated, and in the end 'all flesh' will be judged for their ungodly works: ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων ἔργων τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν, as the Greek of 1 Enoch 1:9 puts it (cf. Jude 15). Thus both apocalypses are also forensic and hold humans responsible. The key distinction is that in 2 Baruch a non-angelological account is given of the *origin* of sin.<sup>187</sup>

But even without reading the *apocalypses* again, one might have suspected one is being presented with a false dilemma. The stark choice, either humanity is under the thrall of powers or it is responsible for its own actions, seems immediately reductionistic. If

---

<sup>186</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology', 174. We would add to Charlesworth's list of four explanations of the fall of the angels, p. xxx, a fifth element, their corruption by imitating humans, cf. 2 Baruch 55:11-17 and 1 Enoch 12:4 (variant punctuation).

<sup>187</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 47, while advocating that the oldest literary strata of *The Book of the Watchers* (1 Enoch 1-36) held to a strictly angelological aetiology of sin, concludes, 'The final redaction of the Book of the Watchers de-emphasises the importance of the heavenly rebellion by focusing on human responsibility for sin.'

the evidence of these two apocalypses represent the poles of the spectrum of apocalypses then Collins' observation seems to be confirmed, 'All the apocalypses, however, involve a transcendent eschatology that looks for retribution beyond the bounds of history.'<sup>188</sup> The presence of cosmological features such as evil powers, and God's warfare against them, does not mitigate the sense of human responsibility, even if in some *apocalypses* there seem to be attempts to formulate some kind of free will theodicy. The fact that de Boer can find *both* patterns *together* in numerous sources including Paul suggests that Paul and others felt less difficulty in attributing a significant role to both supra-human realities as well as human responsibility than some moderns do.

De Boer's 1989 article applies the distinction of apocalyptic tracks to Galatians, attributing a *forensic apocalyptic eschatology* to the Agitators, with which Paul has to engage, and which Paul ultimately overcomes by his own *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*. Further, Martyn and de Boer, largely following Schweitzer's and Käsemann's lead, claim that in Romans Paul combines both *forensic* and *cosmological* apocalyptic motifs, where *cosmological apocalyptic* categories ultimately 'circumscribe,

---

<sup>188</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11.

and to a large extent overtake forensic motifs.<sup>189</sup> The difficulty with both suggestions should be fairly clear by now, in that Paul may well have desired to overcome *both* the forensic *and* cosmological views of the Agitators in Galatia, with forensic *and* cosmological views of his own, and Paul may have been quite innocent of any desire to circumscribe his forensic notions in Romans with cosmological ones or vice versa. The all too neat attribution of each schema to one party or another, and the all too neat privileging of one schema over the other within the thought of Paul suggests that reductionism is afoot. Certainly neither de Boer nor Martyn have demonstrated that *cosmological* concerns somehow trump *forensic* concerns in Paul. Paul, like the two *apocalypses*, is at home with both *forensic* and *cosmological* categories. Though Galatians ends on a cosmological note (6:14-15), that note does not seem to be used to qualify the nearby imagery of sowing and reaping (6:7-9) which given its Old Testament and Septuagintal background has forensic and eschatological overtones. Even if 'the works of the flesh' (Gal 5:19, cf. 1 Enoch 1:9 (Greek)) are a consequence of some kind of enslavement to a power, that does not seem to mitigate the non-inheritance of the kingdom of God (Gal 5:21) which seems to be a case of 'retribution beyond the bounds of history'<sup>190</sup> (cf. 1 Enoch 1:9). Nor then is there reason to insist that Paul's usage of

---

<sup>189</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 365; see de Boer, 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology', 185; Martyn, *Galatians*, 97-98 n. 51.

<sup>190</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11.

δικαιόω in Galatians must be read in a fundamentally cosmological rather than forensic manner because of the influence of an alleged 'track' of apocalyptic eschatology. If a liberative account of δικαιόω is to be given it will have to be on grounds other than cosmological apocalyptic eschatology.

## 2.5 Conclusion

Martyn and de Boer have made a significant contribution towards seeing the inescapably eschatological character of Paul's thought in Galatians, and against seeing Paul's thought there in narrowly anthropocentric terms. But our probing has suggested that there are problems in their presentation. Paul's eschatology needs to be read against the background that is wider and more diverse than the one suggested by the too facile use of *apocalyptic eschatology*. His use of the ἀποκαλύπτω word group cannot be taken as evidence of some kind of irruptive apocalyptic eschatology. The fact that Paul might possibly share some interest in angels and powers with a number of the apocalypses cannot be used to suggest that he is consequently any less interested or committed to notions of divine judgment and forgiveness. Even 1 Enoch with its cosmological war doesn't remove responsibility from human agents. That God



is the primary agent in Galatians is without doubt, but that fact does not of itself remove the role of human action. If there is no evidence of a *non-forensic cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*, the onus is on the apocalyptic reading to justify its non-forensic reading of δικαιόω, and a non-instrumental reading of πίστις without appeal to it. So we turn in the following three chapters to the three key sections of Galatians where justification/rectification and faith play a key argumentative role.

## Chapter 3

### Faith and Justification: Galatians 2:15-21

Martyn's *Galatians* is an invigorating reading of Paul's letter that sees the irruptive invasion by God in Christ of a human cosmos dominated by inimical powers as the inauguration of a new creation. Martyn understands Paul's δικαιο- language in terms of the rectification of the cosmos by the faithful self-giving Christ, rather than acquittal from guilt and acceptance before God through trust in Christ. Christian believing, however, is not entirely irrelevant, but its role is redefined by the Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians (ARG), so that, at most, it is of decidedly secondary importance.<sup>191</sup> As highlighted in our introduction, the ARG is dependant on two issues identified as crucial by Martyn, (i.) the reframing and thus redefinition of traditional δικαιο- language by Paul's cosmological apocalyptic eschatology, and (ii.) that the divine putting to rights of the cosmos is brought about on the basis of the πίστις Χριστοῦ, understood as the faithful death of Jesus Christ (see pp. 8-9 above). We have

---

<sup>191</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 252; & de Boer, *Galatians*, 192 & cf. 319, but note Campbell's comment on Martyn and de Boer: 'These scholars are less "thoroughgoing" or even aggressive than I am in their christocentric construal of Paul's πίστις terminology. They might view my sustained emphasis here as excessive. But I view their restraint as unnecessary and unwise; amongst other things, it creates a weakened defensive perimeter.' Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 1149 n. 39.

already seen in reason in Chapter 2 to question Martyn's dependence on the distinction between *forensic* and *cosmological* apocalyptic eschatology that he has drawn from de Boer, and to suggest rather that even cosmological apocalyptic eschatologies have an ineliminable *forensic* dimension. In this and the following two chapters we turn to Martyn, de Boer, and Campbell's reading of Galatians, in particular those texts where δικαιο- terms predominate, namely Galatians 2:15-21; 3:1-4:7 & 5:2-6.<sup>192</sup> In these chapters we will not be attempting a fresh or comprehensive exegesis of these passages but rather investigating the exegetical underpinnings of the ARG. As we shall see most δικαιο- terms are associated with πιστ- terms at the clausal level,<sup>193</sup> and other πιστ- terminology is predominantly found in the same contexts as δικαιο- terms.<sup>194</sup> Apart from an appeal to Galatians 1:4 that we will consider in Chapter 4, the principal arguments for the ARG are drawn from Galatians 2:15-21; 3:1-4:7 & 5:2-6.

---

<sup>192</sup> The only δικαιο- term that does not fall within these texts is ἡδικήσατε (Galatians 4:12). It does not have to do with divine action.

<sup>193</sup> Galatians 2:17, 21 & 3:21 are the only cases where a δικαιο- term does not occur in a main clause, coordinate clause, or complex clause with a πιστ- term. In each of these three cases the immediately preceding or following clause includes a πιστ- term.

<sup>194</sup> Πιστ- terms are found beyond Galatians 2:15-4:7 & 5:2-6 at Galatians 1:10, 23; 2:7; 5:7-8, 10, 22 & 6:10. None of these are *decisive* for the interpretation of the πιστ- terms in Galatians 2:15-4:7 or 5:2-6.

While there are many competing analyses of the detailed structure of Galatians,<sup>195</sup> it is not atypical to see the letter as broadly falling into three major sections that roughly correspond to Gal 1-2, 3-4 and 5-6 respectively.<sup>196</sup> Galatians 1-2 is an autobiographical apologia for Paul's ministry. Galatians 3-4 consists of a number of interlocking theological and exegetical arguments directed against the Agitators' teaching. Galatians 5-6 consists largely of parenesis. Two of our three δικαιο- / πιστ- passages fall, however, into disputed territory at the borders of these major sections, while the largest of our passages forms the first half of the central section of the letter. Nevertheless, determining the precise rhetorical or argumentative function of Galatians 2:15-21 is not as significant as the fact that the compact language introduced in that section is used again with further elaboration and explanation in Galatians 3:1-4:7 (esp. 3:6-25).<sup>197</sup>

---

<sup>195</sup> Inter alia Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 16-23; Moo, *Galatians*, 63-64. Note the contrasting analyses of Martyn, *Galatians*, 24-27, and de Boer, *Galatians*, 14.

<sup>196</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations* (London: Macmillan, 1874), 65; cf. de Boer, *Galatians*, 11. Contrast John Bligh, *Galatians in Greek: A Structural Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians with Notes on the Greek* (Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966).

<sup>197</sup> For our purposes in this thesis the issues of the precise ethnic mix of the letter's intended recipients, and their particular location within Roman Galatia is less significant than the space normally allotted them. Likewise, it is sufficient to agree with the ARG on the temporal priority of Galatians over Romans. Moo is helpful, *Galatians*, 2-18.

Galatians 2:15-21 lies at the end of Paul's autobiographical apologia (Gal 1:11ff.) and before he resumes his explicit address to his Galatian readers (3:1; cf. Gal 1:1-9). Historically, debate has centred around which point Paul's reported speech to Peter ends. More recently much debate has focussed on the alleged presence of early Jewish-Christian tradition in 2:16a. Even among our Apocalyptic Readers there is no agreement as to whether 2:16a is such a tradition, and if it were, what its extent is.<sup>198</sup> Martyn, de Boer and Campbell agree that 2:15-21 represents a brief encapsulation of Paul's gospel that is elaborated later in the letter.

By means of a *captatio benevolentiae* in 2:15 Paul identifies himself with Peter, and possibly with the Agitators in Galatia, as a Jew in contrast to the sinful gentiles.<sup>199</sup> He goes on in the initial dependant clause of 2:16a to point out some common knowledge about justification / rectification shared by Jewish believers in Jesus Christ, whether that common knowledge should be understood as a tradition or not. In the main clause (2:16b) Paul emphasises the fact that Peter (and other Jewish-Christian believers) and he had trusted in (or into) Christ Jesus. The two subordinate clauses of 2:16c+d underscore by repetition Paul's understanding of the contrast introduced in

---

<sup>198</sup> Parts of 2:16a are traditional, Martyn, *Galatians*, 264-68, esp. 264 n. 158; all of 2:16a following ὅτι is traditional, de Boer, *Galatians*, 143-45, esp. 145 n. 211; all of 2:16a is a Pauline formulation, Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 842-46.

<sup>199</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 248; de Boer, *Galatians*, 141.

2:16a.<sup>200</sup> Galatians 2:17-18 represents something of a digression, the precise sense of which has occasioned much discussion. With de Boer we take it to be Paul's defence of a charge brought against him, in which he turns the tables on his Jewish-Christian critics whether in Antioch or the Agitators in Galatia.<sup>201</sup> Paul introduces a number of important christological and participatory ideas in Galatians 2:19-20 either as an alternate explanation of what δικαιώ itself is, or as an elaboration of its grounds and ramifications. He concludes this paragraph (2:21) by linking Christ's death that he'd introduced in 2:20 with another δικαιο- term, namely δικαιοσύνη.

Galatians 2:15-21 then functions as an enormously significant introduction to issues that will dominate Galatians 3:1-4:7 and recur again in Galatians 5:2-6. The key terms, δικαιώ, δικαιοσύνη, πιστεύω and πίστις, are all introduced and related to each other.<sup>202</sup> Note that all of the instances of πίστις in Galatians 2:15-21 occur within πίστις

---

<sup>200</sup> Much debate has centred on whether the ἐὰν μὴ of 2:16a is to be taken as exceptive or adversative, a debate complicated by the alleged traditional character of all or part of the ὅτι clause. That Paul goes on in 2:16c+d to explain that ἔργον νόμου and πίστις Χριστοῦ are mutually exclusive in regard to rectification / justification, regardless of how the ἐὰν μὴ is to be taken, is a point of significant agreement within and with the ARG; Martyn, *Galatians*, 251-53; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 844, 1148 n. 37. Dunn is credited with stressing the exceptive meaning, Dunn, 'The New Perspective on Paul', 195.

<sup>201</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 140, 156-58.

<sup>202</sup> The adjectives δίκαιος and πιστός are only found at Galatians 3:11 & 9 respectively.

Χριστοῦ expressions.<sup>203</sup> Christological and participatory themes are also introduced that will play a part in Paul's fuller account later in Galatians 3:1-4:7.

Given the relationship between the verb πιστεύω and the noun πίστις, and especially the fact that the verb and the noun (embedded within prepositional phrases that each include πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions) are brought into close syntactic and conceptual relationship in Galatians 2:16, we will initially investigate the function of πιστεύω in Galatians 2:16, before moving onto a consideration of the rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ at 2:16 & 2:20. After our soundings in Paul's use of πιστ- terms we will then turn to consider what evidence Galatians 2:15-21 may, or may not, provide for the ARG's understanding of δικαιώω as the rectification of the cosmos.

### 3.1 How does πιστεύω function in Galatians 2:16 in particular?

In his *Paul and the Postliberals*, Douglas Harink, a systematist who follows the lead of Martyn, Hays et al in adopting the 'faithfulness of Christ' reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ, strongly criticises Luther for translating it 'faith in Jesus Christ.' He then goes on to

---

<sup>203</sup> With δία 2:16a; with ἐκ 2:16c; with and without Ἰησοῦς 2:16a & c; and in an alternate form ἐν πίστει ... τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ 2:20.

discuss *faith*, or rather *faithfulness*, in Galatians without substantive discussion of the significance of other phrases that include the noun πίστις or clauses that include the verb πιστεύω.<sup>204</sup> Harink concludes that Christian faith *in* Christ has little soteriological significance in Galatians. We will return to Harink's treatment of Luther and πίστις Χριστοῦ in the next major section. However, πιστεύω is the main verb of the main clause that is at the core of Galatians 2:16:

2:16b           καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν

Since he does not give substantial attention to this text, Harink's case for marginalising the soteriological significance of Christian trust in Christ is consequently weakened. This main clause, one of the key sentences in a key paragraph within the developing argument of Galatians, seems to be making a significant claim about believing in Christ, and its sequel in the following subordinate clause again seems to be making a significant soteriological claim:

2:16c           ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου,

---

<sup>204</sup> Harink, *Paul among the Postliberals*, 26-29, 36 n. 24, 40-43.



A prima facie reading of Galatians 2:16b+c would suggest that believing in Christ has soteriological significance regardless of the view one takes of the contested πίστει Χριστοῦ expressions. Harink acknowledges his profound indebtedness to Martyn's reading of Galatians and it may be that in turning to him we will find arguments to support Harink's rather bold position.

Martyn's commentary on Galatians 2:16 and his excursus #29 develop the view that faith in Christ is significant in Galatians but 'in a decidedly secondary place'<sup>1205</sup> to Christ's faithfulness. He argues that the first ἵνα clause of 2:16a is 'the central clause'<sup>1206</sup> of the sentence and that the delayed mention of believing in Christ until later in that complex sentence at 2:16b indicates its *secondary* function. The point that Martyn wants to underline is that the faith/faithfulness of Christ is the centre of Paul's attention rather than the Christian act of believing. While in his commentary Martyn makes it clear that 'placing one's trust in this faithful Christ' is 'a matter no less significant for being secondary,'<sup>1207</sup> the nuance is muted in Martyn's more polemical articles where he is most strident in attacking any form of 'condition'

---

<sup>205</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 252, cf. 271 where he says 'he speaks in the second instance our placing our trust in Christ' (italics original).

<sup>206</sup> Ibid, 251 n. 125.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid, 252.

attaching to salvation,<sup>208</sup> and the actual function of this *secondary* faith is not developed by Martyn.<sup>209</sup>

Martyn's construal of Galatians 2:16 is open to question. In Martyn's mind, because Paul spoke of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *prior to* εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστεύσαμεν, then the faithful death of Christ is *primary* and believing in Christ is *secondary*. As a theological point Martyn's view has merit, but as an exegesis of Galatians 2:16 it is questionable syntactically, and contradicts the findings of a number of recent studies of Koinē information-structuring devices. Consider the following three factors:

First, ἐπιστεύσαμεν is the main verb of the main clause of Galatians 2:16 (probably of 2:15-16). De Boer correctly observes that 'the main sentence' is 'we too came to believe in Jesus Christ.'<sup>210</sup> Martyn's alleged 'central clause,' Galatians 2:16a, is itself *subordinate* to a *dependant* clause of this main clause, Galatians 2:16b. The significance of this will become clearer in the points that follow.

---

<sup>208</sup> Martyn, 'Events in Galatia', 161, 179; Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 249.

<sup>209</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 252.

<sup>210</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 141-42.

Second, Martyn is making a claim about the relative saliency of the first ἵνα clause of Galatians 2:16a over and above that of the main verb of the sentence in 2:16b. An older rule of thumb amongst Greek grammarians was that the further to the left within a sentence an item was, the more likely it was to be emphatic.<sup>211</sup> On this understanding there is some plausibility to Martyn's claim. However, this simple rule always admitted to significant qualification and exceptions.<sup>212</sup> During the past two decades there has been a growing body of research in general linguistics, Classical Greek and Koinē in particular that has considerably refined our understanding of *emphasis*, *prominence*, *markedness* and *saliency*.<sup>213</sup> Much of this work is ably interpreted, synthesised, and applied by Stephen Levinsohn in his *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*,<sup>214</sup> and Stephen Runge's *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*

---

<sup>211</sup> C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 166; cf. BDF § 472.

<sup>212</sup> George Benedict Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek* (trans. and rev. William F. Moulton; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1882), 684; trans. of *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1855).

<sup>213</sup> Nicholas Andrew Bailey, 'Thetic Constructions in Koine Greek: With Special Attention to Clauses with εἶμι "be", γίνομαι "occur", ἔρχομαι "come", ἰδοὺ/ἰδε "behold" and Complement Clauses of ὁράω "see"' (Ph.D. Thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2009); Helma Dik, *Word order in Ancient Greek: a pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1995); Helma Dik, *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); S. C Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar* (Functional Grammar Series 9; Dordrecht: Foris, 1989); Allison Kirk, 'Word Order and Information Structure in New Testament Greek' (Ph.D. Thesis, Universiteit Leiden, 2012); Knud Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

<sup>214</sup> Stephen Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2nd ed.; Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2000).

and his *Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament*.<sup>215</sup> This newer work provides a more rigorous framework that in a more principled way explains how and why the older left-most element emphasis rule is little more than a rule-of-thumb that requires supplementation.

In essence information structure theory distinguishes between default, obligatory and optional sentence constituent orders, paying particular attention to places where an optional order disturbs the default ordering of clause constituents. Of particular interest are *optional* constituents that occur *before* the Koinē verb. Different kinds of pre-verbal constituents may function as framing devices for the interpretation of the following verb that govern them, or as discourse topics, or as discourse focuses. *Informally* we may say framing devices are less emphatic than the clauses they are dependant upon, while pre-verbal discourse topics and focuses would be understood to be more emphatic than if they followed the verb.<sup>216</sup>

Dependant participial clauses, whether in the nominative or genitive case, that occur prior to the finite verb upon which they depend are framing devices that provide

---

<sup>215</sup> Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2010); Runge, *The Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament*: (Bellingham, Wash.: Lexham, 2008).

<sup>216</sup> Within Levinsohn and Runge framework ‘emphasis’ is reserved for preverbal focus elements.

information about the setting, and are background relative to the main verb.<sup>217</sup> This principle alone casts doubt on Martyn's assertion, since the putatively 'central clause'<sup>218</sup> (2:16a) is part of a dependent nominative participle clause. Rather, according to information structure theories the information the pre-verbal dependant clause conveys is meant to provide background setting that helps interpret the more salient main clause (2:16b). The knowledge of the contrast between the two putative origins or means of justification / rectification is thus background provided to interpret the more salient main clause, 'even we believed in Christ Jesus.'

Third, if the dependant clause of Galatians 2:16a is a framing device for 2:16b then what do information structure theorists make of the main clause itself? Both Runge and Levinsohn offer discourse analyses of Galatians 2:16 indicating that the καὶ ἡμεῖς introducing 2:16b is an *emphatic discourse focus* and that the main clause has what is known as Focus-Presupposition articulation. The *focus* is contextually new information and the *presupposition* is either information already expressed in the context or is likely to be cognitively active common knowledge shared by the author

---

<sup>217</sup> Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 181-90; Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 246-50 & esp. 251-55. This principal holds true for Classical as well as Koinē Greek: Corien Bary and Dag Haug, 'Temporal anaphora across and inside sentences: the function of participles', *Semantics and Pragmatics* 4 (2011): Article 8: 1-56.

<sup>218</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 251 n. 125.

and their audience. The fact that the ἡμεῖς is an emphatic focus is indicated by (i.) the ascensive καὶ, (ii.) its preverbal position, and (iii.) the fact that for Paul and his fellow Jews (the referents of the ἡμεῖς) believing has not been part of the discussion prior to this point. εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν is understood to be presupposed because the διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of Gal 2:16a is rendered as an objective genitive ('through faith *in* Jesus Christ') by both Runge and Levinsohn. If Runge and Levinshon's analyses are to be followed, then the top level emphasis of Galatians 2:15-16 as a whole falls on 'even we . . . believed.' That reading shifts the human agents of believing into centre stage. Far from being in decidedly second place as Martyn would have it, Christian faith is in fact the burden of what Paul has to say.

[FRAME εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου

ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,]

[FOCUS καὶ ἡμεῖς] [PRESUPPOSITION εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν]

Martyn and the other Apocalyptic readers could respond that the διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ought to be rendered as a subjective or authorial genitive, 'through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ.' If this were the case then the main clause of 2:16b would not have Focus-Presupposition articulation because the εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν

ἐπιστεύσαμεν is now contextually new information. However, this does not aid Martyn's case one whit. The main clause could now be interpreted as having Topic-Comment articulation, with the ἡμεῖς understood as the topic of the clause and the εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν the comment providing new information since faith in Christ would not have been previously mentioned nor obviously presupposed. Within the comment, however, the prepositional phrase εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν is preverbal and is functioning as the emphatic focus. This interpretation of 2:16b would be the worst of all possible worlds for the Apocalyptic reading since it particularly emphasises the objective character of faith, it is believing *in Christ Jesus*.

[FRAME εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου

ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,

[TOPIC καὶ ἡμεῖς] [FOCUS εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν] ἐπιστεύσαμεν

The outcome of this discussion is that: (i.) the main clause of 2:16, i.e. 2:16b is on information structure considerations more salient than the dependant clause of 2:16a, regardless of whichever view one takes of the πίστεως Χριστοῦ expression of 2:16a. The issue of Paul and Jewish believers believing in Jesus Christ cannot be relegated to secondary status within the argument of 2:16. (ii.) The way one renders the πίστεως

Χριστοῦ expression of 2:16a does have implications for determining where the emphatic focus of 2:16b lies. If one renders it as an objective genitive then the focus is clearly the 'even we . . . believed' However, if a subjective rendering is followed then possibly the 'in Christ Jesus' becomes the focus within the comment of a Topic-Comment sentence. Neither analysis would be especially congenial to Martyn's relegation of Christian faith in Galatians 2:16 and would present a challenge to Harink's relative neglect of the verb πιστεύω. Christian believing in Christ is *not* secondary in Paul's thought at this point.

