

INTRODUCTION

Mark D. Nanos

In recent years, the sophisticated refinement and employment of rhetorical and sociohistorical tools have profoundly altered the interpretive landscape. The impact of these methodological developments is probably nowhere more clearly evident than in the contemporary discussions of Paul's letter to the Galatians. As a result, the student seeking to read the secondary literature on Galatians must often negotiate specialized language and complex lines of argument for which he or she may be largely unprepared. In addition to the theological jargon that traditionally characterizes discussion of Galatians, one now encounters a significant amount of rhetorical and sociohistorical terminology, and the reader's familiarity with this specialized language is increasingly assumed. Unless one has been trained in rhetorical theory, especially classical, is familiar with epistolography, has a grasp of historical, social scientific, and literary criticism, and enjoys some acquaintance with the increasing awareness of the interpreter's role in the interpretive process—and the kind of carefully measured phrasing this can produce—this language, which was designed to clarify and increase precision, may instead serve to obscure and perhaps alienate.

This volume is designed to help facilitate familiarity with the contemporary issues central to the interpretation of Galatians, the prevailing points of view as well as some recent challenges to them, and to help penetrate the specialist's technical terminology. Unfortunately, it is unable to address all of the current—much less the traditional—debates or include every pertinent participant and essay, especially the arguments offered only in monographs or commentaries, or as part of research made in the service of other topics and texts. The essays included, however, comprise a comprehensive introduction to significant research in the field, representing some of the best work available, and, for the most part, define the terms commonly employed, or at least provide a sense for how they are used. Those chosen for this volume concentrate around three important areas of particular interest. The first part of the volume examines contemporary rhetorical and epistolary analyses of the letter. The second part investigates recent interpretations of Paul's autobiographical narrative related in Galatians 1 and 2, especially Paul's view of his relationship with the Jerusalem authorities of this nascent movement and, even more specifically, his perspective on the incident with Peter at Antioch. The third part traces various ways of

constructing the situation among the addressees in Galatia, whereby interpreters seek to discover the reasons Paul wrote just this response.¹

Many issues arise in each of these areas of debate. For rhetorical analysis of Galatians, for example, consider but a few of the methodological matters that become immediately apparent in these essays. How should an interpreter approach the task in view of the fact that Paul wrote letters but the rhetorical handbooks addressed the delivery of orations? If analyzed according to rhetorical categories for oration, or, alternatively, within epistolary categories, or even by attending to elements that arise from both of these communication mediums, to what genre should Galatians be assigned, and with what results for its interpretation? Moreover, should analysis of Paul's first-century correspondence be confined to theories and examples that arise in ancient classical handbooks and extant texts, and if so, which ones, or should it include the insights available to us now from later rhetorical theories and examples? Naturally, the decisions made on these matters will impact the way the message of the letter is interpreted or its prior interpretation is confirmed.

In the area of sociohistorical methodology, consider the way that interpreters construct the context of the writer and the recipients of the letter. What were the contextual situations of Paul, his addressees, and those who were influencing them in a direction to which Paul objected? Why did he write this letter? Or more precisely, why did he perceive the need to write it, and what did he design it to accomplish? How might Paul's assessment have differed from the perceptions of the addressees in Galatia? or from the perceptions of those whose influence Paul sought to check? The construction of the situation(s) among the addressees and the perception of Paul upon which the interpreter settles directly influence the way that he or she perceives the nature of Paul's response or confirms a prior understanding thereof. Each interpreter variously draws, intentionally or not, upon a wealth of historical and cultural as well as rhetorical and philosophical—not to mention theological—ideas, traditions, and methods of enquiry and argumentation. Naturally, the different choices made in each of these areas combine to influence every interpreter to different conclusions.

It is interesting to note that both the more rhetorically and sociohistorically oriented approaches to the interpretation of this letter connect when attending to the issue of establishing a context for Paul's letter. Why? Because, in order to interpret Paul's language in Galatians, it is necessary to construct—or at least assume—the context for which it is imagined to have been used, so that the historical rhetorical meaning it may have held for the writer and his addressees can be proposed. We have the extant message Paul sent, but we do not know the situational context that prompted his decision to write it; we cannot know a priori what he meant to communicate, why he arranged it in this and not some other way, or what, for the recipients, it meant when received. In order to construct a context for understanding these his-

¹ Some interpreters refer to their hypotheses as reconstructions; discussing constructions, however, has the advantage of recognizing in the terminology that interpreters seek to conceptualize historical or rhetorical situations that are by nature perceptions for the original players as well as for the later interpreter, and thus not objectively measurable "constructions" (e.g., archaeological sites) that we then "reconstruct."

torical and rhetorical situations, that is, what might have been actually happening as well as what Paul thought was happening and hoped to effect by way of this letter, it is necessary to hypothesize from the language used therein, because apart from this letter we do not have any certain evidence from which to work. These are interdependent tasks. Circularity is thus built into the process of interpretation, since we do not know the context but must hypothesize it from the language of the letter, yet we do not know the meaning of the language of the letter—or the genre—without hypothesizing a context for its usage.

The construction of sociohistorical as well as rhetorical contexts to interpret Paul's language cannot be easily separated from the enterprise of interpretation itself, including theological. Each aspect involves analysis of Paul's rhetoric in a kind of back-and-forth process; moreover, none of this analysis takes place in a vacuum. The point can be illustrated with any of the essays included in this volume, but let us briefly consider the essay that initiated the contemporary interest in rhetorical analysis of Paul's letter, as it should help the reader qualify the results of each of the others.

Hans Dieter Betz makes it clear that he seeks to investigate the "possible criteria and methods" for "how to arrive at an 'outline' of the letter."² Betz thereby announces that he does not seek to offer a hypothesis for, or an analysis of, the sociohistorical context of Paul or the addressees per se, or to offer an interpretation of Paul's language. He wants to determine the rhetorical genre exemplified by Paul's argument, and then outline the elements. Yet the choice of rhetorical genre requires the construction of a sociohistorical as well as rhetorical context provoking Paul's letter—in Betz's case, what is determined to be Paul's "defense" against "opponents." Naturally, this situational hypothesis requires an implicit, if not explicit, analysis of Paul's letter, from which the elements of its construction are gathered. That is, in order to determine the reason for the letter, it is necessary for Betz to have a working hypothesis for the author's perception of the situational exigence—why Paul felt compelled to respond. Only with a situation already postulated can Betz propose a reason for Paul choosing as most appropriate to the task ("inventing") just this kind of *defensive* reply ("forensic"/"judicial") instead of some other kind (e.g., "deliberative" or "epideictic"), or even an entirely different kind of discourse. And only after these stages of the interpretive process have been undertaken can Betz advance an argument for why and how Paul set out to arrange the elements (the outline) of his argument—that is, how Paul "organized" it. This process exemplifies the ineluctable circularity of the interpretive task already noted: from the rhetorical information supplied in the letter, in concert with any other information or conjecture that is also incorporated, the interpreter hypothesizes the historical as well as rhetorical situation giving rise to the letter and at the same time analyzes its rhetoric, including that from which he or she constructed that context, on the basis of his or her hypothesis of the context of its usage. Since the contemporary interpreter was not present, he or she can only hypothesize the historical situations as well as the rhetorical nature of Paul's epistolary response. Then these hypotheses must be tested, debated if you will.

²Betz, "Literary Composition," 3.

It should be noted that the importance of these contemporary discussions of the context and rhetoric of Galatians reaches well beyond the confines of the interpretation of this particular letter. Even discussions of those whose influence Paul opposes in other letters often turn on the identity and interests attributed to those supposed to be influencing his addressees in Galatia. The information contained in Paul's autobiographical narrative of Galatians 1 and 2 is the most important firsthand source that interpreters have available for comprehensive constructions of Paul and his activities, and it provides some of the earliest and most essential available evidence for research into the historical and theological origins of Christianity, reaching even beyond consideration of Paul's relationship with the Jerusalem apostles. For example, histories of early Christianity rely upon an interpretation of the "facts" about Paul, the Jerusalem apostles, and the developments in Jerusalem and Antioch that are related in these narrative units. And the interpretation of the situation in Galatia and of the nature of the message contained in Paul's response also plays a central role in such historical constructions. This last element, the interpretation of Paul's message in this letter, is of course essential to the theological enterprise. Indeed, for sociohistorical as well as rhetorical debates, Galatians holds pride of place.

No one should assume that he or she approaches the interpretation of this text without some presuppositions, whether gained from study of Galatians, Paul's other letters, the Acts of the Apostles, or other ancient texts believed to bear upon its interpretation, and without his or her own predisposition to the material and its meaning, even the perception of its relative importance. Some of these presuppositions may have become part of what he or she believes to be *known* about Galatians as well as its author, Paul, from sermons and classes, literature and newspapers, casual conversation or formal education, or prior reading and study of the letter. This exposure may have led to a negative or positive disposition to the language of the letter, to the person who wrote it, to those to whom he wrote, or to those whom he wrote to oppose. Some interpreters have internalized a particular understanding or seek to do so to direct their future thoughts; some may have other interests, including challenging a particular interpretation, for any number of reasons. The point is that the interpretation of this letter and the ends to which the conclusions drawn are applied represent aspects of a complex process; no one should assume that he or she is approaching the task without some bias. In this interpretive enterprise humility, the employment of interdisciplinary methodologies, and the role of debate to sharpen our awareness of the alternatives offer immeasurable benefits.

Certain debates that were once central for the interpreter of Galatians are now not the focus of most contemporary attention, and are thus not the topics of this volume. For example, the discussion of the precise location of the addressees (the so-called North or South Galatia hypotheses), while ongoing, is presently at an impasse. It is currently difficult to make much headway from the information internal to the letter itself. The arguments tend to focus upon comparisons with information available in the Acts of the Apostles, and are often undertaken as part of comprehensive portraits of Paul and his several journeys. At this juncture most interpreters concentrating upon Galatians summarize the evidence for both positions and, if taking up

one side or the other, usually still seek to distance their conclusions from the necessity of being proven correct on this element.³ Other debates not covered specifically here focus on particular passages, such as investigations of certain elements related in Paul's autobiographical accounts in Galatians 1 and 2. They seek to understand, for example, how or if the events noted there correspond to the events traced in the Acts of the Apostles, the timing of this letter vis-à-vis Paul's other letters, or the chronology and character of Paul's life and activities both before and after his "calling or conversion," or whether he argued on the basis of "faith *in*" or "the faith *of* Christ." Also not included are many essays on a wide variety of topics that include discussion of Galatians, or those that focus upon particular passages but do not aim to offer a comprehensive analysis of either the context or rhetoric of the letter per se. Many of the theologically oriented disputes fall into this category. They concern Galatians and may arise in and influence the arguments of the contributors to this volume, but represent broader topics than this project can hope to address.