Of our Apocalyptic Readers, Campbell provides the most original exegesis of the main clause of Galatians 2:16, translating it with its following subordinate ἵνα clause thus: 'we believed concerning Christ Jesus that we are delivered through the faithfulness of Christ.' The main verb ἐπιστεύσαμεν is rendered as a verb of perception or understanding, the prepositional phrase εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν is understood 'to denote the thing about which certain beliefs are held,' and finally, the ἵνα is construed as explanatory.<sup>219</sup> Combined with his observations about the other two uses of πιστεύω in Galatians, this exegesis allows him to remove human trusting from any especially significant role in the soteriology of Galatians. Individually considered, there is

---

<sup>219</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 840.



nothing remarkable about at least two of these three exegetical decisions he makes regarding the main clause of Galatians 2:16, but the overall rendering he offers is novel.<sup>220</sup>

(i.) There is little disagreement that πιστεύω often functions as a verb of perception or understanding in Koinē, and that at times it so functions in Paul (e.g. Rom 6:8; 10:9; 1 Thess 4:14). Likewise, there is also little disagreement that the verb also often functions to indicate one's trust in a person or entity, and that it frequently so functions in Paul (e.g. Rom 4:3, 5; Phil 1:29). Though Campbell chides Moisés Silva for failing to consider the alternative construal of the verb and its clause, it seems Campbell is a lone voice in seriously raising the possibility that πιστεύω + ἵνα should be construed as 'believe that' in Galatians 2:16.<sup>221</sup> Why this is the case might become clearer as we investigate the verb's combinations with εἰς and ἵνα.

---

<sup>220</sup> Richard B Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* (2nd ed.; The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 123 n. 13 and 143-44 references two similar readings of Kittel and Schläger: Gerhard Kittel, 'Πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ bei Paulus', *TSK* 79 (1906): 419-36; G. Schläger, 'Bemerkungen zu πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ', *ZNW* 7 (1906): 356-58. However, Hays himself comments: 'This much must be said, however, at the beginning of our inquiry: Gal 2:16 speaks clearly and unambiguously of faith in Christ (εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν), of an act of believing/trusting directed toward Christ as "object."'

<sup>221</sup> Campbell's reading contrasts with Martyn, *Galatians*, 252; and de Boer, *Galatians*, 142.

(ii.) Campbell claims that ‘the accusative prepositional construction . . . usually functions in both Paul and the rest of Koinē, to denote the thing about which certain beliefs are held,’<sup>222</sup> backing this up with an endnote citing a number of Pauline ‘variations on this construction.’<sup>223</sup> Certainly there are a number of ways available to Paul, like any Koinē author, to indicate the content of a belief. Some of the various expressions cited by Campbell illustrate this. However, what they do not do is establish that εἰς functions with πιστεύω in this way in Paul. It is notable that few of his examples involve εἰς at all, and those that do (Rom 4:18; 10:14; Phil 1:29), do not necessarily support his position. It is more likely that Romans 10:14 and Philippians 1:29 are speaking not about the *content* of a belief, but a *person* who is trusted. In fact in early Christian usage, combinations of πιστεύω with εἰς + a person have a fairly clear and well established pattern of meaning.<sup>224</sup> It refers primarily to trusting in that person, not primarily believing certain things about that person (inter alia Matt 18:6; Mark 9:42; John 1:12; 2:23; 3:16 passim; Acts 10:43; 14:23; Rom 15:13; Phil 1:29; 1 John 5:10, 13). This impinges on the way we will construe the verb.

---

<sup>222</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 840.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid, 1144 n. 22.

<sup>224</sup> Both James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol 1. Prolegomena (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906), 67-68, and Murray James Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 236-37, give detailed consideration of the evidence.

(iii.) Noting the possibility raised in BDAG that ἵνα may be construed as introducing an explanation, Campbell then further argues that a parallelism of sorts occurs between the three subordinate clauses in 2:16, and that supports the contention that the ἵνα in 2:16b introduces an explanation just as the two instances of ὅτι do.<sup>225</sup> First, it must be noted that Galatians 2:16 is the sole example of πιστεύω being modified by ἵνα in the Paulines, though there are other examples in early Christian literature. Second, there are clear examples of Paul using ὅτι with πιστεύω to indicate the content of belief (Rom 6:8; 10:9; 1 Thess 4:14), just as there are in the rest of early Christian literature. Third, ἵνα has recently been subject to extensive analysis by Margaret Sim, who especially notes the contrast between ἵνα and ὅτι. According to Sim the key distinction between these two subordinating conjunctions is that ὅτι indicates that the following proposition is being represented as *a state of affairs* and that ἵνα indicates the following proposition is being represented as *a potential or desirable state of affairs*.<sup>226</sup> ἵνα is thus suitable to express desires, wishes and purposes. If that is indeed the key contrast, then it is improbable that the ἵνα in Galatians 2:16b simply introduces the content of a belief, but rather it introduces a representation of a potential/desirable state of affairs. Paul and other Christian

---

<sup>225</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 840-41.

<sup>226</sup> Margaret Gavin Sim, 'A Relevance Theoretic Approach to the Particle ἵνα in Koine Greek' (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2006).

literature attest to the use of ὅτι with πιστεύω to introduce content, but ἵνα has another function. From the limited evidence of πιστεύω + ἵνα elsewhere, it seems that the desirable state of affairs indicated is somehow dependant on the act of trust (John 10:38; 12:36).

While πιστεύω may have a range of meaning, *when it is combined* with the preposition εἰς and the conjunction ἵνα, its semantic range is constrained, ruling out 'believe that' in favour of 'trusting in.' Campbell acknowledges that this is a 'pivotal clause' but, despite his claims to the contrary, his reading of it is not 'equally plausible to the conventional construal.'<sup>227</sup> Historical exegesis suggests that his proposal is virtually a novelty, since it seems unknown or unconsidered by early Greek commentators (Chrysostom), all the early Latin commentators - some of whom were competent in Greek (Marius Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius), and the major voices of the Reformation (Luther and Calvin). Its neglect (so Campbell) is probably a function of its inherent implausibility to competent readers of Koinē, even those who are supportive of 'Christological' as opposed to 'anthropological' readings of Galatians.<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>227</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 841-42.

<sup>228</sup> Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 123.

Neither Martyn's attempt to place the Christian action of believing in Christ in a decidedly secondary position nor Campbell's attempt to construe the verb as simply stating that Paul and his fellow believers have come to believe that Jesus is the Christ carry conviction. De Boer is closer to the mark than his fellow Apocalyptic Readers when, after a brief summary of the syntax of Galatians 2:16 and the usage of πιστεύω with εἰς, he concludes that the main thrust of 2:16 is to say positively 'we too have placed our trust in, come to rely upon, Jesus Christ.'<sup>229</sup> We conclude that Paul's use of the verb πιστεύω cannot be subordinated (Martyn), nor redefined to exclude the element of trust in Christ (Campbell). Further, the syntax and information structuring of 2:16 suggest that 'WE too have come to believe in Christ Jesus' is especially emphatic within the argument of 2:16-21, and within the argument of Galatians as a whole.

---

<sup>229</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 141.

### 3.2 Πίστις Χριστοῦ

Without exception the Apocalyptic Readers of Galatians understand πίστις Χριστοῦ as a subjective genitive.<sup>230</sup> In this they have caught the wave of the rapidly growing acceptance of the idea that πίστις Χριστοῦ is intended to convey the idea that Christ was faithful or that Christ had faith, especially with regard to his death. While George Howard and others were important precursors, it is the seminal work of Richard Hays that is typically credited with triggering the dramatic shift of opinion favouring rendering πίστις Χριστοῦ from 'faith in Christ' to 'the faith/faithfulness of Christ'.<sup>231</sup> Hays' work in particular is cited by all of our Apocalyptic Readers. Our interest, however, in this section is not to attempt a comprehensive survey of the debate,<sup>232</sup> nor will we attempt to mount an argument for a given reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ that

---

<sup>230</sup> Though see Martyn, *Galatians*, on terminology 251 n. 127.

<sup>231</sup> George E. Howard, 'On the Faith of Christ', *HTR* 60/4 (1967): 459–65; Howard, 'Faith of Christ', *ExpTim* 85/7 (1974): 212–14; Howard, 'Faith of Christ', *ABD* 2:758–60; Donald W. B. Robinson, 'Faith of Jesus Christ: A New Testament Debate', *RTR* 29/3 (1970): 71–81; Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 56; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983). Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 2nd ed.; Morna D. Hooker, 'ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ', *NTS* 35/3 (1989): 321–42. Hays, 142–44, credits Haussleiter with initiating the modern discussion of the question, Johannes Haussleiter, 'Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube', *NKZ* 2 (1891): 109–45, 205–30.

<sup>232</sup> Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle, eds., *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009); Debbie Hunn, 'Debating the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Twentieth-Century Scholarship', in *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), 15–31; and Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, 'Πίστις with a Preposition and Genitive Modifier: Lexical, Semantic, and Syntactic Considerations in the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Discussion', in *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), 33–53; all provide excellent historical surveys and bibliographies of the debate to 2009.

covers all its occurrences in Galatians, Romans and Philippians. Rather, our focus is tightly circumscribed in this chapter by the two occurrences of the formula in Galatians 2:16 and the occurrence of the similar ἐν πίστει ... τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ formula in Galatians 2:20b. Our discussion will be further circumscribed by considering only those arguments advanced by our Apocalyptic Readers, or explicitly cited by them and those who interact with them.<sup>233</sup> A further πίστις Χριστοῦ expression in Galatians 3:22 will only receive incidental treatment in this chapter, but will be addressed along with the other πίστις expressions of Galatians 3 in our next chapter.

The most comprehensive coverage of the arguments *for* the subjective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ is given by de Boer, though he only interacts with works published to 2002, while the most detailed and unique arguments are provided by Campbell, who takes us up to 2006, and has himself been a vocal participant in the wider πίστις

---

<sup>233</sup> Arland J. Hultgren, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 623–61, though focused on Romans, provides a fine analysis and probably the most comprehensive bibliography to 2009. Significant works beyond Bird and Sprinkle, *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (2009), include, Michael F. Bird and Michael R. Whitenton, 'The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Hippolytus's *De Christo et Antichristo*: Overlooked Patristic Evidence in the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate', *NTS* 55/4 (2009): 552–62; Michael R. Whitenton, 'After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Evidence from the Apostolic Fathers', *JTS* 61 (2010): 82–109; Gerald W. Peterman, 'Δικαιωθῆναι διὰ τῆς ἐκ Χριστοῦ πίστεως: Notes on a Neglected Greek Construction', *NTS* 56/1 (2010): 163–68; Wally V. Cirafesi and Gerald W. Peterman, 'Πίστις and Christ in Hippolytus's *De Christo et Antichristo*: A Response to Michael F. Bird and Michael R. Whitenton', *NTS* 57/4 (2011): 594–603; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 836ff.

Χριστοῦ debate.<sup>234</sup> De Boer takes up, amplifies, updates and adds to all of Martyn's arguments. We will focus at this point on arguments of a more general *linguistic* character and ones that refer primarily to the *context of 2:15-21*, leaving the more *narrowly contextual* aspects of arguments based on Galatians 3:22-26 to the next chapter.

### 3.2.1 Arguments *against* the objective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ and *for* the subjective rendering.

#### A. Seven of de Boer's Eight Arguments for the Subjective Rendering

De Boer in an excursus presents the seven arguments for the subjective rendering with an eighth found in his footnotes.<sup>235</sup> His first argument is *contextual* in character and concerns Galatians 3:22-26 so we will consider it when we evaluate his reading of Galatians 3. We turn first to the *linguistic* aspect of his second argument (original numbering retained):

---

<sup>234</sup> Douglas Aitchison Campbell, *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26* (JSNTSup 65. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); Campbell, 'Romans 1:17 – A *Crux Interpretum* for the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate', *JBL* 113/2 (1994): 265–85; Campbell, 'False Presuppositions in the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate: A Response to Brian Dodd', *JBL* 116/4 (1997): 713–19; Campbell, '2 Corinthians 4:13: Evidence in Paul That Christ Believes', *JBL* 128/2 (2009): 337–56; Campbell, 'The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3:22', in *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (eds. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), 57–71; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 642–46, 672–76 & 848–49.

<sup>235</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 148–150.



2. Galatians 3:22 shows that the phrase *pistis Iēsou Christou* is probably to be construed as a subjective genitive: “that the promise [of the Spirit] be given on the basis of the faith of Jesus Christ [*pistis Iēsou Christou*] to those who have faith [in him] [*hoi pisteuontes {eis auton}*].” To translate the phrase here as an objective genitive would produce a meaningless tautology: “that the promise [of the Spirit] be given on the basis of [their] faith in Jesus Christ to those who have faith [in him].”<sup>236</sup>

While we'll return to the *contextual* aspect of this argument in the next chapter alongside the discussion of 3:23-25, our interest at this point regards the *linguistic* claim that the objective rendering ‘produces a meaningless tautology.’ This is an appeal to the argument from redundancy that has been refuted with brilliant brevity by Silva<sup>237</sup> and at length by Matlock.<sup>238</sup> Douglas Campbell has recognised the force of the refutation and repudiated his own earlier use of it.<sup>239</sup> Note also the additions to the Greek and the English made by de Boer to render the tautology more tautologous:

---

<sup>236</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 149.

<sup>237</sup> Moisés Silva, ‘Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians’, in *Justification and Variegated Nomism Volume 2, The Paradoxes of Paul* (ed. Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien and Mark A. Seifrid; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 232.

<sup>238</sup> R. Barry Matlock, ‘The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2:16, 3:22, Romans 3:22, and Philippians 3:9’, *JSNT* 30/2 (2007): 176-77, 187ff.

<sup>239</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 1146 n. 25; cf. Caneday, ‘The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ as a Theme in Paul’s Theology in Galatians’, 192, esp. n. 28.

There is no Greek equivalent to the addition of '[in him]'. The '{*eis auton*}' is de Boer's Koinē and not original to the text. Without the gratuitous ('[in him]') and potentially misleading ('{*eis auton*}') additions the use of both the noun and the participle can be seen as fulfilling different purposes in the information structuring of the clause. The noun and its adnominal genitive focuses on the object of belief, the participle on the experiencers/agents of the belief. One man's redundancy is another man's emphasis and explanation. In fact as we shall see in the next chapter de Boer and Campbell in particular argue that in Paul the phrase ἐκ πίστεως consistently refers to Christ's faithfulness in Galatians<sup>240</sup> and Campbell would extend that claim to cover the instances in Romans also.<sup>241</sup> If that were indeed the case then Romans 5:1 would become similarly tautologous:

Rom 5:1      Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν  
διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

De Boer and Campbell would probably want to reject the argument from tautology / redundancy in that case.<sup>242</sup> Further, there is a clear case of redundancy in the key text we've been considering, Galatians 2:16, where the ἔργων νόμου vs. πίστεως Ἰησοῦ

---

<sup>240</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 192-93; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, e.g. 1145 n. 24, cf. 1149 n. 39.

<sup>241</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 823-25.

<sup>242</sup> As is explicitly done by Stephen L. Young, 'Paul's Ethnic Discourse on "Faith": Christ's Faith and Gentile Access to the Judean God in Romans 3:21-5:1' *HTR* 108/1 (2015), 45-46. Cf. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 822-25.

Χριστοῦ contrast is repeated at least once, if not twice. So, there is a case for saying that there is little redundancy in Galatians 3:22, and even if there were redundancy, so what?

3. If Paul wanted to say “faith in [Jesus] Christ,” he would have used an expression such as *pistis eis Christon* (found in Col 2:5), corresponding to the verbal construction *pisteuein eis*, “believe in,” in Gal 2:16b.<sup>243</sup>

There have been no end of folk who have wished Paul might have, or should have, written something other than he did. The degree of ambiguity, if ambiguity it is, that attaches to the adnominal genitive here in Galatians 2:16a and 16c is shared equally between subjective as well as the objective renderings. Peterman points out that Paul could have, but never does use the *unambiguously* subjective ἡ ἐκ/ἀπὸ/παρὰ Χριστοῦ πίστις.<sup>244</sup>

Lurking behind de Boer's third objection is the contention that somehow the subjective rendering is more natural than the objective (so Hays<sup>245</sup>), or even more

---

<sup>243</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 149.

<sup>244</sup> Peterman, 167.

<sup>245</sup> Hays, *The Faithfulness of Christ*, 147.

extreme, that the objective rendering is a novelty of translation attributable to Luther (so Howard<sup>246</sup>). Howard claims that the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina render the Greek with a *subjective* genitive.<sup>247</sup> However, the pre-Reformation Latin renderings of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as *fidem Iesu Christi* are subject to precisely the same ambiguity as the Greek.<sup>248</sup> Both Latin translations simply render an *adnominal* genitive construction with an *adnominal* genitive construction that may be interpreted objectively or subjectively. Further, Medieval Latin commentators seem unaware of the subjective rendering, speaking only of Christian faith in Christ and never discussing the option of Christ's faith or faithfulness in Galatians 2. One, Peter Lombard, explicitly disambiguates the genitive objectively when he says, 'In short there is no way that one can be justified except through the faith of Christ Jesus, referring to the faith *by which one believes in Christ*.'<sup>249</sup> Likewise, the standard Medieval 'Study Bible,' the Glossa Ordinaria, glosses *fidem Iesu Christi* in Galatians 2:16 with *idest, qua creditur in Christum*, which is as explicit as one could be.<sup>250</sup> Moreover, the earliest

---

<sup>246</sup> Howard, *ABD* 2:759; 'a Lutheran reflex', Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 115.

<sup>247</sup> Howard, *ABD* 2:759.

<sup>248</sup> As is recognised by Hooker, 231-22.

<sup>249</sup> Ian Christopher Levy, *The Letter to the Galatians* (Bible in Medieval Tradition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 202, italics added. Levy translates Peter Lombard on Galatians 2 in extenso. This and later examples undermine Hooker's claim, 322, that pre-Luther commentaries are not clear on the interpretation of πίστις Χριστοῦ. A number are quite explicitly objective.

<sup>250</sup> Karlfried Froehlich and Margaret T. Gibson, *Biblia Latina Cum Glossa Ordinaria: Facsimile Reprint of the Editio Princeps Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).

Latin commentators of the fourth century are either silent or unaware of the subjective genitive interpretation. In fact the earliest extant Latin commentary on Galatians 2:16a, that of Marius Victorinus, goes so far as to say, ‘we are justified *through faith*, the faith *in Jesus Christ*.’<sup>251</sup> Victorinus’ modern editor, Stephen A. Cooper, points out that the subjective interpretation of these Pauline genitives as proposed by R. Hays and others is unknown among ancient commentators on Paul.<sup>252</sup> It is difficult to know for certain what Chrysostom thought of the πίστεως Χριστοῦ expressions other than to observe that in his sentence-by-sentence commentary on Galatians he does not discuss the ‘faith/faithfulness of Christ’ but he does discuss believing *in* Christ. However, the very terms in which he does so are suggestive. As Silva has noted<sup>253</sup> Chrysostom doesn’t use the verb πιστεύω but rather uses expressions like κατεφύγομεν εἰς πίστιν τὴν εἰς Χριστόν (on Gal 2:15) and ἡ εἰς αὐτὸν πίστις (on Gal

---

<sup>251</sup> Stephen Andrew Cooper and Marius Victorinus, *Marius Victorinus’ Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 281, italics original.

<sup>252</sup> Cooper and Victorinus, *Marius Victorinus’ Commentary on Galatians*, 297 n. 9. Cooper on Victorinus’ doctrine of justification (148-169) is worth reading in the light of Campbell’s claims that ‘Justification Theory’ is ‘Arian.’ Victorinus, a notable anti-Arian, adopts positions on justification, faith, and salvation that represent a fascinating precursor to Reformation views. Cf. Karla Pollmann and Mark W. Elliott, ‘Galatians in the Early Church: Five Case Studies’, in *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul’s Letter* (ed. Mark W. Elliott et al.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 40–61.

<sup>253</sup> Silva, ‘Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians’, 228.

2:17) all of which point away from interpretations which seek to render πίστις 'Christologically.'<sup>254</sup>

The relevance of this foray into the history of exegesis is that it takes us back to a period when Koinē was still spoken Greek, and native speakers of Greek (Chrysostom) and competent second language learners (Victorinus) fail to pick up the potential nuance that πίστις Χριστοῦ could be taken as 'the faith/faithfulness of Christ.' This suggests that *at the very least* the subjective rendering was no more natural than the objective. Confirmation of this comes from Harrisville, who demonstrates that objective renderings are required of a number of adnominal genitive constructions involving πίστις from secular Greek examples.<sup>255</sup> Howard, has not demonstrated that the subjective rendering is more natural, and the suggestion that the objective rendering is an early-modern mistranslation by Luther is a misrepresentation of the history of exegesis and a failure to get to grips with explicit evidence as to the adnominal genitive's rendering by native speakers and competent second language speakers of Greek. There is no linguistic reason to argue that the subjective rendering

---

<sup>254</sup> John Chrysostom, *In Epistulam Ad Galatas Commentarius* (ed. B. de Montfaucon; PG 61; Paris: Migne, 1862).

<sup>255</sup> Roy A Harrisville, 'Before ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: The Objective Genitive as Good Greek', *NovT* 48/4 (2006): 353–58.

is more natural than the objective rendering of the genitive, and historically the objective rendering of is better attested.

To this third argument, de Boer adds an additional argument derived from Paul Meyer in footnote 218:

Put otherwise, the case for construing *pistis Iēsou Christou* as an objective genitive (“faith in Jesus Christ”) would carry more weight if the corresponding verb, *pisteuō*, had the meaning “have faith in, believe in, rely upon” in its transitive usage (i.e., when taking an accusative direct object). In its transitive usage, however, the verb (with a double accusative) means “to entrust (someone with something),” as in Gal 2:7. The connotations “to believe in, to have faith in, rely upon” can only apply to the construction *pisteuō eis*, used in Gal 2:16b (or to the construction *pisteuō* with the dative, as in Gal 3:6), i.e. when the verb is intransitive. See P. Meyer 115 n.82; cf. BDF

#163.<sup>256</sup>

---

<sup>256</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 149 n. 218. Cf. Paul William Meyer, *The Word in This World: Essays in New Testament Exegesis and Theology* (ed. John T. Carroll; The New Testament Library; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 115 n. 82. Martyn, *Galatians*, 270 n. 171, gives his account of hearing Meyer make a similar claim at the 1991 SBL debate between Dunn and Hays.

This argument is vulnerable to criticism at many levels. First, it undervalues the empirical evidence that there are unambiguous examples of the adnominal genitive with πίστις being used objectively in secular Greek.<sup>257</sup> If Meyer's argument were correct then *there should be no such examples*. Further, de Boer himself has admitted that there is at least one objective genitive construction with πίστις in at least one New Testament text (Mark 11:22), and we would contend that there are other potential candidates outside the contested Pauline usages (e.g. Jas 2:1):

Mark 11:22b ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ. (Cf. Mark 4:40).

James 2:1 Ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν  
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης.

Second, BDF §163, which is cited by Meyer, directly contradicts Meyer's claim, repeated by de Boer, as it gives other examples of undoubted objective genitives constructed with nouns cognate to verbs that do not take accusative direct objects, e.g.:

---

<sup>257</sup> Roy A Harrisville, 'ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Witness of the Fathers', *NovT* 36/3 (1994): 233–41.



2 Corinthians 10:5b καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν  
τοῦ Χριστοῦ.<sup>258</sup>

Third, Meyer and de Boer overlook the examples within the Pauline corpus where the object of πιστεύω in the active voice is given in the genitive case:

Romans 4:17b οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ τοῦ ζωοποιούντος τοὺς νεκροὺς  
καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα.

Romans 10:14b πῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν;

Fourth, there seems to be no theoretical basis for this alleged rule – at least none is provided by Meyer or de Boer. However, Simon Wong's *Classification of Semantic Case-Relations in the Pauline Epistles* classifies all the verbs in the Pauline corpus by the syntactical and semantic case relations that pertain between the verbs and the subjects, objects, complements and adjuncts that they govern. There are clear examples of nouns governing objective genitives, where the nouns are cognate to

---

<sup>258</sup> Silva, 'Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians', 229 n. 33 provides further examples such as the classical τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων εὐνοία where the cognate verb εὐνοέω is intransitive. Silva does not reference Mayer 'so as not to embarrass the well known author,' but since his argument still has currency in de Boer's *Galatians* (2011) we have done so here.

verbs that share the same class of case relations as does πιστεύω.<sup>259</sup> If the 'argument structure' (or case relations) of those verbs can be represented adequately in an objective genitive construction there can be no theoretical ground for rejecting the identical 'argument structure' (or case relations) of πιστεύω being represented adequately by πίστις modified by an adnominal genitive.

Cf. Romans 6:17      δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἥτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον  
                                  ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην  
 & 1 Peter 1:22      τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας

4. The formulation *pistis Iēsou Christou* has an exact parallel in *pistis Abraam* in Rom 4:16; the latter undoubtedly means “the faith of Abraham,” not “faith in Abraham” (also 4:12, “the faith our father Abraham”).<sup>260</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> Simon S. M. Wong, *A Classification of Semantic Case-Relations in the Pauline Epistles* (Studies in Biblical Greek 9; New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 119-20.

<sup>260</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 149.

If this argument were applied to the adnominal genitive τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 6:12), then on the basis of ‘the exact parallel’ of the undoubted subjective genitive ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων (x2 Rev 8:3-4) Luke 6:12 must also be rendered subjectively, which is incorrect as in context it is undoubtedly an objective genitive.<sup>261</sup> However, *linguistically* Romans 4:16 does establish an important point that will become relevant when we discuss Campbell’s treatment of Galatians 2:20: fully anarthrous genitive adnominals *may be* rendered subjectively.<sup>262</sup> It does not, however, establish the converse: that fully anarthrous genitive adnominals *must be* rendered subjectively. Further, supporters of the subjective rendering who take πίστις as referring to Christ’s *faithfulness* should be careful in their use of Romans 4:16 since it is clear from both the argument of Romans 4 that it is Abraham’s faith *and not* his faithfulness that is in view, and also because the language of πίστις is used there to encode the same reality as the verb πιστεύω (Rom 4:5) and the articular participle form τῶν πιστευόντων (4:11), which do not carry the connotation of being *faithful*.<sup>263</sup>

---

<sup>261</sup> Making explicit an aspect of Moisés Silva’s argument, ‘Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians’, in *Justification and Variegated Nomism Volume 2, The Paradoxes of Paul* (ed. Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 229-30.

<sup>262</sup> Arland J. Hultgren, ‘The Pistis Christou Formulation in Paul’, *NovT* 22/3 (1980): 253, suggested that based on Pauline usage one would expect subjective genitive expressions involving πίστις Χριστοῦ to be arthrous. This does not seem to follow from syntax alone.

<sup>263</sup> James D. G. Dunn, ‘ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ: A Key to the Meaning of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ’, in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays* (ed. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kevin Rowe and A. Katherine Greib Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 363. Richard Kingsley Moore, *Rectification* (‘justification’)

5. In Gal 1:1, Paul posits an antinomy between human activity and God's action in Christ ("Paul, an apostle not from human beings nor through a human being, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father"), as he does in 1:11-12 (his gospel is "not of human origin" but came "through an apocalyptic revelation of Jesus Christ"); he probably does the same here, setting over against each other (a) a human activity, the observance of the law; and (b) God's own gracious, justifying act, "the faith of Jesus Christ" (cf. 2:21: "the grace of God").<sup>264</sup>

This is the first of de Boer's *contextual* arguments that focuses on Galatians 2:15-21 and its preceding context. At best it is as he says an argument from probability. However, it is not at all clear that the antimony of divine and human action set up early in Galatians 1 is so cognitively active that a reader would be immediately drawn to interpret a further contrast encountered some fourteen or so clauses later in Galatians 2:16 in its light. Further, the contrast of divine and human action is after all entirely explicit in Galatians 1:1 & 11-12 but at best only implicit in Galatians 2:16. De Boer's rather vague appeal to the grace of God in 2:21 does not exclude the possibility

---

*in Paul, in Historical Perspective, and in the English Bible: God's Gift of Right Relationship* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 221.

<sup>264</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 150.

that Paul views God's grace as being the whole package of righteousness and life that result from participating in Christ's death by faith.

6. In Rom 1:5, Paul describes faith as obedience, in the phrase "the obedience of faith" (= the obedience that is faith); in Rom 5:19, he refers to "the obedience" of Christ, which can also be described as his *pistis*, as perhaps in Rom 1:17 ("from [Christ's] faith to [our] faith": cf. Jesus as "faithful," *pistos*, in his death in Heb 2:17; 3:2; Rev 1:5; 3:14; 19:11).<sup>265</sup>

This is an intertextual argument. *Linguistically* though, we might observe that 'the obedience of faith' (Rom 1:5) is itself a highly contested expression both in terms of its semantics and its reference. The relationship of faith to obedience may be construed in a number of ways,<sup>266</sup> and the implicit agent of both the faith and the obedience is by no means certainly Christ in Romans 1:5.<sup>267</sup> Further, the equation of faith with Christ's obedience that de Boer makes here is not one that Paul makes explicitly in Romans or

---

<sup>265</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 150.

<sup>266</sup> C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975), 66-67 discusses seven alternative interpretations of this adnominal genitive.

<sup>267</sup> Romans 6:16; 15:18; 16:19, 26 all suggestive of Christian obedience.

anywhere else. Πιστ- terms, whether or not referring to Christ, are notably absent from Romans 5:12-21 where Christ's obedience is in view. Finally, none of the given examples of Christ being described as πιστός are drawn from the Pauline corpus.

7. The parallel with Gal 2:21 indicates that *pistis Iēsou Christou* must refer to Christ's death (his “obedience” in Rom 5:19):

Gal 2:16a	Gal 2:21
justification	justification
from works of the law	through the law
<i>versus</i>	<i>versus</i>
justification from	justification from
<i>pistis Iēsou Christou</i>	Christ died. <sup>268</sup>

This is de Boer's second contextual argument from Galatians 2:15-21. He correctly observes that both Galatians 2:16 and 2:21 are about the means of justification, and he takes 2:21 as a summary explanation of 2:16. There are two putative ways to justification, one which Paul denies, the way of ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (2:16) / διὰ νόμου (2:21), and the other which he affirms, the way of ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ (2:16) / Χριστός

---

<sup>268</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 150.

. . . ἀπέθανεν (2:21). This construal of the relationship of the two texts effectively equates Christ's death with πίστεως Χριστοῦ. Certainly this reading is not impossible. However, it neglects other features of both verses and the intervening argument, especially of 2:19-20. As we have seen, Galatians 2:16's main clause is emphatic about the fact that Paul and fellow Jewish Christians have come to trust in Christ, an element that is not explicit in 2:21. Using the same information structuring theory we used earlier 2:21 is also emphatic, but about the needlessness of Christ's death if justification came through law.<sup>269</sup> Hence, we might want to be cautious about a simplistic equivalence being drawn between these two texts, as the parallelisms are imprecise, and the informational purposes of the respective clauses are quite different. Galatians 2:19-20 could be taken to fill out what it is about Christ that Paul has come to trust in (2:16), namely Christ in his self giving death (2:20) that is both for Paul (2:20) and in which Paul participates (2:19). Galatians 2:21 then picks up the other half of the contrast in 2:16, namely the putative role of the law. Thus, 'Christ died' (2:21) corresponds to 'Christ' (2:16) rather than 'Christ-faith.'

---

<sup>269</sup> Runge, Steven E., *The Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament*, on Gal 2:20; Stephen Levinsohn, 'BART Displays Enhanced for Discourse Features/Galatians', n.p. cited 7 March 2015. Online <http://www01.sil.org/~levinsohns/GalatiansBART.pdf>.

Due to the compressed nature of Paul's statements in 2:15-21 it is well-nigh impossible to decide definitively between the brief sketches that both de Boer and we have given. At this stage of the discussion, however, all that need be noted is that there is at least one alternative way to construing the relationship of 2:16 and 2:21. De Boer's interpretation is not the only option. As will become ever clearer, both de Boer and we think that the meaning of 2:15-21's dense language is actually to be found in Paul's fuller statements in 3:6-25 especially.

In sum, de Boer presents some *contextual* arguments for maintaining that πίστις Χριστοῦ might have a subjective sense, but none of his *linguistic* arguments require us to take the phrase in a subjective sense. Of the two contextual arguments that depend on Galatians 2:15-21 and its preceding context neither is especially conclusive. We will return to his contextual argument from Galatians 3:22-25 in the next chapter. But it is important to underline the failure of de Boer's arguments from tautology, alternate grammatical construction, the transitivity of πιστεύω, and the parallelism of construction with undoubted subjective genitives.<sup>270</sup> So far then, we have seen no reason to prefer the subjective rendering *on linguistic grounds*, and none of de Boer's

---

<sup>270</sup> Though de Boer's *Galatians* was published in 2011 it is unfortunate that he did not interact with Silva's (2004) linguistically adept discussion of πίστις Χριστοῦ in 'Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians', 227-34.



arguments address why native speakers and competent second language speakers of Koinē understood πίστις Χριστοῦ objectively.

B. Campbell's Argument for the Subjective Rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ from the syntax of Galatians 2:20b: ἐν πίστει . . . τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ

Unlike the other Apocalyptic Readers, Campbell has been a very active participant in the wider πίστις Χριστοῦ debate since the early 1990's.<sup>271</sup> He is somewhat skeptical about the ability of *linguistic* arguments to settle this controversy, preferring instead a contextual and intertextual approach that we will discuss in Chapter 4. He has offered some grammatical observations but in some cases has later withdrawn them.<sup>272</sup>

Despite his preference for a contextual approach, and his skepticism that linguistic observations *alone* can resolve the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate, at least with respect to the phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ itself, Campbell sees great promise in a linguistic investigation of the adnominal genitive in Galatians 2:20b. In fact, he believes that Galatians 2:20b

---

<sup>271</sup> See footnote 235 above.

<sup>272</sup> E.g. see Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 1093 n. 15 & 1146 n. 25 on his repudiation of the argument from redundancy.

understood correctly is the key *independent confirmation* of his approach to πίστις Χριστοῦ.<sup>273</sup>

Campbell seems to be on firm ground to argue that πίστις Χριστοῦ (2:16) and πίστει . . . τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ (2:20) should be interpreted analogously. Richard Longenecker (Campbell's *Doctorvater*) is one of the few who take the contrary position, interpreting πίστις Χριστοῦ as a subjective genitive and πίστει . . . τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ as objective. Though Longenecker presents arguments for the subjective and objective renderings of the key phrase in 2:16, he virtually assumes the correctness of the objective rendering at 2:20 and does not seriously address the obvious parallel between the two texts. He defends the objective rendering of 2:20 simply on the basis of the dative article. ‘The object of Christian faith is here expressed by the dative article τῇ followed by a Christological title in the genitive and by qualifying adjectival phrases also in the genitive.’<sup>274</sup> However, it is far from clear that marking the object of πίστει is *necessarily* the function of the dative article in this case. The dative article should be understood serving a grammatical and discourse function, i.e. it makes explicit that the dative head noun governs the genitive phrase that follows the dative article. The dative head noun has been split off by the verb from the rest of

---

<sup>273</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 643-46.

<sup>274</sup> Longenecker, *Galatians*, 94.

the phrase it governs because of a hyperbaton for focal emphasis.<sup>275</sup> So the adnominal genitive of Galatians 2:20 is potentially as ambiguous as the ones in 2:16, and given their essential conceptual parallelism they are probably best taken as equivalent.

Douglas Campbell addresses the interpretation of Galatians 2:20b at two points in his massive *Deliverance of God*: first when he is arguing against the contention of Hultgren, Dunn, and others that if πίστις Χριστοῦ were intended to be interpreted subjectively then Paul would have used a fully arthrous construction, i.e. ἡ πίστις τοῦ Χριστοῦ;<sup>276</sup> and secondly, when he is arguing from the actual construction Paul uses in Galatians 2:20b to establish that πίστις Χριστοῦ is also subjective and ‘Christological.’<sup>277</sup> Campbell's first argument is basically sound: it is not necessary for an adnominal genitive construction to be fully arthrous in order for it to be interpreted subjectively.

Romans 4:16            ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ    (anarthrous subjective genitive)

---

<sup>275</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 644 is in part correct; Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 272; Runge, *The Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament*, Gal 2:20; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 37; Levinsohn, ‘BART/Galatians’, Gal 2:20.

<sup>276</sup> Hultgren, ‘*Pistis Christou* Formulation’, 253. James D. G. Dunn, ‘Once More ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ’, in *Pauline Theology IV: Looking Back, Pressing on* (ed. E. Elizabeth Johnson and David M. Hay; Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series: Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 61-81.

<sup>277</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 642-646 & 847-48.

However, Campbell draws an illegitimate conclusion from that discussion, which is that if an adnominal genitive construction is fully arthrous, then it is almost invariably subjective. Rather than rejecting Hultgren's conjecture holus-bolus, he has reformulated part of Hultgren's claim. Campbell is claiming that genitive constructions that are *fully* or *partially anarthrous* may be rendered either subjectively or objectively, but that *fully arthrous* genitive constructions are almost invariably subjective. This claim is not supported by the textual evidence or specialists in Greek grammar.

Simply consulting standard reference grammars of Classical, Koinē, New Testament, or Modern Greek consistently turns up examples of undoubted fully arthrous objective genitive constructions.

ἡ τῶν καλῶν συνουσίᾳ<sup>278</sup>

John 7:13      διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων<sup>279</sup>

Matt 12:31    ἡ . . . τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία<sup>280</sup>

Luke 11:42    τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ<sup>281</sup>

---

<sup>278</sup> Herbert Weir Smyth and Gordon M. Messing, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), 319.

<sup>279</sup> Robert W. Funk, *A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1973), 712-13.

<sup>280</sup> James A. Brooks and Carlton L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Washington: University Press of America, 1979), 14-15.

τη δημιουργία αυτής της κατάστασης<sup>282</sup>

Campbell was right to qualify his rule as not being invariable - though by failing to quantify the degree of variability he failed to note that his 'rule' falls short of being a rule. It seems that Campbell's mistake lies in his formulation of the so-called Canon of Apollonius. He gives the canon as, 'Apollonius asserted that a subjective construction could be fully arthrous or fully anarthrous.'<sup>283</sup> The problem is neither Apollonius<sup>284</sup> nor Middleton<sup>285</sup> nor moderns<sup>286</sup> limit this canon to 'subjective constructions.' The canon (with appropriate qualification) applies to all adnominal genitive constructions, regardless of their semantic classification as possessive, partitive, subjective, objective or whatever. It is an observation about the syntactic structure and not the semantics of the construction.

---

<sup>281</sup> Wallace, 118.

<sup>282</sup> Vassilios Spyropoulos et al., *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar* (2nd ed.; Routledge Comprehensive Grammars. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2012), 340.

<sup>283</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 644.

<sup>284</sup> Apollonius Dyscolus, *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus* (ed. Fred W. Householder; Studies in the History of the Language Sciences; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1981), 78.

<sup>285</sup> Thomas Fanshaw Middleton and Hugh James Rose, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Deighton, 1833), 36.

<sup>286</sup> Moule, 114; Wallace, 239-40.

From his misstated version of Apollonius canon,<sup>287</sup> coupled with some weak coverage of the data on fully/partially anarthrous/arthrous genitive constructions, he asserts that a high probability attaches to the conclusion that πίστει . . . τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ is to be rendered subjectively. This is significant for him since the obvious syntactic and referential parallels between πίστει . . . τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ and πίστις Χριστοῦ provide an *independent* line of confirmation from linguistics for the subjective, ‘Christological’ rendering of that phrase.

We would argue that the linguistic data regarding fully or partially arthrous and fully anarthrous genitive constructions point to a very simple conclusion: the article's presence, or absence, or partial presence contributes little if anything to the rendering of the genitive construction. *All grammatical combinations of articles and nouns in the genitive construction can be interpreted as either subjective or objective.*

---

<sup>287</sup> This is ironic given his title 'An Invalid “Rule” In Paul' where he complains about the misapplication of the rule by others, Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 644-46. Douglas J. Moo, review of Douglas A. Campbell *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*, *JETS* 53/1 (2010): 143-50, picks up on this, but surprisingly does not in *Galatians*, 171.

### 3.2.2 Arguments *against* the subjective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ and *for* the objective rendering.

There are no narrowly linguistic arguments that will settle this issue. The grammatical structures used in Galatians 2:16 and 2:20 allow for either the subjective or objective rendering.<sup>288</sup> The only broadly linguistic argument that does seem to favour the objective over the subjective rendering is the one from native-speaker intuition. As already noted John Chrysostom seems to interpret the genitive construction objectively,<sup>289</sup> and Marius Victorinus explicitly disambiguates the construction objectively.<sup>290</sup>

Chrysostom was a native speaker of Greek, and as such was both in contact with the living language and had internalised the language in a way that only a native speaker can. His written remains show clear evidence of a thorough training in the Classical standards of the language, even though by his time spoken Greek was beginning to

---

<sup>288</sup> Porter and Pitts, 'Πίστις with a Preposition and Genitive Modifier', present a statistical argument for the objective rendering of the adnominal genitive from the perspective of Systemic Functional Grammar. Without claiming competence to evaluate their argument, we simply note in passing the vulnerability of previous statistical arguments with respect to disambiguating genitives. See Silva, 'Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians', 229-30.

<sup>289</sup> Chrysostom, *In Epistolam Ad Galatas Commentarius*, Gal 2:16.

<sup>290</sup> Cooper and Victorinus, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians*, 281 & 297.

shift from Koinē to Byzantine Greek.<sup>291</sup> Chrysostom's commentary on Galatians is his only line-by-line commentary on a biblical book, and in it he fails to refer in any way to either a faith exercised by Christ or to Christ's faithfulness when commenting on any part of Galatians 2:15-21. He does however speak unequivocally about Christian faith in Christ. The potential difficulties with Chrysostom's evidence are twofold: (i.) He does not comment on the πίστις Χριστοῦ constructions directly, but rather comments on a section that included both them and εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν. At the very least he didn't see fit to speak of Christ's faith/faithfulness, but we can't know with absolute confidence what his view on those phrases was. His comments on believing and faith could be derived solely from the verb. (ii.) Chrysostom, though a native speaker of Greek, was not in the same historical location as Paul or Paul's first readers. He was a Post-Nicene canonical theologian, and when he read Paul he would still 'hear' Paul in the light of other major NT witnesses. Like many ancients, he was more aware of some of the distinctions between Paul, John, and the other canonical writers than we critical or post-critical moderns give them credit for. However, it seems likely that he would read Paul in a way that emphasised canonical unity with, say, John rather than in his historical distinctiveness. He would

---

<sup>291</sup> Geoffrey Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers* (New York: Wiley, 2009), 155. Questions about Chrysostom's idiolect may be difficult to resolve. Certainly his writings are full of Atticisms and he declaimed in an Atticising style. Whether his colloquial speech was also in a higher, possibly somewhat artificial register is impossible to determine. Horrocks maintains that the vernacular spoken Greek of Chrysostom's day corresponded more closely to the Koinē.



have read both Paul and John's faith language into each other, as did most scholars before the rise of historical criticism. His native speaker intuition of the language would also be conditioned by his canonical worldview. This is not to question the appropriateness of Chrysostom's stance, but simply to observe that linguistic factors were not the only ones at play. However, had the objective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ been *impossible*<sup>292</sup> then it would have been likely that Chrysostom would have commented on what would have been to him the *obligatory* subjective rendering. His canonical worldview would then have led him effortlessly to the faithful Christ of Hebrews<sup>293</sup> and the Apocalypse. The fact this does not happen indicates clearly that the subjective rendering was not linguistically obligatory.

Marius Victorinus was a fluent second language learner of Greek. His advantage over the modern classicist, is that he had access to the living native speaker tradition of Greek, even if Koinē/Atticising diglossia was a complicating factor. Victorinus was the top academic rhetor of the Rome of his day and his translations of many works of Classical Greek philosophy remained standard works to the Renaissance and

---

<sup>292</sup> Meyer's claim repeated by de Boer, *Galatians*, 149 n. 218.

<sup>293</sup> Chrysostom not only believed that Paul was the author of Hebrews, he comments on the theme of Christ's faithfulness there, *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews* (ed. Philip Edward Pusey; trans. Thomas Keble; A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the Division of the East and West; Oxford: Parker, 1877), 63, 67-68. Galatians 2, then, is a case of the dog that didn't bark.

beyond.<sup>294</sup> Like Chrysostom, Victorinus reproduced Paul's text in full in his commentary, though generally working the biblical text into his detailed exposition. Unlike Chrysostom, Victorinus explicitly renders the passage in his running commentary to make it clear that πίστις Χριστοῦ means faith *in* Christ.<sup>295</sup> So with Victorinus we are labouring under only one of the two difficulties we faced with Chrysostom. But even the problem of canonical reading is mitigated significantly by Victorinus' approach to commentary writing. One of his modern editors and translators, Stephen Cooper, sums up the contrast between Victorinus and his fellow fourth and early fifth century commentators thus,

we must understand [Victorinus' exclusive concentration upon Paul] . .

. as a conscious methodological choice. Victorinus' primary goal—to

explain the meaning and import of the Pauline letters for a

contemporary audience—could best be accomplished by explicating

Paul on the basis of what Paul himself said. Calling to mind other

scriptures would distract from the immediate task; but he is not shy

---

<sup>294</sup> Cooper and Victorinus, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians*, 17-19.

<sup>295</sup> Cooper and Victorinus, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians*, 281.Cf. above, p. 103.

about quoting or referring to passages from various Pauline letters while engaged in the explication of a particular one.<sup>296</sup>

Clearly, Victorinus was no more a presuppositionless exegete than we are, but he was serious in his intent to hear Paul *as Paul*. To him, there was no question that Paul was speaking throughout Galatians 2:15-21 and later in 3:22 about the Christian's faith *in* Christ, including the πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions.<sup>297</sup>

Ultimately contextual arguments are vital in interpreting this genitive construction in all its permutations within Galatians 2:15-21, and the paragraph must be interpreted primarily in relation to the rest of the letter.<sup>298</sup> At this point our earlier observations about the discourse grammar or information structure come into play. The most emphatic element in the complex statement that is 2:16 is that 'we too have come to trust in Christ Jesus.' There is some plausibility to the claim that the main verb effectively explains the indeterminate genitive.<sup>299</sup> More importantly, if 2:15-21 is

---

<sup>296</sup> Cooper and Victorinus, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians*, 107; cf. 108 where Cooper quotes Victorinus explicitly commenting on his and Cicero's hermeneutics.

<sup>297</sup> Cooper and Victorinus, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians*, 281 & 297.

<sup>298</sup> To which our apocalyptic readers would be in agreement as their principal arguments for the meaning of almost all the key expressions in 2:15-21 come from the interpretation of Gal 3:6-4:7. See chapter 4, Faith and Justification in Galatians 3:1-4:7.