A word about organization is in order. The volume is divided into three major parts, as discussed above. Two of these are subdivided further according to methodological emphasis. The essays within each part and subdivision appear in the order of their original publication date, with new contributions last; hopefully, this will offer the reader a sense of the way that the debates have developed to date. Below is a brief introduction to each of these parts and subdivisions, and a summary of each of the essays. Cross-references to essays within the volume have been updated to reflect the page numbers of the contributions as they appear now in *The Galatians Debate*. The footnote numbering in these chapters may not always exactly match that of the original articles. A Glossary of selected terms follows the last essay. Finally, there is a comprehensive volume bibliography, an index for citations of ancient sources, and an index of modern authors.

I am confident that the contributors join me in hoping that these essays will serve to stimulate deeper insight, further productive research, and facilitate lively debate for many years to come.

Part 1: Rhetorical and Epistolary Genre

Rhetorical Approaches

To whatever degree it may be argued that the analysis of Paul's letter has been characterized by attention to rhetoric in the past, it is clearly the case that Hans Dieter Betz's work initiated the modern debate. Betz hit a nerve when he proposed in his 1975 article—followed by the detailed articulation of the thesis in his 1979 *Hermeneia* commentary—that Galatians can be "analysed according to Graeco-Roman rhetoric and epistolography."⁴ The reaction to his proposal was swift and significant, and its reach extends far beyond rhetorical analysis of Galatians. Within a few years

³In addition to the helpful discussions found in most contemporary commentaries (esp. R. Longenecker, *Galatians*, lxi–lxxii), see Bruce, "Galatian Problems 2"; Jewett, *Chronology*; Scott, *Paul*; Breitenbach, *Paulus*.

⁴Betz, "Literary Composition"; idem, *Galatians*.

many reviews, essays, monographs, and commentaries began to appear—pro and con, to be sure—with each interpreter concerned to discover the possibilities such rhetorical approaches might hold for Galatians, for Paul’s other letters, and for other New Testament documents. The essays below will trace some of this development, and they will make clear that there are other important voices in this debate not represented directly in this volume. For example, the classicist George Kennedy was one of the first to interact with Betz’s proposal and the challenge to apply classical rhetorical theory to the interpretation of the New Testament documents, including Galatians. His approach was in many ways methodologically similar to Betz, but he differed strongly over classification of the genre, with several notable results. The essay by Robert Hall, among others, brings Kennedy’s voice directly to bear on this debate. Many influential voices should be noted besides those included in this volume; some gave papers in the same meetings and to the same societies, and these practitioners turned to others, especially those working in the fields of classical and modern rhetorical theory. The included essays trace the main lines of the argument in superb fashion and introduce many of the other central figures and ideas to which the reader seeking to join the debate should also attend.⁵

⁵Proponents of forensic classification include the essays herein by Betz, “Literary Composition,” and by T. Martin, “Apostasy to Paganism”; and see, e.g., Betz, *Galatians*; Brinsmead, *Galatians*; Hester, “Rhetorical Structure”; idem, “Use and Influence.” For criticism of this classification, see herein Hall, “Rhetorical Outline”; Smit, “Letter of Paul”; Classen, “St. Paul’s Epistles”; and see Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 144–52; Aune, “Review of Betz, *Galatians*”; Meeks, “Review”; Lyons, *Autobiography*, 112–19; Fairweather, “Rhetoric: Parts 1 & 2”; Cooper, “*Narratio*”; and commentators, e.g., R. Longenecker, *Galatians*, cix–cxiii, Esler, *Galatians*, 60–61; Witherington, *Grace*, 27–31. See also the arguments of those listed below who challenge, to various degrees, the effort to classify this letter by rhetorical categories developed for orations.

Proponents of deliberative classification herein include Hall, “Rhetorical Outline”; Smit, “Letter of Paul”; and see, e.g., Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 144–52; Lyons, *Autobiography*, 119–20, 136, 173–75; Russell, “Rhetorical Analysis”; Fairweather, “Rhetoric: Part 3,” 219, 240, though with caveat; Cosgrove, *Cross and the Spirit*, 25–30; Aune, *Literary Environment*, 206–8; commentators include, e.g., Matera, *Galatians*, 11; Esler, *Galatians*, 61, 137; Witherington, *Grace*, 25–41, passim. Note too Mitchell, *Reconciliation*, 22–23, although dealing directly with classification of 1 Corinthians.

Proponents of epideictic classification have generally argued from a more functional than formal basis and from epistolography; see herein Hester, “Epideictic Rhetoric and Persona,” and see, e.g., Hester, “Placing the Blame”; Kraftchick, “Why Do the Rhetoricians Rage?” 67–71; J. White, “Apostolic Mission,” 159–61; Sullivan and Anible, “Epideictic Dimension”; Nanos, *Irony*, 329–31.

Classification of Galatians within these rhetorical genres has been challenged to various degrees and for various reasons. For arguments about the inherent weakness of analyzing letters according to the classifications developed for oration, see Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, 2–3, for both sides of argument (Demetrius, *De elocutione*, applies rhetorical terms to letters, and Cicero, *De or.* 2.11.49–50, may be taken this way, yet Malherbe notes that there does not seem to have been “an entire theoretical system”). See herein Classen, “St. Paul’s Epistles,” 98–99, 109–13; and, see e.g., Aune, *Literary Environment*, 158–59; Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory*, 93–109, 111–23, 141, 165–67, and esp. 34, 100, 103; Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 27, 51–52, 56; Porter, “Theoretical Justification”; idem, “Paul of Tarsus,” esp. 539–47, 562–67; idem, “Ancient Rhetorical Analysis”; Weima, “Aristotle”; D. Watson, “Rhetorical Criticism”; Reed, “Epistle”; idem, “Using Ancient Categories.” Among those working specifically on Galatians, note herein Berchman, “Galatians (1:1–5)”; Hester, “Epideictic Rhetoric and Persona”; Dahl, “Galatians”; and see, e.g., Hansen, *Galatians*, 22–24; idem, *Abraham in Galatians*, 55–71; Cosgrove, *Cross and the Spirit*, 23–31; Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians*, 30–34, passim; Nanos, *Irony*, 323–31; and the commentaries of R. Longenecker, *Galatians*, ci–cxix; Dunn, *Theology*, 20; Williams, *Galatians*, 28–31; Martyn, *Galatians*, 20–23; Esler, *Galatians*, 18–19, 59–61.

In his seminal essay, “The Literary Composition and Function of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” Betz proposes to read Galatians as an example of forensic rhetoric expressed in the literary genre of an “apologetic letter.” Betz deftly combines the strategies and techniques of Cicero and Quintilian, among others, to show us how he understands Paul to have employed these rhetorical devices in his letter, especially when he analyzes chapters 1–2, which he categorizes as the *exordium* (1:6–11), *narratio* (1:12–2:14), and *propositio* (2:15–21). Where the device is lacking or does not seem to exemplify the model rhetorical approach that Betz understands Paul to be otherwise engaged in constructing, these instances are still understood to represent rhetorical strategies. For example, where the *probatio* of 3:1–4:31 fails to exemplify the elements to be expected in an apologetic letter, Paul’s language is understood to be calculated to, for example, “disguis[e] his argumentative strategy,” as would be “expected” of “a skilled [Hellenistic] rhetorician”: “Paradoxically, extremely perfected logic was thought to create suspicion and boredom, not credibility, while a carefully prepared mixture of some logic, some emotional appeal, some wisdom, some beauty, and some entertainment was thought to conform to human nature and to the ways in which human beings accept arguments as true” (18–19). When Paul places an allegorical proof at the end of the *probatio*, a move that fails to conform with Quintilian’s advice, Betz finds the explanation in the adaptation of Pseudo-Demetrius’s epistolary example, thus moving away from direct argumentation to a more inductive approach calculated to involve the readers/hearers in “find[ing] the ‘truth’ for themselves, thus convincing themselves, and at the same time clearing themselves from the blame of being ἀνόητοι Γαλάται” (24). Evaluation of the *paraenesis* (5:1–6:10) turns around advice not from rhetorical handbooks, where its consideration is incidental at best, but from the philosophical tradition, such as one finds articulated in Seneca’s letters. Although a largely undeveloped observation, it is interesting that in his concluding comments Betz also considers Galatians to have some characteristics of a “magical letter,” whereby Paul “overcomes the limitations of the ‘apologetic letter’” (27–28). For Betz, a letter such as this one “presupposes the real or fictitious situation of the court of law, with the jury, the accuser and the defendant. In the case of Galatians, the addressees are identical with the jury, with Paul being the defendant and his opponents the accusers. This situation makes Paul’s letter a self-apology” (26).

The next two essays in this volume employ similar analytical methods and assume that somewhat similar situations obtain for the addressees, yet represent direct challenges to Betz’s classification of Galatians as forensic/judicial rhetoric. In “The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians: A Reconsideration,” Robert Hall, drawing from the work of George Kennedy, also argues within classical categories, but to propose that Paul’s argument exemplifies a “deliberative” rather than a defensive speech. Even though elements of the other genres may be at work, the functional characteristics of deliberative speech—exhortation and dissuasion to or from a particular future action on the grounds of expedience or harm—dominate Galatians. According to Hall, the participants in this debate are not primarily concerned about adjudicating Paul’s *past* actions (forensic), or praising or denouncing a *past* action, or “merely” seeking “to change a *present* attitude” (epideictic). Rather, Paul is concerned with what decision

the addressees will make “between two antithetical modes of life and behavior” and, as a result, with what direction their *future* actions will take—functions characteristic of a deliberative speech (31). Paul urges the addressees to “cleave to Paul and his gospel and to reject his opponents and their gospel” (31). He employs invective in the declamatory style of popular deliberative, although Quintillian deplored this kind of excess (31). In the style of deliberative, Paul’s narratives seek not to remind of the facts of a case but to introduce “relevant matters external to the case”—in this instance, to prove that Paul’s authority and gospel are from God and confirmed by the church but his opponents and their message are not (32). Paul calls for a choice, appealing to the addressees’ advantage, a distinctive function of deliberative rhetoric, as is also the important role of exhortation throughout—“Galatians must be deliberative” (32). In the balance of his essay Hall explains how the outline of Galatians exemplifies just such a speech in ways that a forensic classification is ostensibly unable to match. The functions of salutation and *exordium* are combined in 1:1–5; the proposition of the letter is set out in vv. 6–9; the proof, which constitutes the bulk of the letter (including the *narratio* and exhortation of Betz’s outline), explains the reasons the audience should accept the proposition. It consists of a narration (1:10–2:21) articulating Paul’s ethos, followed by a variety of other arguments (3:1–6:10). The epilogue of 6:11–18 restates and summarizes the argument, as Quintilian would advise (cf. *Inst.* 6.1.1–2).

In “The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech,” Joop Smit joins Hall in arguing for a deliberative classification of Galatians in classical terms. From the start, he mounts criticism of Betz’s analysis as judicial, yet he shares, even sharpens the concern to find exact formal as well as functional correspondence between Paul’s construction of the letter’s argument and what is advised in rhetorical handbooks that may have been available to Paul. Smit explains discrepancies between the claims Betz makes for Quintilian and for Paul’s letter, and the elements Smit finds present in those references. He challenges the notion that the function of Paul’s narratives is to seek a pronouncement of judgment by the addressees as a judicial body: “The story does not confront them with a precise legal question, but rather proposes two courses of action from which they should choose” (40).

Smit argues that Gal 2:15–21 does not exemplify the formal characteristics of a *propositio*, which sums up the points of agreement and disagreement between the parties besides enumerating and briefly explaining the argument to come, that is, making transparent the organization of the entire speech. Furthermore, he argues that 3:1–4:31 is poorly suited to the task of a *probatio*, to strengthen the position of the speaker’s position. Instead of interrogation of witnesses to ascertain the legitimacy of a certain course of action, Smit finds the strengthening of assertions: Paul “makes the reproach that they would be acting foolishly and harming themselves if they change their behavior” (41). Smit finds fault not only with Betz’s admitted problem of the lack of evidence for the type of exhortation expressed in 5:1–6:10, which Betz labels *paraenesis*, but also with Betz’s classification of 6:11–18 as *peroratio*, since it does not sum up the main points of the *probatio* of 3:1–4:31 and it is missing the

other two parts to be expected in a *peroratio*, namely, an effort to arouse anger and hostility (*indignatio*) and an appeal to pity (*conquestio*).

Smit instructively proposes consideration of four methodological matters that arise for the interpreter seeking to classify Paul's rhetoric in classical terms and that underscore his criticisms of Betz's approach (42–45). First, in terms of historical witnesses, he notes that Quintilian—whose writings are encyclopedic and thus easily mined for support of virtually any view relating to Paul—wrote around 90 C.E. in Rome and was influenced by the continuous adaptation of the Greeks by the Romans, so that reference to Cicero, writing around 85 B.C.E., provides a more reliable control for analysis of Paul's letter. Second, in addition to taking issue with Betz's genre classification of Galatians as judicial rhetoric on functional terms, he suggests the priority of the Hellenistic handbook *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (anonymous, ca. 300 B.C.E.), which precedes the priority position assumed by judicial rhetoric in the handbooks to which Betz appeals. Third, he seeks to challenge the traditional Lutheran theological assumptions he believes to be at work in Betz's analysis, as though at issue were justification by faith in the face of legalistic challenges. Although Smit argues that Paul "crossed the bounds of Judaism" and chose to "leave the hedge of torah" in order to accomplish his task (58), he nevertheless proposes to build his analysis around the recent trend to see at issue a dispute about the conditions that obtain for legitimating the incorporation of Christ-believing Gentiles in unity with Christ-believing Jews in the Christian community of faith. Fourth, he challenges the inclusion of 5:13–6:10 in the original letter's composition—though not necessarily denying that it was written by Paul—thereby seeking to explain the presence of exhortation unattested in the handbooks for preparing a deliberative speech, even as it is absent for the judicial genre. At the end of his essay, Smit returns to this topic and to overcoming the implicit admission of a problem arising for these classical rhetorical analyses.

In keeping with his suggested methodology, Smit finds throughout the letter functional equivalents of the deliberative genre of speech as defined by Cicero and the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. He proposes that 1:6–12 constitutes the *exordium*, which aims "to make the listeners well-disposed, attentive and receptive" (46). Paul's argument here is political as expected, including terms (such as "deserting," "disturbing," and "subverting") to dissuade the addressees from following his opponents and to instead persuade them to remain true to him and the course on which they had begun with his teaching. Smit understands 1:13–2:21 to constitute the *narratio*, which should follow the *exordium* and, as such, be designed to set out the facts in a brief, clear, and plausible manner, bending what details are revealed to the speaker's rhetorical advantage. This is followed by the *confirmatio*, and Smit understands Paul to be occupied with proofs in 3:1–4:11. The absence here of a *divisio* or *partitio* between the *exordium* and *narratio* constitutes for Smit further evidence against classification as judicial, where the *narratio* would be expected to render an account of the earlier stated facts, defining the points of agreement between the parties and clarifying the precise point for which judgment is sought in the plea. Although the details are far too many to note, Smit sees Paul proceeding as he should in a *confirmatio*, clearly articulating a series of arguments based upon honor and advantage as well as baseness

and disadvantage. Paul's *conclusio* is understood to consist of three parts that clarify the choice at hand: the *conquestio* of 4:12–20 seeks to arouse the audience's pity, the *enumeratio* of 4:21–5:6 briefly summarizes to refresh the memory of the listeners, and the *indignatio* of 5:7–12 intends to incite hatred of his opponents. Finally, since the *conclusio* ought to be the final word, Smit proposes that 6:11–18 constitutes an *amplificatio*, which arises because Paul's argument is sent as a letter and thus calls for a subscription in his own handwriting. In addition, he argues that its concerns are in keeping with the concerns of the deliberative genre. Galatians 5:13–6:10 is omitted from the outline, since the otherwise "clear structure and line of thought shown by the text without this passage" are understood to legitimate Smit's hypothesis. It instead "contains a rounded off fragment of Paul added to the letter at a somewhat later time" (58).

Rhetorical analysis of Galatians according to the classical handbooks also occupies Robert Berchman in "Galatians (1:1–5): Paul and Greco-Roman Rhetoric," but with a shift of focus. He notes the exegetical limitations of a methodology that has resulted in skilled critics reaching such different conclusions about the genre of Paul's argument. Berchman suggests this results from the fact that while theoreticians ascribed certain meaning to particular rhetorical forms, Paul "adjusted" these forms "to fit the persuasive context his letter(s) address. Thus the inventive and not the mimetic aspects of rhetoric are what interest him" (62). Formal parallels with Greco-Roman rhetoric may be found, but these forms do not exist in "pure form in Galatians."

To demonstrate the proposed gap between theory and Paul's practice of rhetoric, Berchman undertakes a form-critical analysis of a specific unit within the letter, the prologue or proem of 1:1–5. He approaches the formal structural dimensions of this text as if it were a speech act, investigating the aspects of logic, topic, and genre found there. A variety of elements are noted for each aspect in his detailed examination. For example, in terms of genre, Berchman detects argument from opposites, authority, relation, and the "more and less" in vv. 1–2 (characteristics of forensic); from authority, relation, parallel cases, and authority in vv. 3–4 (characteristics of deliberative); and from authority in the doxology of v. 5 (a characteristic of epideictic speech). For Berchman, within these five verses Paul argues judicially for the truth of his character, deliberatively for the self-interest and future benefits of the addressees, and epideictically to deepen their values. Working backward from these classifications, Berchman advances several suggestions for constructing the historical situation provoking such rhetoric. He finds Paul's creditability at issue behind the forensic arguments, yet the fact that Paul's deliberative rhetoric aims to influence the future course of action the addressees will take suggests a continued relationship and agreement on the importance of the gospel of Christ for themselves (the stasis). This agreement is also implied in the laudatory rhetoric of the doxology, for such epideictic speech appeals to shared values, apart from which such a hymn would not be used. Berchman's Paul is not only well studied in Greco-Roman rhetoric; he is comfortable enough with the formal aspects to employ them functionally beyond their prescribed handbook stereotypes.

In “Apostasy to Paganism: The Rhetorical Stasis of the Galatian Controversy,” Troy Martin employs rhetorical theory—stasis theory in particular—to move from Paul’s accusations and arguments to a reconstruction of Paul’s understanding of the basic issues at dispute. The stasis represents the chief issue to be decided in a dispute, and secondary stases can also arise. If one is accused of some action and denies having done it, this denial constitutes the chief issue at dispute. If one accepts the fact of having done it but redefines it, or appeals to mitigating circumstances that alter the significance of the event, or perhaps challenges the jurisdiction of the case, then the defense chosen determines the stasis, the issues to be resolved, and thus the direction that the arguments to prove or refute one’s claims will take. The interpreter of Paul’s letter has only the remaining arguments of one party from which to construct the issues at dispute. Thus, to determine the stasis, he or she must both take account of Paul’s accusations and seek to fill in the anticipated responses of the addressees.