<sup>299</sup> Inter alia Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 117-18. D. Francois Tolmie, *Persuading the Galatians: A Text-Centered Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter* (WUNT, 2. Reihe. 190; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 90.

best seen as a *hinge* that connects the polemical biography of 1:12ff. to the first sets of arguments in the letter in 3:1-5 & 3:6-4:7, then we should expect the themes and terms of 2:15-21 to play a significant role in the ensuing argument. And if 'we too have believed in Christ Jesus' is informationally highly salient within 2:15-21, then we should expect Christian trust in Christ Jesus to function significantly in the argument of 3:1ff. Further, if Paul's life now is lived by faith (2:20b), we should anticipate that Galatians 3:1ff. will unpack the nature of that faith, whatever it is. As we shall see, there are strong arguments *from* Galatians 3 for identifying the faith by which Paul lives with Christian faith *in* Christ.

### 3.3 Would Paul's use of δικαίω and δικαιοσύνη have been readily accessible and interpretable by the Galatians?

The key exegetical and ultimately theological move made by the ARG is to defer the definition of Paul's δικαιο- terms until Galatians 3:6-4:7,<sup>300</sup> or to suggest that the direction of 'interpretive causality'<sup>301</sup> will ultimately run from Romans to Galatians. Uniformly the ARG takes Paul's understanding and use of δικαιο- language to imply a

---

<sup>300</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 272-73; de Boer, *Galatians*, 155.

<sup>301</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 836.

fundamentally liberative as opposed to forensic account of *justification*. Paul's view of δικαιώω and δικαιοσύνη might be better rendered by terms such as *rectify* and *rectification*, rather than either *justify/justification* or *rightwise/righteousness*.<sup>302</sup> However, this liberative account is not explicit in Galatians 2:15-21, at most merely hinted at in 2:19-20.

Within the ARG there is a division between Martyn and de Boer on the one hand, who insist that Paul has adopted from the Agitators in Galatia and will, in the process of his adoption, redefine the meaning of the δικαιο- language to suit his purposes,<sup>303</sup> and on the other hand Campbell, who sees the δικαιο- language as intrinsic to Paul's proclamation to the Galatians from his earlier visit(s) to them.<sup>304</sup> So would Paul's use of δικαιώω and δικαιοσύνη at Galatians 2:16-17 and 2:21 have been readily accessible and interpretable by the Galatians as they first read his letter? According to Martyn and de Boer, they would have been familiar from the Agitators' teaching with the language of δικαιώω and δικαιοσύνη but they would have had to attend carefully to the unfolding of Paul's argument in the letter to grasp his redefinition of those terms. According to Campbell, the Galatians would have been familiar with Paul's own

---

<sup>302</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 249-50; de Boer, *Galatians*, 155, 164, but cf. 186.

<sup>303</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 249, 268-73; de Boer, *Galatians*, 143-45, 151-155, & 164-65.

<sup>304</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 836.

use of the language of δικαίω and δικαιοσύνη, and Galatians 3:1-4:7 reaffirms for them the Pauline teaching regarding δικαίω in contrast to the message of the Agitators. Martyn, at this point dependant partly on de Boer, puts it thus:

The shifts involved in moving from the first rectification passage to the second provide, then, a major clue not only to Paul's definition of rectification but also to the genesis of his carefully formed thinking on this subject. For in Galatians 3:6-4:7, no less than in the earlier passage, Paul is formulating a polemic against the Teachers' discourses on rectification. Specifically, he is circumscribing "the forensic apocalyptic theology of the ... Teachers with a cosmological apocalyptic theology of his own."<sup>177</sup> Rectification thus remains, for Paul, God's act in the death of Christ. But now, having taken silent leave of the Jewish-Christian concern with the forgiveness of nomistic transgressions, Paul sees in Christ's death God's liberating invasion of the territory of tyranny.<sup>305</sup>

---

<sup>305</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 273.

Campbell, while agreeing with the general notion that Paul has framed (maybe not so much *re*-framed) his doctrine of justification in cosmological apocalyptic terms,<sup>306</sup> believes that Paul had already arrived at this apocalyptic understanding of justification prior to his work amongst the Galatians.<sup>307</sup>

We would agree with the ARG that δικαιόω and δικαιοσύνη were not introduced by Paul into the Galatian situation *as part of his polemic against the Agitators* and their alternative message. This is in contrast to some in the history of Pauline interpretation who have designated Paul's teaching regarding 'justification' as a *Kampfeslehre*.<sup>308</sup> Paul's use of the δικαιο- terms at every point in the letter is simply too abbreviated to have functioned especially effectively as a newly introduced polemical doctrine.<sup>309</sup> Had it been introduced by Paul as he wrote the letter it seems unlikely that the Galatians would have been able to interpret with much clarity what he would have meant by it.. For his argument to succeed to whatever degree, it would need to be comprehensible. One does not need to posit a perfect match of intention, execution and reception to suggest that it is more likely that the Galatians were

---

<sup>306</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 857-58.

<sup>307</sup> Ibid, 836.

<sup>308</sup> The expression is Wrede's, *Paulus*, 73ff. though the idea is older.

<sup>309</sup> Peter Stuhlmacher and Donald Alfred Hagner, *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2001), effectively agreeing with Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 858.

already familiar with some form of δικαιο- conceptuality, whether its source was Paul or the Agitators, than that they were now encountering it for the first time as they read this letter. But was Paul responding to language and conceptuality introduced by the Agitators, or had he already used the language with the Galatians prior to the Agitators' arrival?

On Martyn and de Boer's reading, it was the Agitators who had introduced the language of δικαιοῦ in their presentation of their gospel.<sup>310</sup> The Agitators were Jewish Christians (or, as Martyn puts it 'Christian Jews') for whom law-observance was an intrinsic aspect of their worldview. On Martyn's reading they would have believed that Jesus the Messiah had atoned for the guilt of the nation (2:16a).<sup>311</sup> Confronted by Gentile Christians whose relation to the law could not be taken for granted, these Agitators taught that observance of the law of Israel was necessary to ensure a share in the Messiah's benefits. One of the principal, if not the principal benefit was the certainty of being forensically vindicated as one of Messiah's people on the last day. The Agitators taught that to ensure a favourable verdict on the last day Gentiles, as well as Jews, had to observe the law as well as participate somehow in the faithfulness

---

<sup>310</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 267; de Boer, *Galatians*, 151.

<sup>311</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 268-69.



of the Messiah.<sup>312</sup> In contrast, Paul had seen God's work by his Spirit in forming Christian communities amongst Gentiles without reference to the law. Paul thus concluded that law observance was clearly irrelevant to being part of God's rectifying activity in the world. Confronted with the Agitators' activity and teaching amongst the congregations he had established and taught, Paul's reaction was to take up the Agitators' language and promises regarding future δικαιο- and to invest it with an interpretation consonant with the gospel that he had received from God in Christ. Paul's biography in Galatians 1:12ff. establishes the fact that he received the gospel as a result of a direct and invasive revelation of Christ from God. His account of the Antioch incident (2:11ff.) allows him to speak directly to the Agitators under the guise of his address to Peter. Taking as his starting point a Jewish-Christian stance (2:15) and tradition (2:16a) Paul deconstructs both Peter and the Agitators' point of view (2:16ff.). Where the Agitators interpreted Jewish-Christian tradition (Gal 2:16a) to imply that Christ's faithful death brought forensic justification to those who are law observant, Paul points out that being law observant had not led to justification, but that Christ's faithful death had, hence law observance was irrelevant. Strictly, according to Martyn, Paul does not begin to redefine what δικαίω and δικαιοσύνη are until 3:6-4:7, but he has already begun detaching them from law observance and

---

<sup>312</sup> The ARG does not provide us with a unified or detailed account of how the faithfulness of the Messiah / faith in the Messiah functioned in the teaching of the Agitators.

associating them exclusively with Christ's faithful passion.<sup>313</sup> On de Boer's account Paul begins to move away from a forensic-eschatological interpretation of δικαιο- in Galatians 2:19-20, but does not so much redefine δικαιο- in Galatians 3 but re-frame it within and effectively displace it with categories that reflect cosmological apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>314</sup>

To Campbell, Martyn & de Boer's arguments regarding Paul's use of tradition is 'overly fragile in terms of the evidence, and as incorrect in more ultimate causal and historical terms.'<sup>315</sup> He is critical of their claim that Galatians 2:16a represents a fragment of Jewish-Christian justification tradition, shared by the Jerusalem church, Peter, the Agitators and Paul. Campbell does think it likely that the Agitators used δικαιο- terminology, but Paul had already thought through his gospel so that it could be expressed in terms of δικαιοῦν and δικαιοσύνη prior to writing Galatians. In fact he goes so far as to suggest that the Galatians were quite familiar with the essence of his position.<sup>316</sup> Campbell sees a high degree of coherence in Paul's position that is sustained across a number of textual contexts, which suggests that interpreting Paul

---

<sup>313</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 272ff.; de Boer's disagreement on the extent of the tradition in 2:16a, also disagreement on the ongoing significance of it, de Boer, *Galatians*, 145 n. 211.

<sup>314</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 155, 160ff.; de Boer, 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology', 184-85.

<sup>315</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 846.

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid*, 836.

too narrowly in reaction to the Agitators is misguided.<sup>317</sup> Having said that, there is little difference between Campbell's view and that of the other Apocalyptic Readers. As far as the Letter to the Galatians itself goes, Paul's statements in 2:15-21 are epigrammatic<sup>318</sup> and for us as Paul's readers today we must pay attention to how the themes adumbrated there are developed in 3:6-4:7. Whereas Martyn in particular desires to read Paul from the perspective of Galatians and only then from that of Romans, and de Boer cautions about reading Romans into Galatians, Campbell sees Romans as more definitive.<sup>319</sup>

Where does this leave us? Campbell's specific argument against taking Galatians 2:16a as a piece of shared Jewish-Christian justification tradition seem reasonably cogent.<sup>320</sup> The use of εἰδότες ὅτι in 2:16a may not introduce a fragment of traditional material, but rather as Campbell suggests, a viewpoint that Paul thinks that Peter and he should share. Simply tracing the use of οἶδα + ὅτι in Paul's letters suggests that it is used to introduce a variety of material, some looking like potential candidates for 'tradition,' some like reasonable inferences from his teaching, and others approaching the force of 'as every schoolboy knows.' The very fact that Martyn and de Boer cannot agree as

---

<sup>317</sup> Ibid, 846.

<sup>318</sup> Ibid, 839, cf. 836.

<sup>319</sup> Ibid, 836-37, 841.

<sup>320</sup> Ibid, 842-43.

to the full extent of the traditional material that Paul is citing, demonstrates the fragility of such traditio-historical argumentation.<sup>321</sup> The clues - the tense of δικαιόω, the usage and meaning of ἐὰν μὴ, the substitution of διὰ with ἐκ - are beyond subtle so as to be virtually intractable. Further, though 2:16 is 'epigrammatic' and its teaching regarding justification is 'inchoate',<sup>322</sup> it is fairly clear that Paul expects the Galatians to be able to follow his line of argument, which would have been unlikely if Paul had newly introduced the language and conceptuality of δικαιο- as he wrote the letter. So when de Boer argues that Paul's lack of pause to define δικαιο- language is an indicator of its traditional status, Campbell has replied for us, it could equally well be part of Paul's prior proclamation to the Galatians. As a further consideration, it is arguable that if Paul is picking up the Agitators' language, has he really done enough, not just here in 2:16-21, but also later on in 3:6-4:7 and 5:4-6, to really redefine the Agitators' viewpoint? Would the Galatians, even on a second or third reading, really pick up on the way Paul has reframed the Agitators' language? If Martyn and de Boer's approach is correct, then Paul engaged in a highly fraught strategy that may well have misled the Galatians, and for that matter almost all readers of the letter from antiquity to 1997. The Galatians would have potentially been in the worst position of all, since on the one hand they did not have access to Paul's more considered and

---

<sup>321</sup> Ibid, 846; cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 264 esp. n. 158; de Boer, *Galatians*, 143-45.

<sup>322</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 155-56.

measured Romans, and on the other the Agitators were presumably still *in situ* to 'correct' any misapprehensions that the Galatians might have had about δικαιόω / δικαιοσύνη on reading Paul's missive.<sup>323</sup>

It seems best to follow Campbell at this point. For Paul's argument to work, the Galatians probably were at the very least somewhat aware of the basic shape of Paul's teaching on justification, and the letter functions more to underscore positions that the Galatians were somewhat familiar with. It is improbable that Paul's choice of OT justification texts<sup>324</sup> was done on the spur of the moment, but rather indicate some reflection on his part, and further, that his tacit quotation of these texts suggests that the Galatians would still hear and understand them as scripture. Given the predominantly Gentile, and presumably relatively unversed nature of the Galatian congregations, we would submit that Paul had inducted them in these texts prior to their exposure to the Agitators.

---

<sup>323</sup> Contra Martyn, 'Events in Galatia', 161-62.

<sup>324</sup> Gen 15:6; Hab 2:4, Lev 18:5 and here in Gal 2:16, Ps 143:2.

## The argument thus far

In some ways the position at this stage of the argument is somewhat inconclusive.

Having said that, it would be right to point out that there have been a number of intermediate conclusions of note:

First, the idea of trusting in Jesus Christ has been shown to be clearly expressed in the rhetorically crucial Galatians 2:16. Further, it has been given the highest degree of saliency within that crucial sentence. This counteracts the strong tendency in the ARG of Paul to diminish the role of so-called 'anthropological' (even 'anthropocentric') faith in Paul. Christian trust in Christ seems to be a candidate for a key theme in the rest of Galatians.

Second, narrowly *linguistic* arguments regarding the contested πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions do not seem to yield any clear result. Certainly linguistic arguments *against* the objective reading fail. But then again, there don't seem to be any *decisive* linguistic arguments against the subjective reading either. However, it is of interest that native speaker intuition and living language tradition suggest that in the mid 4th century AD, as commentary on Galatians 2 was being penned for the first time, the

objective reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ seems de rigueur. *Contextual* arguments depend on the unfolding of 3:1ff.

Finally, it seems highly probable that Paul's thought on 'justification/rectification' was not formed on the fly as he composed Galatians, or simply in response to the arguments of others. His choice of scripture and the shape of his argument suggest familiarity on the part of the Galatians, as argued by Campbell. The real test of this will again be Galatians 3:6-4:7.

## Chapter 4

### Faith and Justification: Galatians 3:1-4:7

While Galatians 1:4 and 6:14's talk of invaded ages and executed worlds might provide the apocalyptic frame for Galatians, and Paul's putatively apocalyptic contrast of Flesh and Spirit in Galatians 5:16-26 must not be neglected, Galatians 3:1-4:7 is the heart of the Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians (ARG). Paul's opening moves regarding δικαιο- and πίστις in Galatians 2:15-21 are just that on the apocalyptic reading, opening moves. It is Galatians 3:6-25, backed up by 3:1-5, and even more so by 3:26-4:7, that unfolds Paul's reworking of 'justification' in thoroughly apocalyptic terms and articulates the central role of πίστις Χριστοῦ for a proper understanding of πίστις in Galatians, and maybe in Paul as a whole.<sup>325</sup> It is true that Paul's usage of δικαιο- terms is at its densest in Galatians 2:15-21, but there is little development or explanation of those terms in that context; Paul's understanding of justification remains 'inchoate' in that text.<sup>326</sup> It is in Galatians 3:6-25 that δικαιο- is explained in terms that turn out to be apocalyptic. Again Galatians 2:15-21 represents the densest use of πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions not only in Galatians but in the entire Pauline Corpus. Galatians 3:1-25,

---

<sup>325</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 272-74.

<sup>326</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 155.



however, not only provides key contextual arguments for determining the meaning of πίστις Χριστοῦ in Galatians 2:15-21, but also shows both an intensification and diversification of Paul's use of πίστις / πιστός / πιστεύω (x17 in Gal 3:2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26). Curiously, just as δικαιο- and πιστ- terms peak in their use and significance at Galatians 3:25 & 26 they abruptly disappear from the argument of the letter, cropping up again briefly in Galatians 5:4-6, with a couple of fairly incidental usages of πίστις at 5:22 and 6:10.<sup>327</sup> Clearly the exegesis of Galatians 3 is crucial for the fortunes of the ARG.

The strong correlation of πίστις with δικαιο- terms should be noted. As in Galatians 2:15-21, δικαιο- and πιστ- terms are closely connected in Galatians 3:1-4:7 with only one occurrence of a δικαιο- term in a sentence where πίστις is absent (3:21, but cf. 3:22). So, to get an adequate grasp of the meaning of δικαιο- terms in Galatians requires an adequate grasp of Paul's use of πιστ- related terms. In this chapter we will argue:

(i.) First, that the principal contextual and intertextual arguments deployed by the ARG for a strongly 'Christological' understanding of Paul's πιστ- terms fail.

---

<sup>327</sup> De Boer believes that the petering out of faith and justification terminology in Galatians is indicative of the way that cosmological apocalyptic is more fundamental to Paul than the polemically conditioned language of justification, *Galatians*, 165. Martyn, however, believes that after the adoption of rectification by Paul in the Galatian dispute, he went on to maintain the centrality of that terminology, *Martyn, Galatians*, 275.

Consequently the minimisation of the role of human agency in believing/trusting in God and Christ that is typical of the ARG does not follow.

(ii.) Second, we will argue that there is little or no evidence that Paul's *δίκαιο*- terms are shifted from their typical *forensic-eschatological* sense and redefined in a *liberative* manner by Paul in the argument of Galatians 3:1-4:7.

#### 4.1 Is πίστις always, often, or ever 'Christological' in Galatians 3:1-4:7?

The noun *πίστις* occurs some fourteen times in chapter 3, in various syntactic contexts, and more often than not within repeated, possibly set expressions. For instance we have two occurrences (3:2, 5) of *ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως* in the first paragraph (3:1-5). Those two are quickly followed in the next paragraph (3:6-9) by the two occurrences of *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως* (3:7, 9) and the first (3:8) of the four *ἐκ πίστεως* expressions in Galatians 3 (vv. 8, 11, 12, 24). A variation of the preposition from *ἐκ* to *διὰ* occurs and the article is also introduced at 3:14 & 26: *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*. At Galatians 3:22 we have the fourth and final occurrence of a *πίστις Χριστοῦ* expression in the letter, this time in the form *ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Finally in Galatians 3:23-25 the noun is used absolutely on two occasions, both times as an arthrous

complement (τὴν πίστιν 3:23; τῆς πίστεως 3:25), along with the phrase εἰς τὴν μέλλουσάν πίστιν (3:23). The relationship between these varied usages will need to be teased out in order to determine whether Paul uses them with flexible or consistent reference.

The close connection of the ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of 3:22 with the various πίστις expressions found in 3:23-25 should be especially noted. The key point of agreement within the ARG is that πίστις in Galatians 3:23-25 must be a kind of synonym for Christ, and that thus the ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of 3.22 is referring to the 'faith (or faithfulness) of Christ,' and thus in turn the other πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions of Galatians 2:16 & 20 do the same. For the ARG, Galatians 3:23-25 is the most decisive contextual key that disambiguates the sense of all the πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions in Galatians.<sup>328</sup>

However, beyond that, the consensus between our Apocalyptic Readers breaks down with Martyn being more reluctant than de Boer and Campbell to allow the usages of

---

<sup>328</sup> Consequently, for Martyn and the rest of the ARG Galatians 3:23-25 becomes an absolutely pivotal text for understanding πίστις in the entirety of Pauline theology, Martyn, *Galatians*, 98-99; Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 254-55; de Boer, *Galatians*, 103, 149, 175, 193; de Boer 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 357; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 867ff. Cf. Moo, *Galatians*, 46-47.

3:23-25 to determine all the other uses of πίστις in the letter.<sup>329</sup> De Boer sums up his view thus: 'The primary referential meaning of *pistis* in Galatians, therefore, is (apart from 5:22) always the faith of Christ himself: his faithful death on the cross, not human faith in Christ, which is but a secondary, subordinate implication of the phrase.'<sup>330</sup> Campbell would wholeheartedly agree with de Boer's initial main clause, but be very hesitant in affirming de Boer's last qualifying clause. Campbell sees little or no soteriological role for 'human faith in Christ' per se.<sup>331</sup> Martyn however does see a role for Christian faith in Christ, and would not agree with de Boer's primary assertion. Some occurrences of πίστις refer primarily to Christian, as opposed to Christ's, faith, according to Martyn.<sup>332</sup>

A second fissure opens up between Campbell on the one hand and Martyn and de Boer on the other. Turning from the noun to its cognate verb πιστεύω both Martyn and de Boer understand Paul's usages of it to indicate Christian faith in God and/or in Christ. Campbell denies that *faith in Christ* is ever in view in Galatians, and that, given his reading of 2:16, only the two usages of πιστεύω in Galatians 3:6 & 22 are relevant for

---

<sup>329</sup> Excepting the occurrence at Galatians 5:22.

<sup>330</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 192.

<sup>331</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 879, 927-29.

<sup>332</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 284, 288-89, & esp. 314.

understanding what is for him *theocentric faith*. Believers participate in/with Christ in his theocentric faith/faithfulness<sup>333</sup> that evidences their rectification.<sup>334</sup>

It may be helpful to chart at this point some of the expanded glosses our Apocalyptic Readers give all these usages of πιστεύω, πίστις and πιστός in Galatians 3, contrasting them with a veritably 'Protestant' modern translation (NRSV):<sup>335</sup>

---

<sup>333</sup> Campbell believes that both glosses are correct, Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 384-86, cf. 858.

<sup>334</sup> Ibid, 928-29.

<sup>335</sup> Though note the footnote of the NRSV at Gal 3:22 (cf. 2:16; 2:20).

Charting the Apocalyptic Readers' views of πιστεύω/πίστις/πιστός in Galatians 3

		NRSV	Martyn	De Boer	Campbell
The Verb					
Finite Gal 3:6	ἐπίστευσεν	'believed'	'Abraham . . . trusted God' 'analogous to the faith that was kindled . . . among the Galatians' <sup>336</sup>	'Abraham believed God' 'on analogy . . . to Christians' <sup>337</sup>	'Abraham trusts in God' <sup>338</sup>
Participle 3:22	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	'to those who believe'	'to those who believe . . . in him [Christ]' <sup>339</sup>	'to those who believe . . . in Christ' <sup>340</sup>	'to those who trust or believe . . . in God' <sup>341</sup>
The Noun					
Embedded genitive 3:2 & 5	ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως	'by believing what you heard'	'as a result of the proclamation that has the power to elicit faith' <sup>342</sup>	'on the basis of what was heard of . . . Christ's faithful death on the cross' <sup>343</sup>	'the proclamation of fidelity . . . of the righteous and faithful one . . . <i>without reference to human response</i> ' <sup>344</sup>
In Prepositional Phrases					
3:7 & 9	οἱ ἐκ πίστεως	'those who believe'	'those whose identity is derived from faith, meaning both the faith elicited ... and the faith of Christ enacted in his death' <sup>345</sup>	'those who derive their identity from Christ's faithful death' <sup>346</sup>	'those characterized as' 'through fidelity' <sup>347</sup>

<sup>336</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 297-98.

<sup>337</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 186, 190.

<sup>338</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 858. Later at 872-73 Campbell will say that Abraham's trust *in God* is in analogy with both that of Christ *and* Christians.

<sup>339</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 361, referent of pronoun added.

<sup>340</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 235-36.

<sup>341</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 872. He explicitly rejects that it is faith in Christ, 871-73.

<sup>342</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 284ff.

<sup>343</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 176.

<sup>344</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 856. Italics original.

<sup>345</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 299.

<sup>346</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 192.

<sup>347</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 860 with 862.