Martin proposes two accusations. In 1:6–9, the charge is exchanging his gospel for another one that requires circumcision and observance of the Jewish law; in 4:8–11, the charge is apostatizing to paganism. In order to make sense of these two ostensibly irreconcilable alternatives, Martin argues that the addressees have accepted the terms of this other gospel as the legitimate definition of Christian gospel but they have declined to submit to its requirement of circumcision. Thus they understand themselves to have rejected the gospel of Christ, leaving open only the option of returning to paganism. He thereby determines that the principle stasis is the accusation, in 4:8–11, of a return to paganism and that this is a stasis of quality, which investigates the seriousness of an alleged action, rather than its denial, redefinition, or rejection on technical grounds. Since Martin understands 4:8–11 to constitute Paul’s accusation of their past action of apostatizing in response to the unacceptable terms of the gospel, now believed to include circumcision, he determines the genre to be forensic. Paul is not defending himself, as Betz understands the case to be when assigning Galatians to this same genre, because Paul is engaged in accusing the addressees, like the prophets of old, “in the tradition of a divine lawsuit”: “It is a pre-trial letter written to an offending party to summon that party back to the original agreement. . . . If this case should ever come to trial, the letter to the Galatians is one of the documents the plaintiff, Paul, would most certainly enter as evidence against the defendants, the Galatians” (93–94). Moreover, this stasis is, according to Martin, of the subcategory of shifting the blame to the proponents of this other gospel for leading the addressees into actions that are forbidden. In this way, Martin both classifies the rhetorical genre and clarifies the historical situation for which he understands it to have been invented. While the addressees will agree to the charge of returning to paganism, they will contend that they have done so innocently in response to learning the terms of the *true* gospel, inclusive of terms that Paul had not mentioned—namely, circumcision and the observance of Jewish law. Paul’s argument at this point in the dispute, which is when Galatians is written, sets out the terms of the true gospel as he had delivered it, anticipates that their response will be to blame those influencing them otherwise, and makes it clear that they must not persist in their present course, which includes unjust behavior toward Paul and is

without excuse before God. In the balance of the essay, Martin articulates the details of his approach.

The final essay in this section, by Carl Joachim Classen, “St. Paul’s Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric” offers a critique of methodological issues that arise—or at least should arise—for these approaches to rhetorical analysis in general and to the application to Galatians in particular. In addition, he traces examples of rhetorical analysis of Paul’s letter that precede the contemporary debate touched off by Betz’s essay and commentary on Galatians, especially the sixteenth-century work of Melanchthon, who invented a fourth genre to categorize Galatians, *instruction* rhetoric (*genus didacticum*) [cf. 101]. Although Classen recognizes that Paul would have “imbib[ed] applied rhetoric from others” through reading, “even if he never heard of any rules of rhetorical theory,” he is comfortable with the notion that Paul probably had some direct knowledge of such theory [97–98 and n. 11]. Moreover, Paul’s Tanak studies would have contributed to some level of rhetorical sophistication. Whatever the historical case, Classen’s point is that the contemporary critic of Paul’s correspondence should not limit himself or herself to the rhetorical resources available to a person of Paul’s time, beyond an interest in, for example, demonstrating the extent of Paul’s familiarity with such theories and practices. Otherwise, for the rhetorical analysis of texts, instead of adopting the author’s limitations, “one should not hesitate to use the most developed and sophisticated form” (97). Furthermore, Classen observes another limitation to analysis of Galatians from ancient rhetoric alone: “The categories of ancient rhetoric fail us with respect to the structure of this epistle, because it is an epistle, and they were not made nor meant to fit such kinds of composition” (109). Such an observation introduces a fitting transition to the discussions arising in our next section.

Epistolary Approaches

While Betz was probing the application of ancient forensic rhetorical theory to this letter (which effort included noting formal features of the epistolary structure), Nils A. Dahl was focusing primarily on the promise of ancient epistolary theory. Whereas Betz combed the rhetorical manuals of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, to name a few, Dahl searched the epistolary handbooks of Pseudo-Libanius and Pseudo-Demetrius and the papyri exemplifying ancient correspondence. The product of Dahl’s research was presented to the 1973 SBL seminar entitled “The Form and Function of the Pauline Letters.” Until now this paper, “Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” has been available only to a small number of Pauline scholars who met together to discuss the promise of epistolary and rhetorical approaches to Galatians, or those to whom they passed it on. Although it has not been entirely overlooked by recent interpreters, its influence can hardly be compared to that of the rhetorical approach.⁶ The case for two different lines

⁶Those who refer to Dahl’s paper in their analysis include, e.g., Hester; R. Longenecker; Hansen, a student of R. Longenecker; and myself, thanks to the gracious offer of a copy from Jerome Neyrey, who received it at a seminar at Yale that same year.

of research should not be overstated, however, because certainly both Dahl and Betz were participating in the same meetings and reviewing the same literature.⁷

In “Paul’s Letter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content, and Structure,” Dahl demonstrates the results of an epistolary approach to identifying the genre and structure of Galatians, although, for the sake of space, only two sections of the paper are included here, while three other sections and several charts and appendixes are omitted. Dahl combines the insights of epistolary specialists—who noted that the opening rebuke and expression of surprise were consistent with many examples, from ancient papyri letters, of a form that could be labeled “ironic rebuke”—with his recognition of the special place of irony in such expressions according to the ancient epistolary handbooks. This leads him to suggest that, although representing a change of style from Paul’s other extant letters, the opening to Galatians is not a deviation from epistolary conventions. This is a very common letter style—in fact, more frequent in the extant papyri letters than thanksgiving openings—by which the writer expresses disappointment and disapproval through a statement of feigned surprise, that is, ironically. This ironically rebuking expression of surprise is often accompanied by rhetorical questions of the same nature. But rather than implying a bad relationship with the addressees, “even in reproaches θαυμάζω [“surprise”] is mainly used when the relationship between sender and recipient is basically good and has been good in the past”; moreover, “the ironic rebuke is an indirect ‘expression of affection and concern’ (φιλοφρόνησις) for the addressees” (119). The rebuke undermines the recipient’s negligence, failure to comply with instructions, or some other inappropriate or foolish action, but it does so on the basis of an ongoing relationship, and thus the writer’s continued expectations for a good-will response. Dahl discusses many examples that parallel the style, expressions, and message of Galatians.

Dahl’s analysis of the structure and message of Galatians as a letter instead of a speech yields much to compare with the above analyses. He separates passages “that are more directly addressed to the epistolary situation (1:1–5, 6–10; 3:1–5; 4:8–11, 12, 13–20; 5:2–12; 6:11–16, 17, 18),” wherein the expressions of surprise and distress along with rebuking questions and all the explicit references to those influencing the addressees in Galatia are contained, from the four self-contained narrative units expressing more general information (1:12–2:21; 3:4–29 and 4:1–7; 4:21–31 and 5:1; and 5:13–6:10) [131]. For Dahl, 1:6–4:11 forms a structural unit in which Paul expresses his reaction to developments in the Galatian congregations, providing the background for the request or pleading section of 4:12–6:10. At 4:12, Paul, as the writers of other letters of ironic rebuke often do—and, *mutatis mutandis*, in ways that can be detected in the structure of many of his other letters—asks the recipients to do what they have thus far neglected. The letter body is framed by a salutation in

⁷Betz notes his debt to members of the seminar, mentioning Nils Dahl, Robert Funk, M. Luther Stirewalt, and John White specifically (Betz, “Literary Composition,” 4 n. 9), and refers to Dahl’s paper (9 n. 44). The exchange of ideas is obvious; note the many references in Betz’s work to the epistolary handbooks and papyri, and in Dahl’s paper to the classical rhetoricians.

1:1–5 and an autobiographical epilogue that summarizes the contrast between himself and the advocates of circumcision and draws attention to the importance of remaining on the course set by Paul (6:11–18).

There are many differences advanced for the formal, functional, and structural elements of the letter and the meaning of its various sections; yet the letter's purpose is for Dahl not that different from that of the rhetorical analysts noted above: "to make these churches dissociate themselves from the intruders and again follow the apostle and his gospel" (138). Nevertheless, the way the rhetorical data are understood to be organized may have significant results, for example, on how the interpreter identifies the players and situations in Galatia that Paul sought to influence and the ones whose influence he sought to obstruct.

In "A Paradigm of the Apocalypse: The Gospel in the Light of Epistolary Analysis,"⁸ G. Walter Hansen develops a few specific insights on the topic of Paul's gospel that result from an epistolary approach similar to Dahl's. The theme and mood of the letter are stated in the opening expression of surprise (θαυμάζω) that the addressees have defected from the true gospel, and this rebuke extends from 1:6 to 4:11 (cf. 1:6, 9; 3:1–5; 4:9, 12). For Hansen, the request of 4:12 is the decisive turning point of the letter, and the request section is understood to run from 4:12 to 6:10. Paul turns from rebuking the addressees for their defection from the gospel to appealing to them to live instead according to it. His appeal in 4:12–20 becomes a focal point of this transition, not the subsidiary argument or digression of many rhetorical approaches. Instead of reading Paul's prior autobiographical comments (1:11–2:21) and arguments about Abraham (3:6–4:11) as a defense against accusations brought by Paul's supposed opponents, according to Hansen they represent parallel paradigms of the power of the gospel to prepare the way for the request Paul will make—namely, to make central to their lives the gospel of Christ. The authority of the gospel is at stake; it is the power of faith in that authority that the faithfulness of Paul and Abraham exemplify. Hansen proposes that the epistolary salutation (1:1–5) introduces the theme of the letter: "Paul's personal participation in the gospel—the death and resurrection of Jesus—was a participation in the apocalypse, the intervention of God within history which brought to an end the old world order and brought into being the new creation" (151). The subscription (6:11–18) restates the request to become like Paul, that is, to imitate his experience based upon the apocalyptic event of the cross of Christ.

Part 2: Autobiographical Narratives

Paul's autobiographical remarks in Galatians 1 and 2 have influenced not only the way that this letter has been interpreted but also represent the most extensive firsthand report of Paul's life before faith in Christ and both at and after his change of conviction about the meaning of Jesus (and the groups of Christ-believers). As a re-

⁸Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, 221 n. 22, for expression of his debt to Dahl's paper.

sult, constructions of Paul, of Paulinism, and of the early church all draw significantly from this material. The information is, however, embedded in a narrative fashioned to persuade the Galatian addressees in specific ways in view of Paul's perception of their situation. As a result, the interpreter who draws upon it must construct—or otherwise assume the shape of—the interpretive frame by which to analyze the relatively brief details of events that did not take place in Galatia, whether or not he or she is concerned specifically with interpreting the Galatian situation and Paul's rhetorical approach to it. In other words, the rhetorical analysis of the series of narrative units in Galatians 1 and 2 must consider the rhetorical issues that arise therein, but also their relationship to Paul's larger argument in the letter.

Part 2 of the volume presents several rhetorical and sociohistorical interpretations that exemplify the modern debate on the autobiographical narrative units of the first two chapters. The three rhetorical essays represent significantly different approaches, whereas the four sociohistorical essays often explicitly interact with each other. Indeed, most of them deal with the Antioch incident of Gal 2:11–21. As a result, this section provides the most comprehensive discussion to date of both the issues and the probable solutions for understanding the conflict between Paul and Peter around which this narrative turns.

Rhetorical Approaches

Paul Koptak's "Rhetorical Identification in Paul's Autobiographical Narrative: Galatians 1:13–2:14," employs the literary-rhetorical method of Kenneth Burke, specifically, his idea of identification. Unlike most of the approaches surveyed to this point, this method does not emphasize a contest of opinion in which the communicator seeks to persuade to his or her own side, certainly not in the sense of a defense; instead, it considers the way in which he or she goes about eliciting "consensus and cooperation by demonstrating what Burke calls a 'consubstantiality' between communicator and audience" (160). That is, it seeks to show how they "stand together" with a similar concern or interest. When the communicator identifies with the concerns of the audience, the audience in turn begins to identify with those of the communicator. Koptak thus seeks to understand how Paul rhetorically identifies with the audience and seeks to win their identification with himself. To the degree that they identify themselves standing with Paul, they will recognize also the distance that stands between themselves and those who do not share their (the addressees' and Paul's consubstantially united) understanding of the gospel of Christ.

A few examples will indicate the difference this method can make. The oppositional relationship Paul stresses in Galatians 1 is observed to be between human and divine authority in Paul's own life before and since his confession of Christ—a change of perspective that he shares with the other apostles in Jerusalem. Thus, even if pursuit of the divine course set for him kept them apart for many years, this does not imply, as it does for most interpreters, that "he was a rebel or did not agree with them" (163). Likewise, 2:1–10 is understood by Koptak to show that the Jerusalem apostles stand with Paul on the gospel God revealed to him, even in the face of

opposition from those who did not identify with that gospel of Christ. The apostles also choose to please God rather than human authorities. Paul draws the Galatian addressees into this identification, approaching the choice as one of either identifying with the gospel of Paul, which the Jerusalem apostles and Paul preserved for them through “cooperative independence,” or undermining it by choosing the other messengers and their gospel, which would parallel a choice to identify with the “false brothers” (v. 5). The Antioch incident of 2:11–14 is understood to illustrate the negative alternative, “how the consubstantial principles of unity and equality are betrayed when one chooses to base one’s actions on the desire to please humans rather than God” (166). For Koptak, Paul “brings the Gentiles into fellowship with the Jewish church and he alone stands with them when all other Jewish Christians withdraw” (168). By way of identification, Paul uses the autobiographical narrative “to create a rhetorical community that the Galatians were forced either to join or reject” (168).

In “Paul’s Argumentation in Galatians 1–2,” Johan Vos begins with an understanding that Paul is engaged in a polemic against rival missionaries influencing the Galatian churches. Vos characterizes with “certainty” these “opponents” as Christ-believers who regard Paul’s gospel as incomplete because it lacked inclusion of “the commandment of circumcision as a prerequisite for full membership among the people of God” (169). Then Vos sets out to demonstrate that the autobiographical narrative of Galatians 1 and 2 can be understood “as an answer to the sole demand of circumcision or obedience to the law of Moses and that it is unnecessary to reconstruct other charges” (170). With these decisions in hand about the nature of the historical situation and the specific limits of Paul’s defensive rhetoric (in the sense of an apologetic for the truth of the gospel but not a defense of his apostleship *per se*), Vos explains why it is inadvisable to follow the consensus in understanding many of Paul’s comments to indicate other charges at issue. For example, the prescript of 1:1–5 anticipates the core argument to follow but is offensive in focus: “The divine authorization of the apostle is the decisive argument against the other gospel” (171). Vos classifies 1:6–9 as the *propositio* and finds here the main thesis set out in rebuke and with a conditional curse: “The true gospel is not the gospel of the opponents, but only that of Paul” (173). He explains why the other classifications advanced by rhetorical critics fail to account adequately for the material. Galatians 1:10–12 constitutes a *confirmatio* argued by enthymemes, that is, by a series of syllogisms through which Paul draws attention to the fact that the tone and content of vv. 6–9 demonstrate that Paul is not a flatterer or servant of humans but a servant of God who speaks the truth. Such appeals to ethos as a way of legitimizing the content of a rhetor’s speech can indicate he or she has rivals in mind, or they can represent stereotypical antithesis, but they need not indicate a prior accusation. According to Vos, Paul is not defending himself but proving the truth of his gospel. Vos describes 1:13–2:14(21) as the narrative *confirmatio*. Galatians 1:13–24 confirms Paul’s legitimacy by way of historical evidence (v. 12); 2:1–10 confirms that the Jerusalem authorities endorsed the truth of his gospel and his way of legitimizing it and demonstrates his faithful ethos in the face of challengers; and 2:11–14(21) confirms

Paul's faithful ethos even before Peter and at the same time demonstrates that even Paul's ethos is subservient to the truth of the gospel. Rather than one of the three genres of classical classification, Vos prefers Melanchthon's category of "didactic" to describe Paul's autobiographical narrative, wherein Paul "defended the truth of his gospel in the face of a contrary gospel and gave instructions as to its nature" (180).

James Hester's new contribution to the debate, "Epideictic Rhetoric and Persona in Galatians 1 and 2," serves several functions. It could have been included in part 1 to exemplify an argument for classifying Galatians as epideictic, a less represented position to date. And Hester pursues this rhetorical approach by attending to epistolary conventions in a way that contributes to the above epistolary discussions of Galatians. But the essay is included in part 2 because it concentrates upon analysis of the narrative discourse of Galatians 1 and 2, bringing to bear tools ranging from rhetorical and epistolary theories and practices, both ancient and modern, to the introduction of a new method to the discussion, symbolic convergence theory. Hester categorizes Galatians as a letter of blame, a letter style that expresses a benefactor's attempt to criticize and/or shame the recipients for a perceived wrong done by them to the benefactor and yet still attempts to maintain the relationship. This can be further refined as blame in the sense of reproach, wherein the accused party has benefited from the effort of the writer but now takes on an attitude or change of behavior that threatens the relationship, indicating a failure to remember the debt of gratitude owed. In addition, Hester notes elements of other letter styles, such as rebuke and censure for the addressees' choice of beliefs and behavior known to be wrong (1:8–9; 4:8–11, 21; 5:2, 13, 17), and he observes elements of vituperation (5:2–12), irony (1:6–7; 3:1–5 [sarcasm]), and *paraenesis* (5:16–6:10). These epistolary observations Hester links with elements that exemplify epideictic, not only Paul's expression of disapproval but, more important, the topics of encomium that arise in 1:13–2:14, since encomium "represents the aim and scope of epideictic literature" (188, quoting Burgess). Hester argues that "the narrative section is fashioned as an encomium because of the ability of the encomium to express character, and for its usefulness in fulfilling the argumentative purpose of character contrast" (190). In a detailed comparison of the topics of encomiums with Paul's autobiographical narrative, Hester uncovers many parallels. Most important, Hester argues that Paul begins to shift the blame from the Galatian recipients as observers to them as participants with the *chreia* in 2:14, followed by the elaboration of vv. 15–21, which changes to inclusive language. He concludes that Paul, "having established the issue (stasis [of quality of the gospel and relationship with Paul]), launches into an encomiastic narrative to illustrate the legitimacy of his gospel. Its character was so superior to anything the Galatians might have encountered subsequently that because of it he triumphed over his unnamed enemies in Jerusalem and shamed Peter in Antioch" (191). In sum, "Paul is the enactment of his own vision; he is proof of his own argument and an example of one who is led by his rhetorical vision" (195). He expects the addressees to both imitate his character and obey his persona.

Sociohistorical Approaches

Since 1983, James D. G. Dunn's essay, "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2.11–18)," has represented one—if not the—most comprehensive examinations of the conflict narrated in Gal 2:11–21 (11–14 for some interpreters). Dunn questions the exegetical assumption of previous interpretations that simply the role of Jewish food laws was at issue. The historical evidence available suggests to Dunn that one problem with traditional readings is the failure to grasp that "earliest Christianity was not yet seen as something separate and distinct from Judaism"; even if holding "some distinct and peculiar beliefs about Jesus," it was a "religion of the Jews" (201, emphasis omitted). The questions that arose had to do with the requirements for the inclusion of Gentiles within these Jewish groups. The group in Antioch would have continued to understand itself in a dynamic relationship with the leaders in Jerusalem, "recognizing the church at Jerusalem as the fountainhead of their distinctive faith" (202). Paul shared this perspective also, Dunn argues, until after this incident. In addition, Dunn seeks to account for the political, religious, and economic constraints faced by Jewish groups in Antioch as well as in Judea during this period of life in the Roman Empire; these would have created inter- and intracommunal tensions for the Jewish groups believing in Jesus. Dunn concludes, "The open table-fellowship practised at Antioch was perceived by the Jerusalem church (and perhaps by other Jews) as a threat" to their "heritage"; "the mission of the men from James would then have been their reaction to that threat" (206). In this light, Dunn seeks to examine the way the table fellowship would have been perceived from the perspective of "the ones from James."