3:8, 11, 12, 24	ἐκ πίστεως	‘by/on faith’	‘by Christ’s faith and by the faith that Christ’s faith awakens’ <sup>348</sup>	‘on the basis of Christ’s faith’ <sup>349</sup>	‘through fidelity’ referring ‘to Christ’s death and resurrection’ <sup>350</sup>
3:22	ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	‘through faith in Jesus Christ’	‘via “Christ’s faith”’ <sup>351</sup>	‘on the basis of . . . the faithfulness of Jesus Christ’ <sup>352</sup>	by ‘Christ’s faith in God’ <sup>353</sup>
3:14 & 26	διὰ τῆς πίστεως	‘through faith’	‘through the faith elicited by Christ’s faithful death’ <sup>354</sup>	‘through [Christ’s] faith’ <sup>355</sup>	‘by means of the/that faithful one’ <sup>356</sup>
3:23	εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν	‘until faith’	‘until . . . the coming both of Christ’s faith and of the faith kindled by Christ’s faith’ <sup>357</sup>	‘until the destined faith’ ‘of Jesus Christ’ <sup>358</sup>	‘the coming of Christ’ <sup>359</sup>
As complement					
3:23 & 3:25	τὴν πίστιν / τῆς πίστεως	‘this/that faith’	‘the Christian’s faith . . . now awakened by the Gospel of Christ.’ <sup>360</sup>	‘Faith’ as a metonym for Christ <sup>361</sup>	‘Christ himself’ <sup>362</sup>
The Adjective					
3:9	πιστῶ	‘who believed’	‘Abraham’ whose ‘mind was set at rest by the power of God’s promissory word’ <sup>363</sup>	‘(God-believing) Abraham’ <sup>364</sup>	‘either trusting or trustworthy’ <sup>365</sup>

<sup>348</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 363.

<sup>349</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 193.

<sup>350</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 862-63.

<sup>351</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 361.

<sup>352</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 236.

<sup>353</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 872-73. He adds ‘Christ trusts God’ in parallel to Abraham and Christians.

<sup>354</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 323.

<sup>355</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 214.

<sup>356</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 878.

<sup>357</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 362.

<sup>358</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 237.

<sup>359</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 874-75.

<sup>360</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 363.

<sup>361</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 193.

<sup>362</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 875.

<sup>363</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 302.

<sup>364</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 197.

<sup>365</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 858.

At this point we will offer a critique of de Boer's contextual argumentation for reading πίστις in a consistently 'Christological' way, followed by a critique of Campbell's additional argument for a 'Christological' reading of ἐκ πίστεως derived from Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 at Galatians 3:11. These twin critiques will in fact suggest that the subjective ('Christological') reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ adopted by the ARP is *unlikely at any point within Galatians*.<sup>366</sup> We will then be in a position to offer an alternative construal of πίστις throughout Galatians 2:15-4:7. This alternative construal consistently connects the noun more closely with the verb πιστεύω. It gives some force to discourse-grammatical observations about the role of Galatians 2:16 in the letter as a whole. It explains why it is πίστις rather than δικαιο- that dominates chapter 3. It makes better sense of Paul's choice of Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 in particular. We will argue that *Christian faith in Christ* is at the heart of the letter after all.

---

<sup>366</sup> Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 857 n. 238 fears that de Boer's rigidly 'Christological' reading of faith in Galatians might prompt some to abandon even the 'Christological' reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ. One wonders what he would make of Campbell's even more radically 'monological' approach, *The Deliverance of God*, 1159 n. 113, cf. 875 & 1149 n. 39.



#### 4.1.1 Does the use of πίστις in Galatians 3:23-25 determine its use throughout Galatians?

De Boer's account of πίστις in Galatians 3:23-25 is a more developed version of the account offered by Martyn and is largely consistent with Campbell's approach, so we will focus on his account, with some further refinements suggested by Campbell. At an early stage of his commentary (in an excursus on Galatians 1:12) de Boer points out the decisive role of Galatians 3:23 in understanding what faith is in the letter, 'To anticipate the comment on this passage later, the context indicates that Paul here understands "faith" to be a metonym for Christ himself.<sup>367</sup> At the first actual occurrence of πίστις in the letter at 1:23 he says much the same thing and again points to Galatians 3:23-26.<sup>368</sup> Then in the first of a sequence of three important excursuses<sup>369</sup> on the various πίστις expressions of Galatians 2:16-3:29 it is the role of Galatians 3:23-25 that is the first and most substantial argument in favour of the subjective rendering of Galatians' πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions:

In 3:22, Paul refers once again to "the faith of Jesus Christ," as he does in 2:16a; in the verses that immediately follow (3:23-25), Paul speaks of "Faith" (*pistis*) in a personified way, as a virtual synonym

---

<sup>367</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 82.

<sup>368</sup> Ibid, 103.

<sup>369</sup> Ibid, 148-50; 74-75 & 192-93.

for Christ (3:24): Faith “came” into the world stage at a certain juncture in time (3:23,25), as Christ himself did (3:19). As a result “we are no longer under a custodian” (3:25), meaning not “under the law” (3:23), which was “our custodian until [*eis*] Christ” (3:24), that is, “until [*eis*] Faith should be revealed” (3:23). Faith is not here an intrinsic human possibility nor even a human activity. In these verses, as perhaps already in 1:23, . . . “Faith” functions as a metonym for Christ . . . “Faith” here is something that belongs to or defines Christ himself.<sup>370</sup>

What then of this argument? First, all agree that the three arthous occurrences of πίστις in 3:23 & 25 do form a chain. They are all speaking of the same faith throughout. Second, though Moo is correct in suggesting the possibility that the arthous πίστις of 3:23 could be referring back to the participial form τοῖς πιστεύουσιν in 3:22,<sup>371</sup> it seems more likely, given the presence of the noun form in the expression πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in the same clause of 3:22, that the articular accusative πίστιν of 3:23 refers back to it. Thus, πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and all the occurrences of πίστις in 3:23, 25 refer to the same thing. For de Boer in particular,

---

<sup>370</sup> Ibid, 149, cf. 193. Cf. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 867ff.

<sup>371</sup> Moo, *Galatians*, 47.

this is crucial. Despite a couple of slips in his comments on 3:23-25 where he seems to suggest that the meaning of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 3:22 determines the meaning of πίστις in 3:23-25, or that ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν (3:24) cannot mean anything other than the parallel δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ in 2:16,<sup>372</sup> de Boer has otherwise consistently argued in the opposite direction: the meaning of πίστις in 3:23-25 determines the meaning of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 3:22, and consequently the meaning of the πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions of 2:16 & 20, and the use of πίστις throughout Galatians with the sole exception of Galatians 5:22. For reasons that will become clearer as our argument unfolds, we are inclined to *largely* agree with de Boer regarding the *consistency* of Paul's usage of πίστις especially within 2:15-3:26 but disagree with de Boer as to its *referent*.<sup>373</sup>

Third, while faith might be personified in these verses it is not so clear that faith functions as a synonym for Christ, or how it functions as a metonym of Christ. It is true that both the Seed, which is Christ, and faith 'come' (3:19, 23, 25). It is also true that the law functions as a custodian 'until' faith or Christ arrived (3:23, 24). However, neither of those things establish that faith is a synonym for Christ. The coming of faith is clearly correlated with the coming of Christ in these texts, but just as

---

<sup>372</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 238 & 239 n. 351.

<sup>373</sup> Contra Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 857 n. 238.

correlation is not cause, neither is it identity of reference. The fact that faith is to some extent or other personified in 3:23-25 does not mean it must refer to a person any more than the other personified term, namely Law, in Galatians 3:23-25 does. When de Boer and Campbell refer to faith as being a metonym for Christ they might be more accurate. Faith is clearly closely related to Christ, so much so that by referring to one, one can be referring to the other, or be referring to a complex of realities of which both are inherent and prominent parts. As Campbell recognises in his discussion, metonymy can be pressed into the service of either a more 'anthropological' or a more 'Christological' understanding of faith.<sup>374</sup> The likelihood of which of the two is intended depends on other explicit signals. One can as easily read of 'this faith in Christ' coming and being revealed as one can of 'this faithfulness of Christ,'<sup>375</sup> the question is which one is more likely. We must underline at this point that de Boer's version of the argument for the consistently 'Christological' reference of πίστις in Galatians 2-3 has not delivered a single decisive consideration in its favour. At best de Boer could argue that there is systematic ambiguity about πίστις throughout Galatians 2-3 and try to resolve it on other grounds. As we have already seen in the previous chapter, both de Boer's and

---

<sup>374</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 834.

<sup>375</sup> The article has been deliberately glossed as a near demonstrative in these English glosses to remove the distortion caused by the mismatching functions of the English definite article and the Greek article, which is anaphoric here.

Campbell's attempts to deploy linguistic arguments to determine the meaning of πίστις Χριστοῦ have been shown to be flawed, and therefore can play no part in arriving in a decision about the meaning of πίστις in Galatians 3.

Fourthly, it is worthwhile to pause and to reflect on de Boer's comments about faith not being 'an intrinsic human possibility nor even a human activity.' It is not entirely clear who de Boer is aiming at here.<sup>376</sup> On the one hand, one would want to agree with de Boer that there is nothing *intrinsic* about faith. Further, one might also want to be properly cautious about the use of *possibility*. On the other hand, faith is a 'human activity,' not merely in the sense which de Boer would also accept, i.e. Christ's obedient faithfulness to God as a human being, but also in the sense that it is humans who πιστεύουσιν in Galatians 2:16; 3:6, 22.<sup>377</sup> The idea that Galatians 3:22-25 is referring to a state of affairs where people can now have, and in fact some do have 'faith in Christ,' has not been excluded by de Boer. That that faith's origin is not endogenous is not in dispute.

---

<sup>376</sup> Bultmann maybe? Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 251 n.14; cf. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 879.

<sup>377</sup> That faith is a human activity is underlined by Martyn, *Galatians*, Excursus #29 'Placing One's Trust In Christ Jesus', 275-76.

Despite de Boer's claims, Galatians 3:23-25 does not decisively deliver an unambiguously Christological interpretation of πίστις. If this is the case then the rest of his argument dissolves also. Πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 3:22 does not then necessarily mean 'the faithfulness of Christ.' In the case of that text it may well be the case that the prepositional phrase emphasises the object of faith and the participle form encodes the agents/experiencers of faith. The other πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions of 2:16 & 20 then do not necessarily mean 'the faithfulness of Christ' either. Furthermore, neither is the ἐκ πίστεως of 3:24 unambiguously 'Christological.' If that is so, then 3:24 does not provide the 'Christological' argument for the interpretation of all the other ἐκ πίστεως expressions of the letter (2:16; 3:7, 8, 9, 11, 12), nor the διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως expressions either (2:16; 3:14, 26). It is important to note at this point that we have not yet offered an alternative account of the meaning of these expressions, but simply demonstrated that de Boer does not have a decisive contextual argument for preferring the consistently 'Christological' interpretation of πίστις in the letter.

4.1.2 Does Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 at Galatians 3:11 provide an independent confirmation of a 'Christological' understanding of expressions that contain ἐκ πίστεως throughout Galatians?

Thus far we have established that there are no *decisive* linguistic (Chap 3.2) nor contextual (Chap 4.1.1) arguments for *consistently* taking πίστις in Galatians in a 'Christological' sense. Might there then be some independent line of argument that would push us in that direction? Campbell suggests that there is one derived from the consistent way in which Paul deploys Habakkuk 2:4 and the fact that Paul's ἐκ πίστεως expressions are strictly limited to the two letters where Paul also quotes that OT text.<sup>378</sup> Within the section of Galatians we are currently investigating Paul uses Habakkuk 2:4 at Galatians 3:11:

Gal 3:11      ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον,  
  
                  ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται·

the last clause of which is a quotation of Habakkuk 2:4. Campbell has repeatedly pointed out that Paul's use of this text and the occurrence of ἐκ πίστεως expressions

---

<sup>378</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 377, and 1033 n. 16, where Campbell traces this observation back to Bruno Corsani, 'ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in the Letters of Paul.', in *The New Testament Age: Essays in honor of Bo Reicke*. (ed. William B. Weinrich; Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1984), 87–93.

correlate perfectly in Paul's letters, and that thus Paul's understanding of Habakkuk 2:4 might be decisive to understanding his ἐκ πίστεως expressions. Given that a number of Paul's πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions are embedded within phrases headed by ἐκ πίστεως, understanding Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 might be decisive for their interpretation also. To use a phrase of Campbell's to describe his own position, the 'interpretive causality' runs from Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4, to the meaning of ἐκ πίστεως, to πίστις Χριστοῦ, and finally to *all* of Paul's usages of πίστις in Galatians.<sup>379</sup> Campbell further argues that Paul interprets Habakkuk 2:4 neither 'anthropologically' nor theocentrically, but rather, consistently interprets it 'Christologically' in both Galatians and Romans, concluding that a 'Christologically' interpreted Habakkuk 2:4 lies behind all of Paul's usages of ἐκ πίστεως and derived and equivalent expressions. Christ is the faithful one in Habakkuk 2:4, and it is his faithfulness that is in view each time that Paul uses ἐκ πίστεως. Campbell's argument also gives Galatians 3:23-25 a critical role, but aligns the shape of the argument in Galatians 2-3 with an independent judgment about the 'Christological' reading of Habakkuk 2:4. In effect Galatians 3:23-25 *and* Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 are mutually

---

<sup>379</sup> In responding to Tilling, Campbell modifies his position somewhat, Tilling ed., *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul*, 251.



supportive arguments for a thoroughly 'Christological' reading.<sup>380</sup> To that extent then, Campbell's argument is somewhat less brittle than de Boer's. Since, however, we have already called into question his reading of Galatians 3:23-25, can Campbell's view regarding Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 carry the weight of the consistently 'Christological' understanding of πίστις in Galatians?

Campbell argues that the brevity with which Paul introduces this material in Galatians 3:6-14 and the fact he reuses a number of these texts in Romans suggest that Paul used them 'for fixed pedagogical purposes.'<sup>381</sup> In his treatment of the use of Habakkuk 2:4 in the context of Galatians 3:6-15 Campbell asserts rather than demonstrates his 'Christological' reading of ἐκ πίστεως. He does attempt to demonstrate how a 'Christological' reading works in the context of 3:6-15 but admits candidly that an 'anthropological' reading is possible, though to his mind unlikely because it requires the importation of 'a considerable amount of explanatory material into the gaps in this text.'<sup>382</sup> But let us note the material that both sides of this question have to supply. Both Campbell and many 'anthropological' readers of Paul's faith terminology share the presumption that Genesis 15:6, Leviticus 18:5 and

---

<sup>380</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 865 where he claims the interpretation of Galatians 3:15-26 is decisive for the interpretation of 2:16-3:14.

<sup>381</sup> Ibid, 858.

<sup>382</sup> Ibid, 865.

Habakkuk 2:4 represent OT texts, and arguments derived from them, Paul had already used, and these would have been familiar to the Galatians.<sup>383</sup> In that respect both sides have to supply a similar amount of extra explanation from beyond the text itself. Campbell has to supply a 'Christological' reading of Habakkuk 2:4 from beyond Galatians since nothing in the text requires this reading of it. 'Anthropological' readers meanwhile have to supply a connection between 'anthropological' faith in Galatians 3:11 and the 'Christological' solution of 3:13-14. Though Campbell believes that 'anthropological' readers must supply 'a considerable amount of explanatory material'<sup>384</sup> it does not seem to be far more than to say that one's faith is directed towards the Christ through whom the solution has been provided, something that on our reading Galatians 2:16 has already stated emphatically. The explanatory burden either theory bears does not seem to be disproportionate, though Campbell has to import an aspect of his 'Christological' reading from Romans. Campbell claims the 'interpretive causality' runs from the more explicit Romans to the terser Galatians.<sup>385</sup>

At this point it might be useful to compare Campbell with de Boer's and Martyn's understandings of Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4. Like Campbell, de Boer believes that

---

<sup>383</sup> This is in contrast to Martyn, *Issues*, 159 and de Boer, *Galatians*, 192 n. 276, cf. 204.

<sup>384</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 865.

<sup>385</sup> *Ibid*, 836.

Paul is using Habakkuk 2:4 'Christologically.' However, the direction of 'interpretive causality' is reversed in de Boer: he sees Paul's use of πίστις and ἐκ πίστεως in Galatians 3:23-25 as determining the meaning of ἐκ πίστεως in the quotation of Habakkuk 2:4 at Galatians 3:11. It is not so much that Paul reads Habakkuk 2:4 'Christologically' and brings that reading to his argument in Galatians 3:6-14, but rather Paul uses the language of Habakkuk 2:4 in a way that is consistent with his 'Christological' interpretation of πίστις.<sup>386</sup> De Boer also explicitly rejects Hays' 'Christological' reading of ὁ δίκαιος that Campbell endorses.<sup>387</sup> De Boer points out that to interpret 'the righteous one' of Habakkuk 2:4 as a reference to Christ in Galatians 3:11b 'makes the relationship between the two halves of the verse (more) difficult.'<sup>388</sup> The difficulty lies in that it interrupts the 'all who', the 'everyone', the 'no one,' and 'the one who does' of Galatians 3:10-12 with a reference to Christ. Further, unlike elsewhere in Paul (1 Corinthians 1:30; Romans 4:45) the link between Christ's righteousness or his own justification and that of the Christian is not developed in Galatians.

---

<sup>386</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 204-05.

<sup>387</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 613-15.

<sup>388</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 205 n. 298.

Martyn also rejects Hays' similar 'Christological' reading of ὁ δίκαιος,<sup>389</sup> and further, does not read the ἐκ πίστεως of Habakkuk 2:4 'Christologically' either. In fact in Martyn's view, prior to the occurrence in 3:24, the (οἱ) ἐκ πίστεως expressions are primarily 'anthropological' even if they do have a 'Christological' dimension to them. It is worth quoting him at length at this point:

From Gal 3:7, 8 and 9 one sees, then, that in the first instance Paul hears in Hab 2:4 a reference to faith on the part of the human being whom God has rectified in Christ. As we have seen repeatedly, however, that faith is far from being an autonomous deed of the human being. Just as the faith of which Habakkuk speaks is a reflection of God's faithfulness, so the faith to which Paul refers is elicited, kindled, incited by the faith of Christ, enacted in his atoning death. For that reason Paul can use the single word "faith" to speak simultaneously of Christ's faith and of the faith it kindles, referring in fact to the coming of this faith as the eschatological event that is also the coming of Christ (3:23-25). In the promise of Hab 2:4 he hears, then, a reference to this hypostatized faith.<sup>390</sup>

---

<sup>389</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 313 n. 93, & 314.

<sup>390</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 314.

Campbell thoroughly rejects the idea that *faith* in Galatians 3 refers to Christian faith in Christ. Martyn and Campbell are opposed at this point, with de Boer recognising a similar *polarity* in Paul's πίστις expressions as Martyn, but reversing their *priority*. For de Boer, it is 'Christological' faith that is primary in Galatians 3 with some kind of secondary reference to Christian faith in Christ. While Martyn reads Galatians 3:22-26 similarly to de Boer and Campbell,<sup>391</sup> his handling of ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως at 3:2 & 5 leads him in another direction.

Campbell has not presented compelling reasons to understand Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 in Galatians 'Christologically.' The near context of Galatians 3:6-14 does not require it. De Boer rejects Hays', and thus Campbell's, 'Christological' reading of ὁ δίκαιος, and only endorses the 'Christological' reading of ἐκ πίστεως at 3:11 because of Paul's use elsewhere in Galatians 3. Martyn sees the attraction of 'Christological' readings but has no difficulty in affirming that in the context of 3:6-14 Paul primarily has 'anthropological' faith in mind. And as we shall see in the next section Francis Watson's understanding of how Paul deploys Habakkuk 2:4 is more convincing. It does not seem then that Habakkuk 2:4 provides the ARG with an independent argument for understanding Paul's faith terminology 'Christologically.'

---

<sup>391</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 99, 361-63; Martyn, 'Apocalyptic Gospel', 254-55.

At this point in our argument it is important to take stock. As we saw in chapter 3 on Galatians 2:15-21 none of the *linguistic* arguments for the 'Christological' rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ put forward by the ARG are decisive. The key *contextual* argument for the 'Christological' reading of πίστις and πίστεως Χριστοῦ derived from Paul's argument at Galatians 3:23-25 has, on inspection, turned out to be less than decisive. Finally, the lone voice within the ARG to argue that Paul's 'Christological' understanding of Habakkuk 2:4 at Galatians 3:11 constitutes an independent line of evidence has failed to persuade his fellow apocalyptic readers, and with good reason. The ARG has failed to supply a decisive reason to adopt the partially 'Christological' understanding of πίστις advanced by Martyn, nor the consistently 'Christological' understanding advanced by de Boer and Campbell. This is not to say that such a reading is impossible, but lacks decisive evidence. However, the alternative so-called 'anthropological' reading of πίστις does have evidence which favours it, and to this we now turn.

4.1.3 If an 'anthropological' reading of πίστις in Galatians 3:1-4:7 is possible, is there evidence that it is either probable or even necessary?

Both James Dunn and Francis Watson have in recent years adopted the position that the ἐκ πίστεως phrases in Romans and Galatians are decisive for a proper

interpretation of the πίστις Χριστοῦ formulations in Paul.<sup>392</sup> In this they are in agreement with Campbell. Further, Watson explicitly agrees with Campbell that it is Paul's understanding of Habakkuk 2:4 that is decisive in determining his use of ἐκ πίστεως in both letters.<sup>393</sup> Dunn and Watson's treatments of Paul's ἐκ πίστεως phrases are quite compatible with one another, with Dunn paying rather more attention to the 'interpretive causality,' as Campbell puts it, that allows us as interpreters today to determine how Paul is using this key phrase, especially in Galatians 3:6-10, and with Watson paying rather more attention to what Campbell might call the historical and intertextual causality that led to Paul using these expressions in the first place.

For Dunn the exegesis of Galatians 3:6-10 is key. While in earlier work Dunn had advanced linguistic considerations in support of his 'anthropological' understanding

---

<sup>392</sup> James D. G. Dunn, 'ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ'; Francis Watson, 'By Faith (of Christ)'.

<sup>393</sup> Watson, 'By Faith (of Christ)'; In his preface to Bird and Sprinkle, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, xviii, Dunn endorses Watson, but note difference on how decisive Habakkuk 2:4 is. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 377, on the correlation of Habakkuk 2:4 with the prepositional phrase in Paul. Spallek's dissertation is worth consulting but (i.) is orientated towards Stanley Stowers interpretation of the ἐκ πίστεως / διὰ πίστεως distinction in Romans 3:30, and (ii.) is oddly inconclusive about Paul's usage of the prepositional phrase in Galatians. His work has now been overtaken by Dunn and Watson, Andrew John Spallek, 'St. Paul's Use of ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Romans and Galatians: The Significance of Paul's Choice of Prepositions with ΠΙΣΤΙΣ as Object and Its Bearing upon Justification by Faith'. STM Thesis. Concordia Seminary, St. Louis 1996.

of πίστις Χριστοῦ,<sup>394</sup> in a 2008 festschrift for his sparring partner Richard Hays, he eschews linguistic arguments and opts for a thoroughly contextual method for determining what Paul means by his ἐκ πίστεως expressions in Romans and Galatians.<sup>395</sup> According to Dunn, Galatians 3:6-10 'clearly defines Christians by reference to Abraham's believing.'<sup>396</sup> Galatians 3:7 should be understood to be saying that 'those ἐκ πίστεως' are those who have believed just like Abraham did. Dunn claims that Hays' 1983 exegesis of Galatians 3:6-9 is unconvincing, and he notes that Martyn, who follows Hays in part, does not argue for a 'Christological' reference to πίστις in Galatians 3:8.<sup>397</sup> For Dunn, the conceptual parallelism between Abraham in Galatians 3:6 and the Gentiles of Galatians 3:8 could not be clearer: both believe and are justified. Dunn presses his argument home when he points out that Hays' later admission that πίστις refers to human believing in 3:7-9, & 14 is in fact fatal to Hays' overall thesis.<sup>398</sup>

If ἐκ πίστεως refers to Gentile believing in Galatians 3:6-10, claims Dunn, then it would make sense for Paul to understand the phrase likewise in his citation of

---

<sup>394</sup> James D. G. Dunn, 'Once More ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ'.