Dunn offers a detailed discussion of many sociohistorical features, including issues of purity, food, and the various active identity systems for approaching interaction with non-Jewish and even with diverse Jewish people, and the topics raised on these matters will occupy an important portion of the debates that arise in the following essays. As a result of Dunn's understanding of these historical—largely religious—issues, coupled with his interpretation of key terms in Paul's text, he proposes that three alternatives remain for interpreting the incident at Antioch. He decides against the first and second alternatives. For Dunn, it is unlikely that Peter and the other Jewish believers in Jesus "had completely abandoned the laws governing table-fellowship" or that Paul would have reacted so negatively if at issue were "merely that the Gentiles should observe the most basic laws of the Torah—the Noahic laws" (222–24). And it is unlikely that Paul would employ the terminology he did if at issue were the final stage of proselyte conversion; moreover, it is doubtful that "Peter would have abandoned in Antioch an agreement made in Jerusalem" (225). He settles on the third alternative, falling somewhere between the other two offered. Although some basic food laws were being observed by Jews and Gentiles alike at this table, "what the men from James would have called for was a much more scrupulous observance of the rulings on what the dietary laws involved, especially with regard to ritual purity and tithing" (225). The reasons Peter withdrew are suggested to be his acceptance of the logic of this demand; his native sensibilities to

the pressure threatening Jewish groups, especially his fellow Christ-believers; his concern to preserve a good reputation among Jews; his acknowledgment of the authority of Jerusalem; and his deduction that these Gentiles would be willing to go along for the sake of their Jewish brothers and sisters. In turn, Paul is understood to have recognized “for the first time, probably,” that “the principle of ‘justification through faith’ applied not simply to the acceptance of the gospel in conversion, but also to the whole of the believer’s life” (230). Thus, Dunn concludes, Paul saw that to “live life ‘in Christ’ *and* ‘in accordance with the law’ was not possible; it involved a basic contradiction in terms and in the understanding of what made someone acceptable to God” (230, emphasis his).

“Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2” by Paula Fredriksen covers many substantial historical issues that need to be investigated by the exegete approaching this narrative. She seeks to understand Paul’s arguments “within his own religious context, first-century Judaism” and, in particular, within the views that prevailed among certain Jewish people and groups toward Gentiles, that is, representatives of nations other than Israel (236). Fredriksen argues that Gentiles were generally seen as idolaters unless they chose to convert and become proselytes and observers of Jewish life. In between these two identities there is a third very broad category of “anomalous” Gentiles, Gentiles who adopt some Jewish ways of life, associate with Jewish communities in certain ways, become benefactors of Jewish communities, and so on, yet without electing to become proselytes. In some cases it is apparent that they continued to participate in public idolatry concomitant with their role in the larger non-Jewish community. These Gentiles are sometimes identified as “God-fearers.” But there is also another category to consider, that is, the eschatological images of Gentiles: what is the place of Gentile people at the end of the ages? At the negative extreme were those who anticipated the destruction of the nations—in most cases, of the unrighteous Gentiles among them. At the positive extreme were those who anticipated that in the end “the nations participate in Israel’s redemption” (244). The repudiation of idols to turn to the living God at the end represents a moral but not a halakic conversion; they will be included (saved) in the people of God as Gentiles who are no longer idolaters, yet they will still not be Jews/Israelites.

These conclusions in hand, Fredriksen discusses the political reasons that would account for Paul’s prior persecution—disciplinary flogging—of Jewish believers in Jesus. Finding fault with the largely theological reasons usually proposed, she instead argues that Paul reacted to “apostles enthusiastically proclaiming the imminent subjection of the present order through the (returning) Messiah to the coming Kingdom of God,” in synagogues that included Gentiles, some responding positively to this message, so that together these believers in Jesus “would constitute a committed, energetic, and vocal subgroup *within* the larger community” (253, emphasis hers). The larger Jewish community would have been concerned that proclamations to Gentiles of a crucified Messiah—a political troublemaker in Roman terms—would eventually become known in the larger non-Jewish community, posing a threat to working relationships they enjoyed with the local Roman government. Paul may have represented

the synagogue court's jurisdiction over its Jewish members in order to avoid this risk. Fredriksen suggests that, in view of the failure of the expected events of the parousia, over the next decades some Christ-believing Jews began to seek the incorporation of Gentiles by proselyte conversion in order to further the Jewish mission in the meantime, since otherwise they faced a problem of creditability among Jewish groups. Faced with "too many Gentiles, too few Jews, and no End in sight," Paul came to see that, paradoxically, the restoration of Israel awaited the completion of his "work among the Gentiles, bringing their donation, and in a sense themselves, as an acceptable sacrifice to Jerusalem" (258). Central to Fredriksen's interpretation of Paul's proposition is the notion that he held to the conviction that Gentiles remain Gentiles.

Philip F. Esler challenges the usual way of viewing Peter's ostensible change of course between the Jerusalem meeting (2:1–10) and the Antioch incident (2:11–14[21]) in "Making and Breaking an Agreement Mediterranean Style: A New Reading of Galatians 2:1–14." Indeed, Esler magnifies the difference, suggesting Peter's withdrawal at Antioch represents an intentional breach of the agreement reached in Jerusalem. When it comes to setting out the Jewish context by which to evaluate the social values at issue, Esler understands both the prevailing norms and the situation described very differently than do the interpreters of the other essays in this section. Esler argues that Jews would not dine with Gentiles in the particular way that he believes would have been necessary to share eucharistic meals, which meals he understands to be the setting of the Antioch incident. The Jews would have been concerned to avoid the widespread Gentile habit of offering the gods a libation from the wine they drank and to avoid having to share a loaf of bread with someone who also ate idol food. This fear of idolatry led them to demand the circumcision (conversion) of the Christ-believing Gentiles if they were to return to the table (at Antioch) or avoid exclusion from it (in Galatia).

To make this case, Esler pursues several theses. Methodologically, he appeals to Mediterranean cultural studies to argue that Paul's narrative signifies an honor challenge. Esler explains the model he adopts, and when he applies it to the conflict that Paul relates, he concludes, in short, that the agreement that appeared to be reached in Jerusalem in response to Paul's initiation of an honor challenge was ultimately found to be nonbinding. Since it was not sealed with an oath, Paul was vulnerable to being shamed if he acted upon the ostensible agreement. Esler understands the agreement between the Jerusalem apostles and Paul to guarantee eucharistic table fellowship with Gentiles in the Diaspora without requiring proselyte conversion. It was opposed by a strict faction of Christ-believing Jews in Jerusalem, but they suffered defeat. They eventually brought sufficient pressure to bear, however, to persuade the Jerusalem apostles to renege on the agreement, thus avenging their earlier loss of honor. The ultimate termination of that table fellowship by Peter when he is in Paul's Diaspora zone signifies the leadership reneging on its earlier agreement. It is understood to be to Paul's shame because the agreement could not be proven, apart from an oath, to reflect their true intentions; hence, it was not their honor that was impugned but Paul's. Thus Paul cannot come right out and accuse Peter of breaking the agreement when

calling for the circumcision of the Gentiles in Antioch after the arrival of the ones from James; instead, he merely accuses Peter of inconsistency.

In the final essay in this section, Mark D. Nanos offers a new contribution to the debate, “What Was at Stake in Peter’s ‘Eating with Gentiles’ at Antioch?” Two particular questions are at the center of the investigation: 1) What did the “ones of/for circumcision” find objectionable about Peter’s eating with Gentiles, and as part of that question, why did Peter fear them? 2) What did Paul find so objectionable about Peter’s subsequent withdrawal and separation from those meals? To discover the answers, other issues are raised and discussed, such as the identities of the parties involved and the appropriateness of analyzing the sociotheological setting through a pre-Christian Jewish communal lens. From the start, the prevailing portraits of Paul—which naturally influence the kinds of hypotheses that have been considered in order to interpret his message—are challenged. Instead of assuming that Paul was against observation of a Jewish diet for Jewish believers in Jesus, or even just indifferent to the matter, it is assumed that he both held it to be important for these Jews and practiced it as significant for himself. Moreover, Nanos maintains that the Gentiles involved had already adopted the diet expected of Gentiles seeking to associate at mixed meals, so that the food laws were not themselves at dispute and neither was the fact that Jews and Gentiles were eating together, whether at a eucharistic meal or at some other kind. Nanos argues that “the ones ἐκ [for] circumcision” should be identified as non-Christ-believing Antiochene Jews, perhaps a special-interest group that advocates the prevailing view for how to incorporate Gentiles as equals within any Jewish group, regardless of what they believe about Jesus, and thus objects to the policies being advocated by the Christ-believing groups in Antioch. The “certain ones from James” are identified also as most likely representing non-Christ-believing interest groups, but with James’ permission, or, alternately, as supportive of the mixed meals. Beyond the timing supplied by noting their arrival, the purpose of their coming and its relationship to the events that followed are not clear. It is specifically “the ones for circumcision” whom Peter is said to fear, not the “certain ones from James,” and it is this group or groups that Nanos believes to be central to understanding the historical situation.

After discussing other views, especially those expressed in the above essays, Nanos argues that what was at stake was not the food or that it was being shared with Gentiles per se. Rather, it was the way it was being shared, that is, among equals, which is a pattern reserved for those who have become proselytes; but such a policy of equality is not extended to mere Gentile guests or those who have not embarked upon the course of becoming proselytes or declared any intention to do so. Thus, Nanos proposes, this mixed meal signified the novel and dangerous claims to status being made for the Gentiles within this Jewish group. It symbolized the claim that the end of the ages had dawned in the death and resurrection of Jesus, the time of eschatological *shalom*. Naturally, this claim—together with the social results its implementation would impose upon the larger Jewish minority communities and upon the larger Greco-Roman society into which the Jewish communities were intimately networked—was cause for concern and for action that can be understood to signify

tensions both within the communities and between them. According to Nanos, it is just such social dynamics, and the theological claims they symbolize, that Paul's narration of the Antioch incident reveals, interpreted from Paul's perspective for the sake of achieving his rhetorical goals for the later Galatian addressees.

Part 3: The Galatian Context

The third section comprises essays that seek to construct the situation(s) of the addressees in Galatia. There is a distinction in Paul's letter between the narrative discourse units, in which Paul relates the stories of prior situations of his life (e.g., Jerusalem, Antioch), and the situational discourse units, in which Paul directly addresses the present situation of the recipients of the letter in Galatia. Although those narratives were designed and included to achieve his rhetorical aims for the addressees, they do not relate the events that are taking place in Galatia, and their relationship to the events of the addressees is a matter of interpretation. The organization of this volume is intended to help clarify this matter for the reader. For the most part, while the essays in part 2 concerned interpretation of the narratives in Galatians 1 and 2, the essays in this section focus upon the historical and rhetorical situations of the addressees. A range of rhetorical, literary, sociological, social scientific, historical, and theological approaches are employed in the process. The debates turn largely on how one constructs the identities, interests, and messages of those people whose influence over the addressees is opposed by Paul. What were their goals, their strategies, and the specific techniques employed to achieve them? Also important to these discussions are the ways that the addressees and their situations are conceptualized, the way Paul's former influence among them is understood, and the way that the purpose of the message he conveyed in this letter is perceived. Together, these kinds of elements constitute the discussion of the context of the addressees, and decisions—or assumptions—about these matters ineluctably shape the theological interpretation of Paul's language.

The section begins with A. E. Harvey's essay, "The Opposition to Paul," which offered a challenge to the prevailing lines of argument developed during the mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries. At the time of Harvey's article, these debates were framed by F. C. Baur's hypothesis that Paul's rhetoric reveals a mission to undo his work on the part of "opponents" originating from Jerusalem to execute the interests of James and Peter. Even the interpreters that challenged this hypothesis generally understood the issues to be framed by features of its construction and, in particular, the fact and nature of Paul's opposition, even if the reasons for it and the representatives of it were differently portrayed. Yet while Harvey retains the notion that Paul responds in Galatians to opposition—communicated in the title itself—he raises questions where many others had not. He cautions against mirror-reading prior opposition from Paul's arguments in the letter, noting in particular that some of Paul's arguments in 1 Corinthians reflect not prior opposition but failure to consider the implications in ways that Paul therein seeks to arouse.

It is clear to Harvey that there is pressure being exerted upon the addressees to get circumcised. To understand this pressure, Harvey argues for several preliminary situational elements: 1) the addressees are Christians, and most of them Gentiles who had been God-fearers in the synagogues of Galatia previously but without deciding to become proselytes; 2) when they “first became Christians they had made a clean break from the Jewish community” but then later “had already renewed their contact with the synagogue to the extent of observing the Jewish festivals and holy days, and were now contemplating the further step of accepting circumcision”; and 3) those bringing this pressure to bear must have been Jewish proselytes or those contemplating becoming such, on the basis of Harvey’s understanding of the participle in 6:13: “those who get themselves circumcised” (324–26). The pressure is understood to be by the local synagogues upon former God-fearing Gentile members of the Christian churches. The goal is not to “wean the Christians from their new faith”; rather, it is “to make them conform to an outward pattern of Jewish observances” (328). “Reprisals” against these former “supporters from the synagogue” are considered “inevitable unless those who had defected could not merely be brought back to their former allegiance but made to commit themselves permanently by accepting circumcision and persuading their fellow-Christians to do the same” (328). This pressure was “sometimes supported by powerful propaganda, sometimes by the threat of persecution” (331–32). Thus “Paul’s real opponents are those Christians in Galatia who are ready to yield to this pressure and are persuading others to do the same” (328). The addressees’ concerns are fear and expediency, and thus they seek a compromise that they believe does not threaten their faith in Christ; after all, the pressure is “mediated by Jews or Gentiles within the church” (331–32). “Paul’s task is not so much to meet their arguments as to show them up as having no arguments, indeed as having given the matter no serious thought at all” (330). Harvey signals that one significant result of this argument is that it moves the interest of the opposition from the traditional theological concern with Judaism to a more pragmatic one, which he believes befits the usual Jewish tolerance for a wide range of beliefs and interpretations: a greater concern that behavior conform with patterns of Jewish observance. Harvey’s view represents a challenge to the theological, if not sociological, heart of the Baur hypothesis, including many of the elements shared by most, if not all, of arguments that have been mounted against it.

Robert Jewett’s essay, “The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation,” represents an argument that has been often cited, and its influence is evident in many monographs and commentaries. He opens with a brief but lucid discussion of the various prevailing views of the time, and he takes as his point of departure a challenge posed by Walther Schmithals that Jewett finds still unsatisfactorily answered at the time, even by Schmithals’s conclusions. The question is also important for what it reveals about the framework of the discussion at the time: “Why would Jewish Christians suddenly lose their traditional disinterest in the Gentile mission and embark on a circumcision campaign in Galatia?” (336). Jewett constructs a situation in Galatia that includes people who “had come into Galatia with the aim of stirring up the congregation and perverting the gospel” (336). They require circumcision of the

Christ-believing Gentiles “on grounds that entrance into the elect spiritual community demanded prior admission into Abraham’s covenant through circumcision” (336). Among other indications, Jewett identifies the “agitators” as “Christian believers,” on the basis of his understanding of the implications of 1:7 and 6:12 (336–37); as Jews advocating the circumcision of these Gentiles, on the basis of his interpretation of the participle in 6:13 (337–39); as outsiders, on the basis of the implications of 1:6 and 4:17, among others (339); and as originating from, and oriented to, Jerusalem, for several reasons (339–40).

This relatively traditional construction in hand, Jewett sets out to explain an interesting paradox that arises from his understanding of Paul’s remark in 6:12 that the advocates of circumcision in Galatia are motivated to succeed at this task in order to avoid “persecution for the cross of Christ.” He understands the feared persecution to be anti-Pauline, yet the motivation to circumcise these Gentiles to be avoidance of that persecution. How can one make sense of this? To solve this apparent problem, Jewett offers a new construction of the situation in Galatia that is intimately linked with political constraints originating from Judea and Jerusalem. The leaders of the Christ-believers there were under pressure to comply with the norms of “the Zealots,” whom Jewett understands to represent mortal danger to those “in the villages of Judea or Galilee who maintained close relationships with Gentiles or who did not zealously seek the purity of Israel” (340). During the late forties and early fifties, in order for the Christ-believers in Judea to “avert the suspicion that they were in communion with lawless Gentiles” and thereby “thwart Zealot reprisals,” they sought to have the Christ-believing Gentiles circumcised (341). This program extended out to Antioch and Galatia in order to protect the Judean churches from reprisals. It was not primarily a theological interest that motivated this mission to Galatia, provoking Paul’s letter, but an expedient political agenda, which, for Jewett, makes sense of several of Paul’s statements that remain largely unexplained in the alternative views. Moreover, their strategy was “cleverly designed” to seem to the Galatians to “offer a completion” rather than opposition to Paul’s work (342; cf. 343). They seemed to offer the promise of perfection in a way that would appeal to the Hellenistic sensibilities of the addressees, promising them entrance into Abraham’s promise, identity as part of Israel, perfection in the Spirit. Their goal was, after all, to get the Galatians to comply so that they could return home with news that would get the pressure off the Judean churches; the level of commitment to Torah or the lifestyle of a proselyte thereafter were not really their immediate concern. Hence, Paul’s ethical instructions are explained as addressing the failure of the Galatians to grasp the ethical imperatives of life in the Spirit or the suffering of an ultimate judgment. The puzzle of “pneumatic libertinism” at the same time as “nomism” is understood to be the result of their believing that circumcision promised perfection, but did not require a nomistic lifestyle, except for circumcision and some calendrical practices that would “ensure entrance into the mythical seed of Abraham” (347).

In the title, “A Law-Observant Mission to Gentiles,” J. Louis Martyn signals the central thrust of his argument. Martyn’s construction of the situation in Galatia

depends largely upon the way he understands the identity of the ones whom Paul opposes, to which he immediately turns. He labels them “the Teachers” to avoid identifying them solely by way of their relationship with Paul; moreover, referring to them as “opponents” is “somewhat reductionist.” For, even if Martyn finds them to be opposing Paul, he notes that Paul considers them opponents “not merely of himself” but “of *God*” (349, emphasis his). To begin with, the Teachers “have connections both with Diaspora Judaism and with Palestinian, Christian Judaism.” They are “messianic Jews, at home among Gentiles,” who are “in touch with—indeed understand themselves to represent—a powerful circle of Christian Jews in the Jerusalem church, a group utterly zealous for the observance of the Law” (351).

To further elaborate the Teachers’ identity, Martyn employs data from a range of documents from Diaspora Jews, Judeans, and Christian Jews of various places that he understands to parallel his interpretation of “Paul’s own references to the Teachers’ work” (351). To fill out the portrait with incremental precision, Martyn offers ten arguments from the “direct references” of the letter itself and four from “allusions.” The Teachers are (1) outsiders, (2) Jewish people who have arrived from outside Galatia, (3) Christian-Jewish evangelists with a gospel (4) that proclaims both Christ and Law; (5) and this Law—“the covenantal Law of Sinai”—is presented by them as good news for Gentiles in their “ecumenical mission.” They (6) seek “to correct what they see as the Law-less evangelism of Paul,” in order to “keep on good terms with some persons of considerable power” and “perhaps understanding it [their mission] to be the means by which God is filling out the infinite number of progeny he had promised to the patriarch.” They (7) argue for and demonstrate that the Law is the source of the Spirit (8) and that the Galatians will be shut out from salvation if they do not accept the conditions of their message, (9) namely, by becoming proselytes, the males circumcised, and observing the Jewish calendar as well as dietary regulations. For them, (10) “Christ is secondary to the Law,” “the Messiah of the Law.” The Teachers argue (11) that they are descendants of Abraham, which the Gentiles can become, too, if they become circumcised and Law-observant; (12) that Jerusalem—“the Jerusalem church”—is their “mother”; (13) that the Gentiles will become part of the people Israel if they accept their message; and (14) that they will escape the “Impulsive Desire of the Flesh” that still plagues their daily life, whereas Paul, “an unfaithful student of the Jerusalem apostles,” has left them without “potent ethical guidance.” This portrait in hand, in the balance of the essay Martyn elaborates what these Teachers’ “Sermon on Abraham” to the Galatians might have been like—an interesting exercise for which he draws from the various sources noted above and integrates his interpretation of these with his interpretation of Paul’s language in Galatians.

The contribution of Nikolaus Walter, “Paul and the Opponents of the Christ Gospel in Galatia,” represents Mark Nanos’s translation of the author’s original German essay. Accepting the prevailing theses that Paul responds in Galatians to a Jewish mission opposing his “Law-free Christian . . . gospel,” Walter challenges the identification of the rivals in Galatia as Christians and of their message as about Christ.