<sup>395</sup> Dunn, 'ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ', 357-59.

<sup>396</sup> Ibid, 360.

<sup>397</sup> Ibid, 361 n. 30.

<sup>398</sup> Ibid, 361-62 n. 32, citing Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 2nd ed., 269.



Habakkuk 2:4 at Galatians 3:11. Further, the preceding ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως expressions of 3:2, & 5 should be then drawn into the orbit of the ἐκ πίστεως motif. Dunn sees this line of reasoning confirmed in Paul's use of Abraham's πίστις in Romans 4 where, despite the different emphasis of the argument and the relative infrequency of ἐκ πίστεως within that unit, it is clear from Romans 4:16 that Paul uses the expression to describe believing Gentiles as having the same faith as Abraham.<sup>399</sup>

Dunn then poses the question, if 'anthropological' faith is so clearly intended in Galatians 3:2-14 (and for that matter Rom 3:27-5:1) then what signals suggest that the ἐκ πίστεως of 3:22 should be understood differently from the earlier ones? He adds in a footnote Silva's observation that given the prevalence of πίστις as Christian faith in God/Christ throughout early Christian writings, it would require clear contextual indicators when it was being used otherwise.<sup>400</sup>

Watson's approach is to focus on Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4. Agreeing with Campbell, he notes the tight correlation between Paul's citation of that OT text and the occurrence of ἐκ πίστεως. However, he goes beyond Campbell by noting the strong further correlation between ἐκ πίστεως, both in shorter and more developed forms

---

<sup>399</sup> Dunn, 'ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ', 363-64.

<sup>400</sup> Ibid, 364 n. 35, citing Silva, 'Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians', 230-31.

like ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and various δικαιο- expressions. Watson argues that:

(1) The more developed forms such as ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and even other forms such as ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως are derived from ἐκ πίστεως.<sup>401</sup> (2) Given the tight correlation between the occurrence of ἐκ πίστεως and Habakkuk 2:4 in the Pauline letters, and the function of Habakkuk 2:4 in those letters, then ἐκ πίστεως and its derivatives stem from Habakkuk 2:4.<sup>402</sup> (3) Where Paul might use ὁ δίκαιος as a Christological title it has been derived from Isaiah 53:11 and not Habakkuk 2:4.<sup>403</sup> (4) Not only has Paul derived ἐκ πίστεως from Habakkuk 2:4, but also its relationship to δικαιο- terms. (5) Paul never directly relates 'life' or 'to live' with ἐκ πίστεως, but that he relates ἐκ πίστεως with δικαιο- terms on multiple occasions (Gal 2:16; 3:8, 24; 5:5; Rom 1:17; 3:26, 30; 5:1; 9:30; 10:6) indicates that, whatever we might think the correct interpretation of Habakkuk 2:4 is, *Paul* understood it as 'the righteous by faith.' 'We have to determine at what point Paul *divides* his Habakkuk citation. . . . The entire exegetical debate about the faith-of-Christ formulations is encapsulated in this question.'<sup>404</sup> According to Watson, Paul understood Habakkuk 2:4 to say 'the righteous-by-faith shall live.' Watson's argument is compelling and provides strong reasons to see Christian faith as playing a significant role in the matter of justification

---

<sup>401</sup> Watson, 'By Faith (of Christ)', 152-53.

<sup>402</sup> Ibid, 153ff.

<sup>403</sup> Ibid, 158.

<sup>404</sup> Ibid, 159-60.

/ rectification and for understanding πίστις Χριστοῦ as referring to that same Christian faith but now with its object explicitly expressed.

Chris Tilling in a recent exposition of Campbell's view of faith attempts to defend it from Watson's criticism.<sup>405</sup> Tilling advances five brief arguments against Watson's position, but since four of the five either simply miss Watson's point or fail to notice that Watson has already directly addressed the objection, we are left with one argument that actually engages with Watson's position. Tilling argues that *faith* is correlated with *life* in at least two Pauline passages, Romans 4:16-17 and 6:8. However, neither text constitutes anything close to a direct correlation of ἐκ πίστεως with *life*. In Romans 4:16-17, while *life* terminology and ἐκ πίστεως occur within the same complex clause, they are not otherwise in grammatical or logical relationship to one another. In Romans 6:8 the prepositional phrase is not present at all, which makes it questionably relevant as a riposte to Watson. Granted the verb πιστεύω is used, but it is used there with ὅτι to indicate the content of a belief about being made alive with Christ, rather than a causal relationship where the belief leads to the life. Neither

---

<sup>405</sup> Chris Tilling, 'Campbell's Faith: Advancing the Pistis Christou Debate', in *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul: Reflections on the Work of Douglas Campbell* (ed. Chris Tilling; Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2014), 248-49.

Tilling, nor Campbell who responds to Tilling, have successfully advanced the discussion beyond Watson's case.<sup>406</sup>

We would simply offer a minor modification to Watson's position, and suggest a further confirmation from the perspective of linguistic information structuring theory. (1) Like most on both sides of this discussion, Watson sees the interchange of *διὰ πίστεως* and *ἐκ πίστεως* expressions as merely 'stylistic'.<sup>407</sup> It seems more probable due to the wider, though not more frequent, distribution of the *διὰ πίστεως* expressions in Paul's writings,<sup>408</sup> and the strong correlation between citations of Habakkuk 2:4, *δικαιο-* terms, and *ἐκ πίστεως*, that *διὰ πίστεως* might be the more natural way for Paul to express the relationship between *πίστεως* (Χριστοῦ) and *δικαιο-* terms in his own idiolect, but that the influence of Habakkuk 2:4 leads him to use *ἐκ* over *διὰ*. Where Habakkuk 2:4 has played no part, such as in Philippians 3:8-9, Paul uses *διὰ πίστεως*. Where Habakkuk 2:4 does play a part, *ἐκ* predominates but Paul occasionally reverts to *διὰ πίστεως*.<sup>409</sup> If this is indeed the case, then instead of

---

<sup>406</sup> Campbell's response to Tilling can be found in Tilling, *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul*, 251-52.

<sup>407</sup> Watson, 'By Faith (of Christ)', 161.

<sup>408</sup> Rom 3:22, 25, 30, 31; 2 Cor 5:7; Gal 2:16; 3:14, 26; Eph 2:8; 3:12, 17; Phil 3:9; Col 2:12; 2 Tim 3:15. *διὰ* + *πίστεως* occurs in contexts where *ἐκ* + *πίστεως* does, and in ones where it does not, whether or not one adopts a 7, 10, or 13 letter Pauline canon. *ἐκ* + *πίστεως* is found *exclusively* in Galatians and Romans.

<sup>409</sup> E.g. Rom 3:22, 25, 30-31; Gal 2:16a; 3:14, 26.

being a mere stylistic variation, or a potential indicator of source dependency,<sup>410</sup> the *διὰ πίστεως* expressions confirm that both they and the equivalent *ἐκ πίστεως* expressions ought to be understood *causally* or *instrumentally*, at least in Paul. So even where Paul uses *ἐκ πίστεως* we should think that he is thinking in terms not of justification's *origin* in faith, which *ἐκ* alone might suggest, but rather that he is thinking of justification being *through* faith, or *by means of* faith (in Christ).<sup>411</sup>

(2) As we argued in Chapter 3 regarding Galatians 2:16b, Paul has expressed himself there in such a way that *πιστεύω* is especially salient within the complex sentence, and *ἐκ/διὰ πίστις Χριστοῦ* is also prominent and repeated. Whatever the precise view one might take of Galatians 2:15-21's role within the structure of Galatians as a whole, it is clear that 2:16ff. introduces key terms that will play an important role within 3:1-4:7 at least. Given the salience of *πιστεύω* in 2:16 it would not then be surprising if Christian believing/faitth would play at least as significant a role in 3:1-4:7 as the other terms introduced in 2:16. On the consistent apocalyptic/'Christological' reading of de Boer and Campbell it does not; on Watson's and Dunn's approach it does. Contextual,

---

<sup>410</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 143.

<sup>411</sup> Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament*, 112-13 agrees with our conclusion but does not consider the recent discussion of Paul's *ἐκ πίστεως* expressions dependency on Habakkuk 2:4. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 627, makes a similar observation based on the interchange of the same prepositions in Romans 3.

intertextual and information structuring considerations align to confirm that Paul is speaking of Christian Christ-directed faith throughout Galatians 2:15-4:7 whenever he uses a πιστ- term there.

Rather than seeing Galatians 3:22-25 as the key to the πιστ- terminology of the letter, we suggest that there are three somewhat independent indicators that Christian trust in Christ is a key concern of the letter: the salience of the verb in 2:16, a text that introduces many of the key ideas of Galatians 3; the use of Genesis 15:6 at Galatians 3:6; and probably most decisively, Watson's argument that the exclusive way Paul associates ἐκ πίστεως with δικαιο- terms informs us of how he reads Habakkuk 2:4. Once the meaning of ἐκ πίστεως has been determined then the meanings of διὰ πίστεως, οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, ἐκ / διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, and the anaphoric articular τὴν πίστιν / τῆς πίστεως of 3:23-25 then follow. Watson, Dunn and our arguments all point towards the fact acknowledged by Campbell, 'Galatians . . . turns out to be all about "faith,"'<sup>412</sup> but not Christ's faith(fulness) but rather Christian faith in Christ.

---

<sup>412</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 838.

## 4.2 Does Paul reframe and/or redefine δικαιώω in Galatians 3:1-4:7?

On Martyn's reading of Galatians, the language of justification, or rather *rectification*, was introduced into the Galatian situation by the Agitators.<sup>413</sup> Martyn believes that in Galatians 2:6-21 Paul does not attempt to redefine or correctly define what rectification is, but simply sharply separates it from observance of the Law.<sup>414</sup> However, Paul's silence regarding what rectification is in 2:16-21 creates space for him to give a new definition in Galatians 3:6-4:7, which is the second of the three sections of the letter where δικαιω- terms play a key role.

So what is the reframing and redefinition that Paul gives to this traditionally Jewish-Christian language that had been taken up by the Agitators? First, Paul places rectification within the context of a drama of cosmic warfare. Instead of a landscape where God, Christ and sinful human beings are the principal participants, Paul sees the cosmos as a battlefield that also includes anti-God powers: 'in that setting the need of human beings is not so much forgiveness of their sins as deliverance from

---

<sup>413</sup> Or at least if Paul had used the language at all, it was the Agitators' use of it that prompted the more developed account of δικαιώω / δικαιοσύνη given by Paul in Galatians, Martyn, *Galatians*, 250, 269ff, 275.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid, 268, 274; cf. de Boer, *Galatians*, 154.

malignant powers that hold them in bondage.<sup>415</sup> Second, and here we'll quote Martyn in full:

But now Christ's death is seen to have happened in collision with the Law, and human beings are not said to need forgiveness, but rather deliverance from a genuine slavery that involves the Law. In this second rectification passage the Law proves to be not so much a norm which we have transgressed - although transgressions are involved (3:19) - as a tyrant, insofar as it has placed us under the power of its curse. And by his death Christ is not said to have accomplished our forgiveness, but rather our redemption from slavery. With the apocalyptic shift to a scene in which there are real powers arrayed against God, rectification acquires, then, a new synonym, *exagorazô*, "to redeem by delivering from slavery" (3:13; 4:5).<sup>176</sup> And, as we have noted, one of the powers from whose tyranny Christ has delivered us is the Law in its role as the pronouncer of a curse on the whole of humanity.<sup>416</sup>

---

<sup>415</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 273.

<sup>416</sup> Ibid, 273.



Note in particular Martyn's key claim here about the meaning of δικαιο- language: it is now essentially synonymous with the language of redemption from hostile powers.<sup>417</sup> While Martyn is rightly seen as a formidable adversary of the so-called 'New Perspective on Paul,' at this point he is also at some distance from the classical Reformation understanding of justification as well.<sup>418</sup> Martyn's Paul is not so interested in the issues of forgiveness and/or the right relation of the individual before God but rather Paul is more interested in presenting a *cosmological* theology of salvation.

Martyn's exegesis of Galatians 3:10-14 supports his summary of the position outlined above. Further, Paul's continued use of ἐξαγοράζω not only at 3:13 but in 4:5 also is understood to constitute a redefinition of δικαιο- language. Galatians 4:3-5 is described by Martyn as '

nothing less than the theological centre of the entire letter. It

contains nearly all of the letter's major motifs, and it relates them to

one another in such a way as to state what we might call the good

---

<sup>417</sup> Ibid, 273 n. 176 esp., cf. 317 on Gal 3:13 and 388 on Gal 4:5.

<sup>418</sup> Martyn indicates his dependence on Sanders's new perspective on Judaism, but distances himself from Dunn and Wright's new perspective on Paul, *Galatians*, 147 n. 176, 347 esp. n. 182. Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), considers Martyn a strong critic of the New Perspective, 235-40.

news of Paul's letter to the Galatians . . . One can read the whole letter as lines of thought radiating out from 4:3-5 in such a way as to explicate the theme stated in 1:6-9.<sup>419</sup>

And this is of course in line with Martyn's claim that Galatians 1:4b and 6:14 form a cosmological apocalyptic frame for the whole letter.<sup>420</sup>

So what do we make of Martyn's claim? First, in chapter 2 above, we have disputed de Boer and Martyn's claim that Paul in common with other Second Temple sources was conscious of a clear distinction between a *forensic* and a *cosmological* apocalyptic eschatology. As de Boer points out himself, many sources from the period show no difficulty in combining both broadly forensic and cosmological perspectives, and Paul does so himself.<sup>421</sup> Neither Martyn, nor de Boer, really explore sufficiently the ongoing presence of strongly forensic motifs within works that also show indications of cosmological apocalyptic features.

---

<sup>419</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 388 & 389.

<sup>420</sup> Ibid, 98 & 273 n. 176.

<sup>421</sup> De Boer, 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology', 177 & 182; de Boer, 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology', 360. See Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 314-15 for a trenchant comment on this.

Second, we must question whether Galatians 1:4b, which is allegedly a Pauline creation, should be set in too strong a contrast with Galatians 1:4a, which is part of Paul and the Agitators' shared inheritance from the early Jewish-Christian church. Other possibilities for the relation of 1:4a and 1:4b exist other than the latter qualifying the former.

Third, the key claim at this point in Martyn's exposition of the letter is that ἐξαγοράζω functions as a synonym of δικαιόω in 3:13 and 4:5, and further that *both* are synonymous with ἐξαίρέω in 1:4b. It is interesting to note that de Boer is more circumspect at this point, only claiming that ἐξαγοράζω and ἐξαίρέω are synonyms, but not claiming that they are synonyms of δικαιόω.<sup>422</sup> De Boer does not in fact follow Martyn by claiming that Paul *redefines* δικαιόω in Galatians 3:1-4:7, but rather sees Paul *displacing* justification language with language more consistent with that of *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*. Martyn never presents an argument for his identification of synonymy between δικαιόω and ἐξαγοράζω either in his extended comment on rectification or in the detailed exegesis of either the δικαιόω or ἐξαγοράζω texts. Martyn, de Boer and Campbell are all agreed that the Agitators

---

<sup>422</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 210.

had a forensic-eschatological understanding of δικαιώ.<sup>423</sup> How then do Galatians 3:13-14 and 4:3-5 function as redefinitions of δικαιώ? The bare assertion of synonymy seems weak for the following reasons:

(i.) There is no explicit linkage of the terms in Galatians. While both δικαιώ and ἐξαγοράζω function within the developing argument of 3:10-14, the relationship between them is not spelled out. ἐξαγοράζω is neither introduced in some kind of exegetical structure relating to δικαιώ, nor are there repeated instances where both terms function identically within the same slot in the semantic structure of Paul's various statements.

(ii.) The argument for synonymy might have carried more weight if ἐξαγοράζω was also modified by expressions such as ἐκ πίστεως, or Christ was the agentive subject of δικαιώ as well as ἐξαγοράζω. Both verbs ultimately have the same objects in view, namely we/us (3:13 & 3:24), but then so do other soteriological realities in Galatians such as adoption and the gift of the Spirit which are not identical to δικαιο- (4:5-6).

---

<sup>423</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 264-69; de Boer, *Galatians*, 164, 186; Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 845.

(iii.) Martyn could conceivably respond to our criticism by saying that since Christ lies behind the ἐκ πίστεως statements then the link between ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως (3:11) and Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν (3:14) is more direct than might first appear. However, not only has Martyn himself resisted collapsing the ἐκ πίστεως statements into affirmations primarily about Christ's death (especially at 3:11),<sup>424</sup> but we have already presented evidence earlier in this chapter for rejecting the view that ἐκ πίστεως is a way of speaking of Christ's faithful death.

(iv.) Martyn might also respond by saying that there is no difficulty in seeing adoption, the gift of the Spirit, rectification and redemption as essentially synonymous. In fact he does extend his claim of synonymity when he says, 'we must at least mention two further ones [synonyms]: For Paul God makes things right by bringing life where there was death (Gal 3:21; Rom 4:17) and by creating community where there was division (Gal 3:28; note *heis* ["one"]).'<sup>425</sup> However, rectification, redemption, the gifts of life, the Spirit, and adoption can only be made synonymous by expanding the meaning of each. Once that is done, questions can still be asked about the internal structure of setting-to-rights-of-the-cosmos-by-redemption-and-the-gift-of-the-Spirit-life-and-adoption. How do these relate to one another? Bruce

---

<sup>424</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 314.

<sup>425</sup> *Ibid.*, 273.

McCormack makes a similar observation regarding other aspects of Martyn's position on rectification: 'But images and concepts alone, no matter how rhetorically powerful, do not rise to the level of an adequate explanation. How is it that the "rectification" of the world is achieved by Christ's faithful death? How can the faithful death of a single human being achieve a military victory over the anti-God powers?' And he goes on to pose more ontological and explanatory questions.<sup>426</sup>

Returning to 3:10-14 it might seem better to relate the various eschatological-soteriological realities there in ways other than synonymy. For instance one could argue that Christ's redemption of his people by becoming a curse on the tree and thus somehow exhausting or absorbing the curse for them is appropriated by believing in him (cf. 2:16) resulting in justification before God and thus (eternal) life. Martyn has not excluded this possibility.

Martyn's case for a cosmological apocalyptic redefinition of δικαιώω by ἐξαγοράζω does not seem to withstand scrutiny. No considerations have been advanced that undermine the view that Paul has a Christian, and typical forensic-eschatological view of justification in mind as he develops his argument in Galatians 3. Rather, Paul differs

---

<sup>426</sup> McCormack, 'Can We Still Speak of "Justification by Faith"? An in-House Debate with Apocalyptic Readings of Paul', 167.

from his more typical Second Temple contemporaries in giving faith a role in justification, specifically the Christian's faith in Christ. As we turn from Galatians 3:1-4:7 to the final section of Galatians where both πίστις and δικαιόω play a key role, namely Galatians 5:2-6, we will see that instead of presenting a challenge to forensic-eschatological justification through trust in Christ, it serves to underline the pattern we have seen emerging since Galatians 2:15-21.

## Chapter 5

### Faith and Justification: Galatians 5:2-6

We turn now to the last passage in which δικαιο- terminology and πίστις feature prominently and are closely related to one another, namely Galatians 5:2-6. The two key claims of the *Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians* (ARG) that we're investigating in these exegetical chapters is whether there is good evidence for both understanding Paul's δικαιο- language as essentially encoding the idea of divine rectification of the cosmos, and for understanding his use of πίστις related expressions as primarily referring to the *faithfulness of Christ* rather than to *faith in Christ*. The ARG combines cosmic rectification and Christ's faithfulness to emphasise that rectification is an irruptive divine action achieved through the obedience of Christ, and consequently it explicitly diminishes the role of Christian response to divine action. Christian πίστις is far less significant within the ARG than it is in Reformation, 19th-20th Century 'Lutheran,' or New Perspective readings of Galatians. The ARG depends on the accuracy of the observation that Paul's δικαιο- and πίστις language is at least systemically ambiguous or has been comprehensively misunderstood for most of the last 2000 years.



The primary arguments of the ARG, and we would suggest the primary refutations of their arguments, concern the earlier parts of the letter where both δικαιο- and πίστις terms are prominent, namely Galatians 2:15-21 and Galatians 3:1-26. For completeness we must also consider the contribution of this final passage where both sets of language are prominent. The decision to understand Galatians 5:2-6 in terms of divine rectification achieved on the basis of Christ's obedience flows largely from decisions made earlier in one's reading of Galatians. That the systematic ambiguity has some degree of prima facie plausibility in Galatians 5:4-6 can be seen by the two following renderings of that text:

4 You who want to be justified by the law have cut yourselves off from Christ; you have fallen away from grace. 5 For through the Spirit, by faith, we eagerly wait for the hope of righteousness. 6 For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love. (NRSV)

4 You who want to be justified<sup>427</sup> by the law have cut yourselves off from Christ; you have fallen away from grace. 5 For through the Spirit that we received on the basis of Christ's faithful death,<sup>428</sup> we eagerly wait for the hope of *rectification*.<sup>429</sup> 6 For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is Christ's faith<sup>430</sup> working through love. (NRSV altered to accommodate Martyn, de Boer's and Campbell's exegetical glosses)

On any analysis of the structure of the letter Galatians 5:2-12 plays a key role as the penultimate and most impassioned section of warning. By placing his positive statements about δικαιο- and πίστις (5:5-6) in the context of a warning to the Galatians (5:2-12) we see again the contrast between νόμος (5:3-4) and πίστις (5:5-6) in the matter of justification (5:4, 5) that was evident in Galatians 2:15-4:7. That circumcision was the principal, or maybe one of the principal, works of the law that Paul had in mind is made explicit for the first time in this section (Gal 5:2ff. cf. Gal 2:3).

---

<sup>427</sup> Retaining the NRSV's 'justified' as de Boer does, in contrast to Martyn. De Boer and Martyn agree that *justification* with its forensic overtones accurately captures the perspective of Paul's opponents in Galatia, see de Boer, *Galatians*, 34, 164, 186. Martyn uses 'rectified' here but that weakens his point of view that sets up a strong contrast between Paul and the Agitators' views of rectification/justification, Martyn, *Galatians*, 272-73.

<sup>428</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 316-17; and cf. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 890.

<sup>429</sup> Using at this point Martyn's 'rectification' (*Galatians*, 8) to highlight the point he and de Boer (*Galatians*, 186) make about Paul's distinctive use and understanding of δικαιο- terms.

<sup>430</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 318.

Our interest in this text is as ever quite circumscribed: what does it indicate about the natures of πίστις and δικαιοῦν / δικαιοσύνη and their relationship? As in our observations on the Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians 3:1-4:7, we will note that there is a clear divide between Martyn on the one hand and Campbell and de Boer on the other, especially with respect to the interpretation of Paul's use of πίστις language. Martyn is quite traditional in his handling of Galatians 5:2-6, taking πίστις there to refer to the faith that Christians have *in* God and/or Christ. In contrast, both Campbell and de Boer understand πίστις to refer to 'the faithfulness of Christ.' Both refer extensively to the 2005 work of Hung-Sik Choi as a precursor to their 'Christological' readings of Galatians 5:5-6.<sup>431</sup> Our focus, will thus be on Campbell and de Boer, and in their use of Choi.

Our aim in this chapter is to assess whether there are any reasons to prefer the ARG within Galatians 5:2-6 over more typical readings of the letter which understand δικαιο- and πίστις here at least in terms of some kind of forensic justification and Christian faith. In some respects, as Martyn recognises, this passage *least* reflects his understanding of Paul's apocalyptic eschatology, and in some ways reflects more

---

<sup>431</sup> Hung-Sik Choi, 'ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5-6: Neglected Evidence for the Faithfulness of Christ', *JBL* 124/3 (2005): 467-90. Moo, *Galatians*, notes Choi, de Boer and Campbell's 'christological' interpretation of πίστις here in Galatians 5:5-6 and dismisses it as 'improbable.'

typical Second Temple and Jewish-Christian perspectives (especially Gal 5:4).<sup>432</sup> De Boer and Campbell, however, are prepared to push through for a thoroughly apocalyptic perspective on Galatians 5:5-6 especially.

As in our previous chapters, we will focus initially on Paul's use of πίστις expressions before turning to his δικαιο- expressions. This course is especially warranted in Galatians 5:4-6 since the main positive arguments advanced for the ARG from these verses concern πίστις. On the other hand δικαιοῦσθε (5:4) and δικαιοσύνης (5:5) are understood in the light of 2:15-3:26. We will return in the second half of the chapter to these terms and see that their somewhat 'traditional' Jewish flavour make good sense within a forensic-eschatological understanding of Paul's δικαιο- language.

### 5.1 Is πίστις 'Christological' in Galatians 5:2-6?

De Boer's treatment of Galatians 5:2-6 is the briefest and the least argumentative. He finds no new evidence in Galatians 5:5-6 for the so-called 'Christological' understanding of πίστις. Noting, however, the presence of ἐκ πίστεως in 5:5, he

---

<sup>432</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*. 472.

suggests that it should be interpreted in 5:5 as it was in Galatians 3. In terms of argumentative strategy, de Boer is arguing from the usage in 3:23 & 25, to its usage in 3:24, on to its use at 3:6ff., and thus ultimately to the usage at 5:5, rather than arguing that Paul's use at 5:5 provides independent evidence for a 'Christological' interpretation of the phrase. For de Boer's purposes it is sufficient for him to provide a coherent reading of 5:2-6 that understands πίστις 'Christologically.' Hence de Boer reads Galatians 5:5 thus, 'We, through the Spirit that we receive on the basis of Christ's faithful death, are waiting for the hope of justification,'<sup>433</sup> drawing attention to the parallel with Galatians 3:22. He entertains, but does not unequivocally endorse, Choi's view that the ἀγάπη of 5:6 should also be interpreted 'Christologically,' de Boer noting that Galatians 5:6 and 2:20 could be understood in parallel. Despite his advocacy of the consistent 'Christological' reading, de Boer concludes his discussion of πίστις in Galatians thus:

Just as Christ's faith has its human correlate (believing in Christ; cf. 2:16; 3:22), so also Christ's love "for us" has its human correlate (loving one another; cf. 5:13-15). Human believing and loving are forms of participation in the antecedent faith and love of Christ. *Paul's concise expressions probably encompass both the christological and the*

---

<sup>433</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 316-17.

*anthropological aspects, though the former appear to be primary and in any case the basis for the latter.*<sup>434</sup> (italics added)

It is quite clear that despite its novelty in the exegetical tradition, the consistently 'Christological' interpretation of πίστις in Galatians 5:5-6 is not inherently impossible within that immediate context.<sup>435</sup> On the other hand, de Boer does not advance any arguments against the so-called 'anthropological' reading of Galatians 5:5-6, and in his concluding remark effectively allows the possibility of such a reading. Ultimately de Boer's reading stands or falls on the strength of the 'Christological' reading elsewhere in Galatians. His use of Choi is fairly general, without citing any of Choi's arguments.

In contrast, Campbell is explicitly indebted to Choi, though he seeks to 'remedy a few gaps in his argument,' so at this point it might be worthwhile to turn to Choi's argument for a 'Christological' understanding of faith and, for that matter, love in Galatians 5:5-6.<sup>436</sup> First, Choi focuses on the ἐκ πίστεως of Galatians 5:5, arguing that Galatians 3:8 and 3:23-26 establish that ἐκ πίστεως is used 'Christologically' by Paul in those two contexts. This prompts the first of Campbell's 'remedies': strictly then,

---

<sup>434</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 319, but cf. 365 on the somewhat exceptional use of πίστις in Galatians 5:22.

<sup>435</sup> 'Improbable,' Moo, *Galatians*, 329 n. 14.

<sup>436</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 1163 n. 137.

Galatians 5:5-6 does not of itself provide 'neglected evidence' but rather *corroboratory* evidence for the 'Christological' reading. Campbell is correct in pointing out this correction to Choi's argumentative logic.

Second, Choi offers three supportive considerations from the immediate context of 5:2-6 for a 'Christological' interpretation of ἐκ πίστεως in 5:5: (i.) 'the antithesis between the law and πίστις . . . as the two mutually exclusive objective means of justification';<sup>437</sup> (ii.) the other antitheses of 5:2-6 support the νόμος / πίστις antithesis; (iii.) 'if it is correct that Paul usually mentions the mission of Jesus Christ and of the Spirit side by side (3:1-5; 4:4-6; 4:28-5:1), then it is likely that faith in 5:5 is to be understood in a christological sense.'<sup>438</sup> The first of these supportive considerations seems problematic since it is somewhat unclear what Choi intends by claiming that law is an 'objective means of salvation.' In *Galatians* Paul is not concerned with possession of 'the Law,' nor does Paul combat the view that the law somehow extrinsically places someone in a state of blessedness. Rather it is the *doing* of the law that is at issue (Gal 5:3). Neither Paul nor his opponents think the Law is an objective means to salvation. Both think some kind of doing is involved. If we then revise Choi's statement to say that there is an antithesis of two *means* of justification it becomes

---

<sup>437</sup> Choi, 479.

<sup>438</sup> Choi, 481.

immediately apparent that the first consideration doesn't assist in distinguishing between the antitheses of Law vs. the faithfulness of Christ, or Law vs. faith in Christ. Choi's second consideration that there is a νόμος / πίστις antithesis throughout Galatians 5:2-6 would probably be more accurately stated in terms of a νόμος / Χριστὸς antithesis. When πίστις enters the picture in 5:5-6 it does not have to be 'christological' in the sense of referring to Christ's faithfulness in order for it to play apart in the contrast. As we have already argued faith is faith *in Christ* in Galatians 2:15-3:26.<sup>439</sup> As for Choi's third consideration, he correctly observes that the Spirit frequently occurs in Galatians in contexts where Christ is also present. However, it is not invariable as can be seen in Galatians 5:16-18. But given our case for understanding ἐκ πίστεως as Christian faith in Christ in Galatians 3 then Galatians 3:14 becomes an example of the gift of the Spirit and faith in Christ being closely related to one another. Further as Moo and Watson point out the connection of faith (understood as faith in Christ) and righteousness in Galatians 5:5 as elsewhere in Galatians must 'not be overlooked.'<sup>440</sup> Choi's considerations are weak at best. Campbell admits as much when he says, 'I know of no decisive arguments in the text of 5:5 that

---

<sup>439</sup> Moo, *Galatians*, 329 esp. n. 14.

<sup>440</sup> Moo, *Galatians*, 329; Watson, 'By Faith (Of Christ)', 160.



establish a christocentric construal, it must be interpreted in close relation to what precedes and what follows.<sup>441</sup>

Third, Choi attempts to demonstrate the likelihood of the 'Christological' reading of πίστις in 5:6 on the ground of six observations: (i.) 'First, the concept of πίστις as "power" can lead us to understand it in a different way from the consensus because in Galatians power is concerned not so much with the Christian's faith as with Christ's faithfulness.'<sup>442</sup> This 'observation' essentially assumes what it sets out to prove. Choi is attempting to demonstrate that πίστις refers to 'Christological' faith but assumes the correctness of that view in order to establish it. (ii.) 'Second, Mulka's observation that in Paul's letters the subject of the verb ἐνεργέω is usually closely bound up not with a human element but with a spiritual and divine being further leads us to interpret πίστις in 5:6 from a different perspective.'<sup>443</sup> Here the difficulty is that the view he's opposing, the so-called 'anthropological' view, in no way removes divine working from even the Christian exercise of faith. That divine power leads to Christian as much as to Christ's action is clear from passages such as Galatians 2:8 and

---

<sup>441</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 890.

<sup>442</sup> Choi, 482.

<sup>443</sup> Choi, 484, citing Arthur L. Mulka, 'Fides Quae per Caritatem Operatur (Gal 5:6)', *CBQ* 28/2 (1966): 180.

Philippians 2:12-13 amongst many others.<sup>444</sup> (iii.) 'Third, Paul's three antitheses—between circumcision and Christ (5:2-3), between the law and Christ (5:4), and between circumcision and the cross (5:11; cf. 6:12-14) —suggest that πίστις, the antithesis of circumcision/uncircumcision, should also be interpreted in a christological sense.<sup>445</sup> This observation also fails to take seriously that the opposing view is not suggesting faith *in faith*, or faith *in one's own human powers etc*, but rather that Christian faith is faith *in Christ* in Galatians. Moreover, though Christian faith in Christ is a human act or experience, it nonetheless can be considered a *divine* creation, just as Martyn argues throughout Galatians 3:1-5.<sup>446</sup> (iv.) Choi argues that since the prior use of love at Galatians 2:20 was with respect to Christ's love, and that introducing Christian faith would somehow be unexpected at this point, then love here is Christological.<sup>447</sup> This is not an impossible reading of Galatians 5:6 but most commentators do not see it as odd that Paul raises the topic of love at this point. In fact Campbell, while allegedly following Choi, actually makes a case for the likelihood that Paul was beginning to introduce ideas that would come into prominence in Galatians 5:13ff.<sup>448</sup> (v.) 'Fifth, the fact that the argumentative situation of 5:6 is

---

<sup>444</sup> Note Martyn's, *Galatians*, 276, apposite comments on divine working in Christian faith.

<sup>445</sup> Choi, 485.

<sup>446</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 284ff. on Galatians 3:1-5.

<sup>447</sup> Choi, 486-87.

<sup>448</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 888.

concerned not so much with how the individual can be justified as with what is the valid "external" soteriological basis of justification might help us to understand πίστις as Christ's faithfulness.<sup>1449</sup> We have already dealt with Choi's deployment of this argument with respect to 5:5. The Law is not an external basis of justification in Galatians. (vi.) 'Sixth, since πίστις in 5:5 refers to "the faithfulness of Christ," πίστις in 5:6 also should be interpreted as "the faithfulness of Christ," because πίστις in 5:6 refers back to πίστις in 5:5.' Campbell implicitly rejects this line of argumentation when he claims that 5:6 is the more decisive text and admits that there are no decisive contextual reasons for taking 5:5 'Christologically.' Certainly Choi would be right in affirming that πίστις in 5:5 and 5:6 refer to the same thing, but 5:5 adds nothing to the case for the 'Christological' construal of 5:6.

Choi's arguments are far from decisive. Campbell is right to suggest that he has not presented independent evidence from 5:5-6 that ἐκ πίστεως and πίστις should be taken 'Christologically.' Campbell does go on to add a couple of considerations to Choi's argument that derive from Campbell's critique of what he calls 'Justification Theory.' First, Campbell suggests that the language of ability and power that's associated with faith in 5:6 does not cohere well with the role of faith in 'Justification

---

<sup>1449</sup> Choi, 487.

Theory.'<sup>450</sup> As a criticism of 'anthropological' faith this would only succeed if 'anthropological' faith functioned within 'Justification Theory' only as Campbell presents it. However, if Christian faith in Christ can be seen as closely associated with union with Christ (as it generally has been in the Reformation tradition) then Campbell's consideration falls by the wayside.<sup>451</sup> Second, Campbell suggests that the antithetical patterns that Choi points out, and other antitheses in Galatians point towards an explicitly retrospective epistemology.<sup>452</sup> But again a great deal depends here on the success or otherwise of Campbell's construal of 'Justification Theory.' Certainly there seems to be little *prima facie* reason for insisting that a retrospective religious epistemology and justification appropriated by Christian faith are inherently contradictory. In fact, there are quite a few examples of both being maintained together from the 16th-20th centuries.<sup>453</sup> Campbell's argument founders on the weakness of his case for tying so-called 'anthropological' faith to a strictly prospective religious epistemology. Campbell's additional considerations are unpersuasive to those who don't agree with his construction of 'Justification Theory.'

---

<sup>450</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 887.

<sup>451</sup> See Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament*, 77ff.

<sup>452</sup> Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, 888-92.

<sup>453</sup> One early example: *The London Baptist Confession of Faith*, ch 24-25, 28, Anon., *A Confession of Faith of Seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, Which Are Commonly (but Unjustly) Called Anabaptists. Published for the Vindication of the Truth, and Information of the Ignorant; Likewise for the Taking off of Those Aspersions Which Are Frequently Both in Pulpit and Print Unjustly Cast upon Them. The Second Impression Corrected and Enlarged. Published according to Order.* (Thomason Tracts / 52:E.319[13]; London: Math. Simmons for John Hancock, 1646).

Despite their references to Choi, de Boer and Campbell's reasons for adopting a 'Christological' reading of πίστις at this point in the letter are driven by their reading of Galatians 3:1-4:7. Choi's arguments in themselves are far from conclusive, and are defective at a number of points. Where Choi is correct is to insist that πίστις in both 5:5 & 6 are referring to the same entity, and that ἐκ πίστεως in 5:5 refers to the same thing as it does in Galatians 3. Campbell is correct to argue that Galatians 3 determines the meaning of Galatians 5 and not vice versa. Given our reading of Galatians 3 we see no reason to adopt Choi's 'creative thesis' and will maintain that the 'opinio communis'<sup>454</sup> regarding πίστις in 5:5-6 is secure. But if πίστις is then Christian faith in Christ what implications might that have for our understanding of δικαιο- in Galatians 5:2-6, especially 5:4 & 5?

5.2 Is it likely that the δικαιο- terms of Galatians 5:4 & 5 encode *cosmological rectification*?

Galatians 5:4 & 5 constitute Paul's final two usages of δικαιο- language in the letter. Neither sentence is used by the ARG to justify their reframing of the typically forensic

---

<sup>454</sup> Choi, 482.

language into what they allege are the more distinctively Pauline cosmological or liberative terms. No new arguments based on Galatians 5:4-5 are presented by Martyn, de Boer and Campbell to support their contention that justification needs to be re-read in the light of those two texts. Even so, δικαιοσύνη in Galatians 5:5 is understood by the ARG as *cosmic rectification* given their account of the argument of the letter to that point. Again, like the interpretation of πίστις in 5:5-6, Galatians 2:16-4.7 is determinative for the interpretation of Galatians 5:4-5 rather than vice versa. Since we have already argued (i.) that it is unlikely that Paul was using δικαιο- language reactively, (ii.) that the Galatians were already familiar with at least an adumbration of Paul's fuller theology of justification and its use of Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 prior to the writing of the letter, and (iii.) that Paul does not reframe and thus redefine δικαιο- language within the letter's argument, we could simply conclude that Galatians 5:5 in particular can be read consistently as referring to Christian faith and *forensic-eschatological justification*. However, it is worth pausing over these two texts a little longer because, as noted briefly earlier, Martyn, for one, recognises the distinctively Jewish or Jewish-Christian cast of the language in Galatians 5:4-5, and that Jewish cast is somewhat in tension with the strong emphasis Martyn has placed on present justification.<sup>455</sup>

---

<sup>455</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 472.

### 5.2.1 Galatians 5:4

Galatians 5:4 is the third of three strong statements within Galatians 5:2-4 designed to warn the Galatian Christians away from pursuing an approach to justification based on adoption of circumcision and the law. Galatians 5:2b+c, ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσκει, is the first time in the letter that Paul makes explicit the key role of circumcision for the Agitators (cf. Gal 2:3; 5:11-12; 6:12-15). Having prefaced Galatians 5.2b+c with the solemn declaration of 5:2a, he starts 5:3 similarly, the πάλιν there in all probability referring back to 5:2a. The two statements that follow in 5:3b+c and in 5:4 can then be understood as elaborations of 5:2b+c.

5:3b+c            παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον  
τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι.

5:4a+b+c        κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε,  
τῆς χάριτος ἐξέπεσατε.

For our purposes it is not strictly necessary to decide how accurately Paul had represented the Agitators' view, or precisely how Paul himself saw the connections between circumcision, law and doing (5:3). However, it is clear at this point in his

argument that for Paul the adoption of circumcision was tantamount to the adoption of the law, and that the adoption of the covenant of law separated one from the grace and benefit of Christ (5:2, 4). It is instructive to compare 5:4 as a whole with 2:21. Neither the present tense nor the connection of law with justification in Galatians 5:4b are unknown in Second Temple Jewish sources,<sup>456</sup> though Martyn and de Boer are probably correct in understanding the present as signifying an attempt or an intention.<sup>457</sup> Certainly the focus of Second Temple sources and Jewish-Christian traditions regarding justification is on future justification, but it is in the present that the Galatians are being urged to seek that justification/rectification. Though Martyn translates δικαιωσθε with 'rectified' he understands it at this point to be a forensic term, as that is what it would have been for Paul's opponents.<sup>458</sup> There is little reason to substantially disagree with Martyn and de Boer's approach to Galatians 5:4.

### 5.2.2 Galatians 5:5

Within Galatians 5:2-6 verses 5 & 6 represent Paul's positive counterpoint to the false path he sees the Galatians taking in 5:2-4. Taken with Galatians 5:4, Galatians 5:5 provides the contrast of the two routes to justification/rectification that are in view

---

<sup>456</sup> Käsemann, 'The Righteousness of God', 178, points out present justification in Qumran's Thanksgiving Psalms.

<sup>457</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 314; Martyn, *Galatians*, 471.

<sup>458</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 250, 264-69; cf. de Boer, *Galatians*, 34.



throughout the letter. Where the route of the Agitators is ἐν νόμῳ (5:4) the route of Paul's gospel is πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως (5:5). The ARG takes ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης at 5:5 as referring to the hope of cosmic rectification. It is certainly not impossible that the ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης of 5:5 is the hope of the setting to rights of the whole cosmos. In that case, ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης might function here much as Käsemann envisaged διακιοσύνη θεοῦ functioned in Romans.<sup>459</sup> In fact, one could possibly read virtually all the letter's previous usages of δικαιο- language as being fundamentally forensic and 'anthropological,' and all the letter's πίστις and πιστεύω expressions as being about Christian *faith in Christ*, and yet still envisage this particular clause as referring to the total eschatological deliverance effected by God. So for the reader inclined towards seeing justification as a forensic declaration upon the one who trusts in Christ virtually nothing turns on the determination of the denotation of ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης. However, the decidedly future orientation of 5:5 is in tension with the strongly present eschatology of Martyn in particular. In fact, the whole of 5:5 could easily have been written by a Second Temple Jew committed to the futuristic forensic eschatology that de Boer claims Paul is attempting to undermine and replace with his cosmological (read, *non-forensic*) version. Martyn and de Boer both appeal to the familiar 'now and not yet' and effectively consider the present the time where

---

<sup>459</sup> Käsemann, "The Righteousness of God" in Paul, ch. 7 of *New Testament Questions of Today*, 168-82. Though Moo, *Galatians*, 329 does not entertain the possibility.

rectification is operative and especially at work in the Church as the vanguard of the new creation, yet the war with sin and flesh endures, ensuring that the complete rectification is yet to come.<sup>460</sup>

Having said that though, according to the ARG the Galatians would have had to understand, and Paul hoped to persuade them of, the shift from being *justified forensically* in 5:4 to hoping for a *cosmological deliverance* in 5:5. This is not impossible, but it is not especially motivated by the text itself, and, as we have argued earlier, contra-indicated by the flow of Paul's argument and the usage of δικαιο- language in 2:16-4:7. If anything, it would be easier for the Galatians to understand both δικαιοῦσθε in 5:4 and δικαιοσύνης at 5:5 as essentially *forensic-eschatological*. But further, if as we have argued in the first half of this chapter, it is entirely plausible that πίστις here (5:5) is to be understood as Christian faith, and that it is unlikely that it refers to Christ's faithfulness, then 5:5 would get drawn into the orbit of the other texts throughout Galatians that connect πίστις and δικαιο- language.<sup>461</sup> This conclusion might be resisted by appealing to the fact that πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως modifies ἀπεκδεχόμεθα rather than ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης directly. De Boer's approach is to posit that the eager awaiting is in/by the Spirit that has been given on

---

<sup>460</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 34.

<sup>461</sup> Watson, 'By Faith (of Christ)', 151.

the basis of Christ's obedient death.<sup>462</sup> This approach to the syntax of 5:5 could be adopted even with an 'anthropological' interpretation of πίστις: the hope of cosmic deliverance that we eagerly await in/by the Spirit that has been received through faith [in Christ]. Even so, the preponderance of texts in Galatians relate δικαιο- terms and πίστις rather more directly than this, suggesting that δικαιοσύνη at this point retains its *forensic* rather than *cosmological* sense and that 'in/by the Spirit' should be read in parallel with, and not be further modified by, 'through faith.'

Both the πίστις and δικαιο- language of Galatians 5:4-6 are systemically ambiguous. However, there are strong reasons for insisting that the ἐκ πίστεως and πίστις of 5:5 and 5:6 refer to the same thing, and that has been determined for us by Paul's usage in Galatians 3 in particular. Against Choi, and with the ARG, 'the direction of interpretive causality' is from the earlier chapters of Galatians towards 5:2-6. We have previously argued that there are no decisive arguments in favour of a 'Christological' rendering of Paul's πίστις expressions in Galatians 2:15-4:7, and there are highly suggestive reasons for rendering all such expressions as having faith *in* God/Christ. Further, if one were to grant the ARG's claim that δικαιο- terminology was *cosmologically* reframed by Paul in this letter, then Galatians 5:4-5 in particular stands as a rather

---

<sup>462</sup> De Boer, *Galatians*, 317.

curious Jewish-Christian way of putting things that sits uncomfortably with Paul's alleged reframing. If instead, one thinks Paul's δικαιο- language is *forensic-eschatological* throughout the letter, then Galatians 5:4-5 fits comfortably within that framework. Again, evidence from Galatians 2:15-4:7 suggests that Paul had indeed taught the Galatians previously, and now sought to remind them of and reapply, his forensic interpretation of justification. For Paul, forensic justification and Christian faith in Christ were inherently connected.

## Chapter 6

### Summary and Conclusions

Martyn, de Boer and Campbell have presented us with an invigoratingly fresh reading of Paul's letter to the Galatians, and largely from that reading of Galatians, provided an alternative perspective on Paul. Our focus has been on their understanding of δικαίω and δικαιοσύνη as *cosmic rectification* in Galatians. Our investigation has led us to consider especially their understanding of the putative distinction between *forensic* and *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology* on the one hand, and the meaning and role of πιστεύω and πίστις in the argument of Galatians on the other, as these play a decisive part in their case that Paul's δικαιο- language refers to *cosmic rectification*.

With regard to *apocalyptic* we saw that there is much need for caution within the scholarly guild, as the term, whether used as an adjective, or heaven forefend as a noun, is notoriously polyvalent and liable to obscure what's being said as much as bring clarity. For some (many?) it means little more than an inaugurated eschatology with an overlap of the ages. For others, it means much more than this. Further, the occurrence of ἀποκάλυψις and its cognates should not be taken as a sure signal of apocalyptic language or eschatology or theology. In the first century it was a fairly

unexceptional noun that was not freighted with the degree of significance currently attached to it. It certainly did not carry with it any necessary connotation of *invasive* action.

As to de Boer's substantial contribution to our understanding of the eschatology of the apocalypses with his distinction between *cosmic* and *forensic* apocalyptic eschatology, we discovered on further investigation of the two polar archetypes of his theory, 1 Enoch and 2 Baruch, that there are ineliminable *forensic* elements in even the most *cosmological* of apocalypses. We noted Collins's comment that the sole common eschatological datum in all the apocalypses was a final judgment. The distinction between 1 Enoch and 2 Baruch's eschatology to put it clumsily is that 2 Baruch is *explicitly non-angelological* in its attribution of primeval sin and correspondingly *non-angelological* in its description of future judgment and salvation. If de Boer's *forensic* vs. *cosmological* distinction is inaccurate, then it cannot be made to apply to Paul. We would conclude that the presence of cosmological aspects in Paul's theology and eschatology does not tell us anything about whether or not his theology and eschatology was forensic or not. In fact, given the universally forensic character of final judgment in the apocalypses (and Second Temple Judaism generally), it would be somewhat of a surprise if Paul were to turn out to be non-forensic himself. The fact

that there are indications of typical forensic thought in Paul, including Galatians, further weakens de Boer's argument.

Turning to the Apocalyptic Readers' handling of πιστ- terms in Galatians, first we saw that they failed to give the prominence of Christian faith in Christ, explicitly expressed in Galatians 2:16b by means of the verb and a prepositional phrase, adequate attention in the subsequent unfolding of Paul's argument in Galatians 3-4. Martyn provided the most nuanced account of faith in Galatians 3-4, but his claims that somehow Christian *faith in Christ* is always secondary to *Christ's faithfulness unto death* in Galatians 2-3 was found to be unsustainable within Galatians 2:15-16 on the grounds of linguistic information structuring theory and it does not make good sense of Paul's use of ἐκ / δια πιστεως in the argument of Galatians 3. De Boer's more consistently 'Christological' account, and Campbell's 'monological' account of πιστ- in the letter were repeatedly found wanting.

We have argued that linguistically there is nothing to favour the subjective rendering of πίστις Χριστοῦ over the objective rendering. However, it should be noted that competent native and second-language speakers of Koinē who comment on Galatians 2:16 and 3:22 consistently and utterly without exception render the expression as

speaking of Christian *faith in Christ*. Contextually, a case can be mounted for rendering the key texts subjectively, but even if that were determined to be the most probable rendering of those genitives, an apocalyptic reading does not necessarily follow. More substantively, we were persuaded by Watson's argument especially, that Habakkuk 2:4 lies in the background of Paul's ἐκ / διὰ πίστεως statements in Galatians. All the πίστις Χριστοῦ expressions in Galatians are in fact expansions of ἐκ / διὰ πίστεως expressions. We believe Watson's case that Paul consistently primarily associates ἐκ / διὰ πίστεως with δικαιο- language rather than ζάω or its cognates, and that the righteous one in Habakkuk 2 is not understood messianically by Paul, establishes that all the ἐκ / διὰ πίστεως expressions, including crucially the ἐκ / διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ expressions, speak of the person who is 'righteous by faith' or 'righteous by Christ-faith,' i.e. 'righteous by *faith in Christ*.' We offered one minor supplementary revision to Watson's case by noting that the distribution of ἐκ and διὰ in Paul suggests that διὰ was Paul's habitually more natural way of expressing the prepositional relationship but that ἐκ was used where Habakkuk 2:4 was within scope. That observation, in turn, suggests that the prepositional relationship whether expressed by διὰ or ἐκ ought to be understood instrumentally. Thus, justification / righteousness / rectification comes *by means of faith in Christ*.



Turning then at last to Paul's δικαιο- language in Galatians we pointed out that our Apocalyptic Readers, while agreeing amongst themselves that Paul had reframed the normally forensic δικαιο- terms with cosmological concepts, do not agree as to *how* Paul does this. Further the varied specific arguments for this reframing are weak. We argued that Paul's use of δικαιο- language in the letter suggested that it was language that Paul could be confident that the Galatians understood, and that they had heard him use before. Paul understands justification / rectification to come by means of faith in Christ. Paul wouldn't object for a moment to the idea that justification / rectification is on the grounds of Christ's obedient death, but that is beside the point here in Galatians. Paul is debating not the *grounds* of justification / rectification but the *means*. And the means is *faith in Christ*, and not circumcision, or even circumcision *and* faith in Christ. In Galatians it is the 'subjective' aspect of justification / rectification that is in view. Further confirmation of that comes from the fact that it is never the cosmos but it is always a human person or human persons who are understood as the objects of justification / rectification. Given the abiding forensic character of Paul's eschatology, and the failure to provide strong arguments for the downplaying of forensic concerns, δικαιο- terms in Paul have an inescapably eschatological-forensic cast, and the instrumental function of faith in Christ is

repeatedly stressed. Cosmic rectification is not primarily in view in Galatians, but rather the justification of the believer.

Where Martyn's account is especially attractive is his stress on divine action. Martyn himself has demonstrated some sensitivity to issues surrounding the interaction of both divine and human agency. If anything, he has become more sensitive to the issues since the publication of his *Galatians* in 1997. However, theologians such as Myers and McCormack have roundly criticised Harink and others for seriously downplaying human action in favour of divine. Neither Myer nor McCormack can be accused of being Pelagian in any meaningful sense but both are concerned that in the apocalyptic reading 'the human subject . . . [is] erased to make room for divine action.'<sup>463</sup> The somewhat ambivalent stance though of Martyn towards universal salvation suggests that even he amongst the Apocalyptic Readers has been unwilling to give Christian faith in Christ the causal role it plays in Galatians. By so stressing divine action in the way they have, especially by understanding *Christ-faith* as Christ's faithfulness, the Apocalyptic Readers have removed *much*, or in Campbell's case, *all* of the grounds for understanding a faith that is centered on Christ as decisive.

---

<sup>463</sup> Benjamin Myers, 'From Faithfulness to Faith in the Theology of Karl Barth', in *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), 307; cf. Bruce L. McCormack, 'Can We Still Speak of "Justification by Faith"? An in-House Debate with Apocalyptic Readings of Paul', 167.

Linguistically and exegetically they have not demonstrated their case, and a strong case can be mounted for seeing faith in Christ as being soteriologically crucial for the eschatological justification of the believer.

## Bibliography

- Anon. *A Confession of Faith of Seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, Which Are Commonly (but Unjustly) Called Anabaptists. Published for the Vindication of the Truth, and Information of the Ignorant; Likewise for the Taking off of Those Aspersions Which Are Frequently Both in Pulpit and Print Unjustly Cast upon Them. The Second Impression Corrected and Enlarged. Published according to Order.* Thomason Tracts / 52:E.319[13]. London: Math. Simmons for John Hancock, 1646.
- Arnold, Brian John. 'Justification One Hundred Years After Paul'. Ph.D. Thesis. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., 2013.
- Apollonius Dyscolus. *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*. Edited by Fred W. Householder. Studies in the History of the Language Sciences. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1981.
- Aune, David E. 'Understanding Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic'. *Word & World* 25/3 (2005): 233–45.
- Bailey, Nicholas Andrew. 'Thetic Constructions in Koine Greek: With Special Attention to Clauses with εἶμι "be", γίνομαι "occur", ἔρχομαι "come", ἰδού/ἰδε "behold" and Complement Clauses of ὁράω "see"'. Ph.D. Thesis. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2009.
- Barclay, J. M. G. Review of Nicholas Thomas Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. *Scottish Journal of Theology* (Forthcoming).

Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*.

London: DLT, 1986.

Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Bary, Corien, and Dag Haug. 'Temporal anaphora across and inside sentences: the function of participles'. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 4 (2011): Article 8: 1–56.

Bauckham, Richard. 'Apocalypses'. Pages 135–87 in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*

*Volume 1, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Donald A. Carson,

Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha'. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (1986): 97–117.

Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-*

*English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Based on

*Walter Bauer's Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen*

*Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur, sixth edition, ed. Kurt Aland and*

*Barbara Aland, with Viktor Reichmann and on previous English editions by W.F. Arndt,*

*F.W. Gingrich, and F.W. Danker*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,

2000.

Beker, Johan Christiaan. *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God*.

Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. First Paperback Edition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Paul the Theologian: Major Motifs in Pauline Theology'. *Interpretation* 43/4 (1989): 352–65.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Bird, Michael F., and Preston M. Sprinkle, eds. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.

Bird, Michael F., and Michael R. Whitenton. 'The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Hippolytus's *De Christo et Antichristo*: Overlooked Patristic Evidence in the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate'. *New Testament Studies* 55/4 (2009): 552–62.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blich, John. *Galatians in Greek: A Structural Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians with Notes on the Greek*. Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966.

Boer, Martinus Christianus de. *Galatians: A Commentary*. New Testament Library.

Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology'. Pages 345–83 in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Vol 1*. New York: Continuum, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology'. Pages 169–90 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 24. Edited by Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Paul's Mytholization Program in Romans 5-8'. Pages 1-20 in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5-8*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Paul, Theologian of God's Apocalypse'. *Interpretation* 56/1 (2002): 21–33.

Branick, Vincent P. 'Apocalyptic Paul'. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47/4 (1985): 664–75.

Brooks, James A., and Carlton L. Winbery. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Washington: University Press of America, 1979.

Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 1st cheap edition. 2 vols. London: SCM, 1965. Translation of *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Neue theologische Grundrisse. Tübingen: Mohr, 1948-51 .

Calvin, Jean. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John Thomas McNeill.

Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. 2 vols. Library of Christian Classics 20-21.

Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960. Translation of *Institutio Christianae religionis, in*

*libris quatuor nunc primum digesta, certisque distincta capitibus, ad aptissimam*

*methodum: aucta etiam tam magna accessione ut propemodum opus novum haberi*

*possit*. Geneva: Robert Estienne, 1559.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*.

Edited by David Wishart Torrance and Thomas Forsyth Torrance. Translated

by Thomas Henry Louis Parker. Calvin's Commentaries 12. Edinburgh: Oliver

and Boyd, 1965. Translation of *Ioannis Calvini commentarii in quatuor Pauli*

*Epistolas: ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses*. Geneva: Jean

Girard, 1548.

Campbell, Douglas Aitchison. '2 Corinthians 4:13: Evidence in Paul That Christ

Believes'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128/2 (2009): 337-56.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'An Attempt to Be Understood: A Response to the Concerns of Matlock and

Macaskill with *The Deliverance of God*'. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*

34/2 (2011): 162-208.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'False Presuppositions in the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate: A Response to Brian Dodd'.

*Journal of Biblical Literature* 116/4 (1997): 713-19.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Romans 1:17 – A *Crux Interpretum* for the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113/2 (1994): 265–85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3:22'. Pages 57–71 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21–26'. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 65. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Caneday, Ardel B. 'The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ as a Theme in Paul's Theology in Galatians'. Pages 185–205 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.
- Charlesworth, James Hamilton. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.
- Chester, Stephen J. 'Paul and the Galatian Believers'. Pages 63–78 in *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*. Edited by Stephen Westerholm. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 'When the Old Was New: Reformation Perspectives on Galatians 2:16'. *Expository Times* 119/7 (2008): 320–29.
- Choi, Hung-Sik. 'ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5-6: Neglected Evidence for the Faithfulness of Christ'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124/3 (2005): 467–90.
- Chrysostom, John. *In Epistulam Ad Galatas Commentarius*. Edited by B. de Montfaucon. Patrologia Graeca 61. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*. Edited by Philip Edward Pusey. Translated by Thomas Keble. Vol. 44. A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the Division of the East and West. Oxford: Parker, 1877.
- Cirafesi, Wally V., and Gerald W. Peterman. 'Πίστις and Christ in Hippolytus's *De Christo et Antichristo*: A Response to Michael F. Bird and Michael R. Whitenton'. *New Testament Studies* 57/4 (2011): 594–603.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Cooper, Stephen Andrew, and Marius Victorinus. *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Corsani, Bruno. 'ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in the Letters of Paul'. Pages 87–93 in *The New Testament Age: Essays in honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William B. Weinrich. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1984.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975.
- Davis, Joshua B., and Douglas Karel Harink, eds. *Apocalyptic and the Future of Theology: With and beyond J. Louis Martyn*. Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2012.
- Dik, Helma. *Word order in ancient Greek: a pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Dik, S. C. *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Functional Grammar Series 9. Dordrecht: Foris, 1989.
- Dunne, John Anthony. 'Suffering and covenantal hope in Galatians: A critique of the "apocalyptic reading" and its proponents'. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 68/1 (2015): 1–15.
- Dunn, James D. G. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'ΣΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ: A Key to the Meaning of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ'. Pages 351–66 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*.

- Edited by J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe and A. Katherine Greib. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. London: SPCK, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Once More, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ'. Pages 61-81 in *Pauline Theology: Volume IV Looking Back, Pressing On*. Edited by E. Elizabeth Johnson and David M. Hay. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The New Perspective on Paul'. Pages 183–206 in *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. London: SPCK, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Revised edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Dunn, James D. G., and Alan M. Suggate. *The Justice of God: A Fresh Look at the Old Doctrine of Justification by Faith*. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1993.
- Elliott, Mark W., Scott J. Hafemann, John Frederick, and Nicholas Thomas Wright. *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Froehlich, Karlfried, and Margaret T. Gibson. *Biblia Latina Cum Glossa Ordinaria: Facsimile Reprint of the Editio Princeps Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1992.

- Funk, Robert W. *A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1973.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5-8*. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Singularity of the Gospel: A Reading of Galatians'. Pages 147–59 in *Pauline Theology, Vol 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*. Edited by Jouette M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Harink, Douglas Karel. *Paul among the Postliberals: Pauline Theology beyond Christendom and Modernity*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Paul, Philosophy, and the Theopolitical Vision: Critical Engagements with Agamben, Badiou, Žižek and Others*. Theopolitical Visions 7. Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2010.
- Harris, Murray James. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Harrisville, Roy A. 'Before ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: The Objective Genitive as Good Greek'. *Novum Testamentum* 48/4 (2006): 353–58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Witness of the Fathers'. *Novum Testamentum* 36/3 (1994): 233–41.
- Haussleiter, Johannes. 'Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube'. *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 2 (1891): 109–45, 205–30.

- Hays, Richard B. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 56. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Hooker, Morna D. 'ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ'. *New Testament Studies* 35/3 (1989): 321–42.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. New York: Wiley, 2009.
- Howard, George E. 'Faith of Christ'. *Expository Times* 85/7 (1974): 212–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Faith of Christ'. Pages 758–60 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'On the Faith of Christ'. *Harvard Theological Review* 60/4 (1967): 459–65.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The *Pistis Christou* Formulation in Paul'. *Novum Testamentum* 22/3 (1980): 248–63.
- Hunn, Debbie. 'Debating the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Twentieth-Century Scholarship'. Pages 15–31 in *Faith of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.

- Jones, Hefin, review of Douglas Aitcheson Campbell *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. *Reformed Theological Review* 71/2 (2012): 131-33.
- Kabisch, Richard. *Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Translated by W. J. Montague. London: SCM, 1969. Translation of selections from *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Keck, Leander E. 'Paul and Apocalyptic Theology'. *Interpretation* 38/3 (1984): 229-41.
- Kirk, Allison. 'Word Order and Information Structure in New Testament Greek'. Ph.D. Thesis. Universiteit Leiden, 2012.
- Kittel, Gerhard. 'Πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ bei Paulus'. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 79 (1906): 419-36.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. *Studies in Biblical Theology Second Series* 22. London: SCM, 1972. Translation of *Ratlos vor der Apokalypik*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1970.

- Lambrecht, Knud. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Levinsohn, Stephen. 'BART Displays Enhanced for Discourse Features/Galatians', No pages. Cited 7 March 2015. Online <http://www-01.sil.org/~levinsohns/GalatiansBART.pdf>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2000.
- Levy, Ian Christopher. *The Letter to the Galatians*. Bible in Medieval Tradition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations*. London: Macmillan, 1874.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Luther, Martin. *A Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians Based on Lectures Delivered by Martin Luther at the University of Wittenberg in the Year 1531 and First Published in 1535*. Translated by Philip S. Watson London: J. Clarke, 1953.



Translation of *In Epistolam Sancti Pauli ad Galatas Commentarius ex Praelectione*

*Domini Martini Lutheri Collectus*. Wittenburg: J. Luft, 1535.

Macaskill, Grant. *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Martyn, James Louis. 'Afterword: The Human Moral Dilemma'. Pages 157–66 in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5-8*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'De-Apocalypticizing Paul: An Essay Focused on Paul and the Stoics by Troels Engberg-Pedersen'. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*/86 (2002): 61–102.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Epilogue: An Essay in Pauline Meta-Ethics'. Pages 173–83 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon Gathercole. Library of New Testament Studies 335. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Events in Galatia: Modified in Covenantal Nomism versus God's Invasion of the Cosmos in the Singular Gospel: A Response to J. D. G. Dunn and B. R. Gaventa'. Pages 160–79 in *Pauline Theology, Vol 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*. Edited by Jouette M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of J. Christaan Baker *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. *Word & World* 2/2 (1982): 194–98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ‘The Apocalyptic Gospel in Galatians’. *Interpretation* 54/3 (2000): 246–66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ‘The Gospel Invades Philosophy’. Pages 13–33 in *Paul, Philosophy, and the Theopolitical Vision. Critical Engagements with Agamben, Badiou, \*Zi\*zek and Others*. Edited by Douglas Karel Harink. *Theopolitical Visions* 7. Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. *Studies of the New Testament and its World*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- Matlock, R. Barry. ‘The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2:16, 3:22, Romans 3:22, and Philippians 3:9’. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30/2 (2007): 173–203.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul’s Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 127. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- McCormack, Bruce L. ‘Can We Still Speak of “Justification by Faith”? An in-House Debate with Apocalyptic Readings of Paul’. Pages 159–84 in *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul’s Letter*. Edited by

- Mark W. Elliott, Scott J. Hafemann, Nicholas Thomas Wright, and John Frederick. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Meyer, Paul William. *The Word in This World: Essays in New Testament Exegesis and Theology*. Edited by John T. Carroll. The New Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Mikkonen, Juha. *Luther and Calvin on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: An Analysis and Comparison of Substantial Concepts in Luther's 1531/35 and Calvin's 1546/48 Commentaries on Galatians*. Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi University Press, 2007.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Middleton, Thomas Fanshaw, and Hugh James Rose. *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*. Cambridge: Deighton, 1833.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Douglas Aitcheson Campbell *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53/1 (2010): 143–50.

- Moore, Richard Kingsley. *Rectification ('justification') in Paul, in Historical Perspective, and in the English Bible: God's Gift of Right Relationship*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 1. Prolegomena. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906.
- Mulka, Arthur L. 'Fides Quae per Caritatem Operatur (Gal 5:6)'. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28/2 (1966): 174–88.
- Myers, Benjamin. 'From Faithfulness to Faith in the Theology of Karl Barth'. Pages 291–308 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Peterman, Gerald W. 'Δικαιωθῆναι διὰ τῆς ἐκ Χριστοῦ πίστεως: Notes on a Neglected Greek Construction'. *New Testament Studies* 56/1 (2010): 163–68.
- Pollmann, Karla, and Mark W. Elliott. 'Galatians in the Early Church: Five Case Studies'. Pages 40–61 in *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel,*

- and Ethics in Paul's Letter*. Edited by Mark W. Elliott, Scott J. Hafemann, N. T. Wright, and John Frederick. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Andrew W. Pitts. 'Πίστις with a Preposition and Genitive Modifier: Lexical, Semantic, and Syntactic Considerations in the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Discussion'. Pages 33–53 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.
- Robinson, Donald W. B. 'Faith of Jesus Christ: A New Testament Debate'. *Reformed Theological Review* 29/3 (1970): 71–81.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament*. Bellingham, Wash.: Lexham, 2008.
- Sanders, Ed Parish. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul*. Past Masters. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Schreiner, Thomas R., Luke Timothy Johnson, Douglas Aitchison Campbell, and Mark

D. Nanos. *Four Views on the Apostle Paul*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Schweitzer, Albert. *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*. Translated by William

Montgomery. London: A & C Black, 1912. Translation of *Geschichte der*

*Paulinischen Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart*. Tübingen: Mohr,

1911.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. 2nd ed. Translated by William Montgomery.

London: A & C Black, 1953. Translation of *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*.

Tübingen: Mohr, 1930.

Silva, Moisés. 'Faith versus Works of Law in Galatians'. Pages 217–48 in *Justification and*

*Variegated Nomism Volume 2, The Paradoxes of Paul*. Edited by Donald A. Carson,

Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Sim, Margaret Gavin. 'A Relevance Theoretic Approach to the Particle ἵνα in Koine

Greek'. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Edinburgh, 2006.

Smyth, Herbert Weir, and Gordon M. Messing. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.:

Harvard University Press, 1956.

Schläger, G. 'Bemerkungen zu πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ'. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche*

*Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 7 (1906): 356–58.

Schurer, Emil. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1885.

Spallek, Andrew John. 'St. Paul's Use of ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Romans and Galatians: The Significance of Paul's Choice of Prepositions with ΠΙΣΤΙΣ as Object and Its Bearing upon Justification by Faith'. STM Thesis. Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1996.

Spyropoulos, Vassilios, David Holton, Peter Mackridge, and Irene Philippaki-Warburton. *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar*. 2nd ed. Routledge Comprehensive Grammars. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2012.

Stuhlmacher, Peter, and Donald Alfred Hagner. *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2001.

Tilling, Chris. 'Campbell's Faith: Advancing the Pistis Christou Debate'. Pages 234–50 in *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul: Reflections on the Work of Douglas Campbell*. Edited by Chris Tilling. Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2014.

Tilling, Chris ed. *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul: Reflections on the Work of Douglas Campbell*. Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade, 2014.

Tolmie, D. Francois. *Persuading the Galatians: A Text-Centred Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe. 190. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

- Trueman, Carl R. 'Simul Peccator et Justus: Martin Luther and Justification'. Pages 73–97 in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*. Edited by Bruce L. McCormack. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Philipp Vielhauer, 'Apocalypses and Related Subjects: Introduction', in *New Testament Apocrypha Volume 2: Apostolic and Early Church Writings*. Edited by Robert McLachlan Wilson. Translated by David Hill; 1st ed.; London: Lutterworth, 1965), 581–607. Translation of *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Volume II. Edited by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Watson, Francis. 'By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and Its Scriptural Solution'. Pages 147–63 in *Faith of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of R. Barry Matlock *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1997): 611–13.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.



Whitenton, Michael R. 'After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Evidence from the Apostolic Fathers'.

*Journal of Theological Studies* 61 (2010): 82–109.

Winer, George Benedict. *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Translated

and revised by William F. Moulton. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1882. Translation of

*Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1855.

Wong, Simon S. M. *A Classification of Semantic Case-Relations in the Pauline Epistles*.

*Studies in Biblical Greek* 9. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Wright, Nicholas Thomas. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. London: SPCK, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Justification: Its Relevance for Contemporary Evangelicalism (1980)'. Pages 21–

41 in *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul 1978-2013*. London: SPCK, 2013. Excerpt

from *The Great Acquittal: Justification by Faith and Current Christian Thought*.

Edited by Gavin Reid. London: Collins, 1980, 13ff.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 vols. Christian Origins and the Question of God

4. London: SPCK, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul for Everyone: Galatians and Thessalonians*. London: SPCK, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*. London: SPCK, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978-2013*. London: SPCK, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis:

Fortress, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith (1978)'. Pages 3–20 in *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul 1978-2013*. London: SPCK, 2013. Repr. from *Tyndale Bulletin* 29 (1978): 61-88.

\_\_\_\_\_. *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Oxford: Lion, 1997.

Wrede, William. *Paul*. Translated by Edward Lummis. London: Philip Green, 1907.

Translation of *Paulus*. 2nd ed. *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1907.

Wübbenhorst, Karla. 'Calvin's Doctrine of Justification: Variations on a Lutheran Theme'. Pages 99–118 in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*. Edited by Bruce L. McCormack. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.

Young, Stephen L. 'Paul's Ethnic Discourse on "Faith": Christ's Faith and Gentile Access to the Judean God in Romans 3:21-5:1'. *Harvard Theological Review* 108/1 (2015), 45-46.