Their message is “not another version of the Christ proclamation but the opposite of a gospel of Christ: a gospel without Christ Jesus” (362). They incorporate similar language in order to “trick” the Galatians into a decision that turns them away from Christ without realizing it. They reprove Paul and discredit his gospel as human and blasphemous; their own message of Torah is, however, from God, having been given to Moses. Walter understands Paul to respond to their charges in part by “depreciating his relations with the Jerusalem Christians” in 1:15b–22; thus, they must have “depicted his dependence as something that devalued the message” (363). If that is so, then it is unlikely that they are Judaic Christians, since they, too, would be dependent upon Peter and James. These opponents see Peter, James, and Paul joined in “betraying the essentials of Judaism,” even if Paul seems to them to be “the most dangerous,” since he is actively reaching out to the Gentiles (364). Paul thus seeks to uphold the “faithful Law keeping of the original apostles in Jerusalem”—even though he is ambivalent about this strategy—because “they see the Law-free mission to the Gentiles not as ‘betrayal’ of the Torah and Judaism but as fulfillment of the will of God newly revealed in Christ Jesus” (364).

Although this group opposes Paul’s mission, this is not their primary purpose but a side effect with which they must be concerned because they, too, are engaged in a mission to the Gentiles, but one that promotes proselyte conversion instead. And they do so by proclaiming the theme of “Abraham as the Father of Believers,” not unlike what Martyn proposes, except that Walter understands their message to proclaim this independent of a relationship to Jesus Christ. Thus, just as they adopted Paul’s terminology of εὐαγγέλιον to make their case against his message of Christ, Paul responds in this letter with an argument about Abraham that is designed to undermine their message without Christ. The promise to Abraham precedes Torah and came directly to Abraham, not by a mediator. Abraham’s justification is by faith, not Torah. And it was “linked with a ‘seed’ (σπέρμα) of Abraham (in the singular!)—and this seed has come in Christ Jesus, no one else (Gal 3:14–16)” (365). Walter argues that “if the opponents were Christians, then such an argument would not have scored the necessary point!” Finally, Walter understands Paul to deny legitimate status as children of Abraham “to any Judaism that is bound to the service of Torah” (365). This kind of polemic, which Walter does not find Paul using when writing of Abraham in Romans 4 or 9–11, for example, leads him to suggest that Paul is afraid of their winning his converts away from Christ, but it “is hardly appropriate to use against Christian competitors” (365). Moreover, other elements of the letter and its differences from, for example, the way Walter understands Paul to approach the opponents of 2 Corinthians, leads him to conclude, “Must we, then, not assume that the opponents actually stand outside the churches, outside of any relationship with Christ, and that they do not desire so much to specifically invade the churches as, rather, on the contrary, to undermine and eliminate the churches by means of ‘compelling’ the Galatians away from Christ toward Torah (cf. 6:12–13)?” (366).

John M. G. Barclay’s essay, “Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case,” offers a helpful methodological discussion as well as an argument for the

implications on the study of Galatians. Whether the reader of Paul agrees with his arguments or not, in order to “*understand* their real import,” Barclay proposes that he or she will need to construct the issues at dispute and “enter into the debate from *both* sides” (367, emphasis his). The obstacle is that we often are faced with constructing from the author’s point of view the thoughts and identities of those whom the author opposes. The text we have that supposedly “answers the opponents” is then used as a “mirror” to “see reflected the people and the arguments under attack” (367). For Galatians, the problem is magnified in several ways: 1) Paul is not directly addressing the opponents even if he is addressing the audience about them and the effect they have had, so it is not merely the audience at the other end of his comments but a third party whom we seek to identify; 2) this is polemical rhetoric from someone who believes “his whole identity and mission are threatened,” and thus “his statements about the character and motivation of his opponents should be taken with a very large pinch of salt” because Paul shows them “in the worse possible light, with the hope of weaning the Galatians away from them”; and 3) there is a problem of circularity: the way Paul used language in dialogue “remains obscure until we can hypothesize the other end of the dialogue, and yet . . . in order to reconstruct that dialogue,” we must use the same verses (370).

Barclay examines several examples of mirror-reading in the interpretation of Galatians that he judges to be subject to methodological “pitfalls.” These are 1) “*undue selectivity*” of the texts and criteria to discern the identity and message of the opponents; 2) “*over-interpretation*” of certain statements as rebuttals of counter-statements that may not constitute accusations; 3) “*mishandling polemics*” by taking at face value some of Paul’s statements about those he opposes and by taking Paul’s side “unduly” or, alternately, using this language to criticize him; and 4) “*latching onto particular words and phrases* as direct echoes of the opponents’ vocabulary and then hanging a whole thesis on those flimsy pegs” (372–76, emphasis his). Barclay lays out several suggestions for improving the criteria, including the need to measure carefully the 1) type of utterance; 2) tone; 3) frequency of theme; 4) clarity of evidence; 5) unfamiliar elements as perhaps more telling; 6) consistency of the portrait; and 7) historical plausibility of the construction on offer (376–78). This last category gives rise to Barclay’s concluding argument for measuring the plausibility of various aspects of the construction of the Galatian situation on offer and of his own suggestions. To review but one of the categories, Barclay concludes that it is “certain or virtually certain” that 1) “Paul’s opponents were Christians”; 2) “they wanted the Galatians to be circumcised and to observe at least some of the rest of the law, including its calendrical requirements”; 3) “they brought into question the adequacy of Paul’s gospel and his credentials as an apostle”; and 4) “their arguments were attractive and persuasive for many Galatian Christians” (380).

In “The Argumentative Situation of Galatians,” B. C. Lategan begins with a helpful description of some of the elements of an argumentative situation. “No argument is necessary in a situation where matters are self-evident.” But “when questions arise or doubt exists,” then “argumentation is called for” (383). Argumentation is concerned with persuasion and involves a common language in order to facilitate

communication; it also involves a communicator and audience. Lategan appeals to Perelman's distinguishing of three kinds of audiences: the universal audience, the single interlocutor, and the subject himself or herself. Moreover, however historically real the people whom the author addresses or argues about are, the audience is a construction in the mind of the one arguing, and it is from one's image of them and what one thinks will be important to them that one argues. The "quality of the argument and the strategy of the writer" are products of the author's perception of the audience, and by them he or she seeks to move the reader or hearer (384). For Lategan, argumentative situation and rhetorical situation are the same in concept but distinguishable in that the former emphasizes "the *issue* regarding which persuasion is attempted" whereas the latter attends to "the *strategies* used by the writer to effect persuasion" (384).

These definitions in hand, Lategan suggests that the audience for Galatians consists of the uncircumcised who are considering taking this step; those who are Jews by birth, "with whom he identifies himself by using the first person"; and maybe a universal audience inclusive of the contemporary reader, since Paul uses the first person in the autobiographical narrative of 2:17–20 in a way "which transcends the confines of a specific historical setting and which assumes a certain timeless quality" (385). After a brief discussion of the guidelines set out in Barclay's essay and a survey of some prevailing views, Lategan concludes that there is one direction of opposition facing Paul (against the two-front and some other views he surveys) and the tension concerns "two modes of existence—one of slavery under the law and one of freedom in Christ" (387). Lategan concludes that the central concern with Abraham in Paul's argument indicates that his position as "father of the believers" was emphasized by "the Galatians' opponents" and "a close link between Abraham and the law was taken for granted, which provided further authority for the demand that the law should be kept" (387). Paul accepts the premise of their argument but undermines the implications by arguing that Abraham as father must be taken as he was then, "uncircumcised, without the formalized law—in fact, a gentile—who trusted God and his promise and acted only out of faith" (388). The kinship relationship with Abraham, then, follows for the Gentile who has faith in Christ, Abraham's seed. The audience is moved to a new understanding of their socialization. Lategan also understands the cursing and rhetorical questions of 1:11–12 to indicate "a sensitivity to what appears to be an accusation by the opponents that Paul is playing for the gallery by preaching a soft or easy gospel" (389–90).

The ethical instructions of the last two chapters also illuminate the argumentative situation. These pivot around standing firm in the freedom made possible by Christ and in the command to walk in the Spirit, which flow from Paul's prior theological arguments. The ethical elements "are not cast in the form of commands or instructions, but represent a summary of the self-evident results flowing from a life controlled by the Spirit" (391). And these elements are typically Hellenistic as well as Jewish. Lategan understands the argumentative situation to concern Paul's response to such matters as the move from "independent ethical decisions" by his converts to "practical guidelines for the everyday life of the believer" on offer from

Paul's opponents. This response is grounded in Paul's theological convictions about "the new existence in faith" that Paul has argued (392). They must exercise freedom but also live in a spiritual way: "They will need neither him nor the crutches of a casuistic system" (393–94). So it seems to Lategan that there is an anti-Pauline opposition, that it seeks to convince the Galatians to observe Torah in addition to faith in Christ, and that this message was proving persuasive because of the disorientation of these Gentiles, who were "new to the Christian faith, but also unfamiliar with its Jewish roots," and thus needed "practical advice to guide their day to day life in an environment not very sympathetic to or supportive of their new convictions" (395).⁹

In "The Inter- and Intra-Jewish Political Context of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," Mark D. Nanos argues that in this letter Paul reacts to a situation in which his non-Jewish addressees, who had placed their faith in Paul's "message of good," were now having to negotiate the local communal constraints they faced in Galatia. Nanos asks, "How would Jewish communities in central Anatolia have responded to *Gentiles* claiming to be full and equal members of the communities of the righteous, on the basis of faith in Christ, apart from proselyte conversion?" (396). He suggests that a mixed response is implied by the way Paul frames his reaction in this letter. On the one hand, anyone claiming to have already gained full community status would have likely been denied, but on the other hand, anyone seeking to turn from idolatry to full membership among the people of God might be welcomed as potential proselytes. Nanos understands these Gentiles to be members of Jewish subgroups within the Jewish communities who are, after Paul's departure, beginning to interact more fully with other members of these larger local Jewish communities and, as a result, beginning to recognize some differences about their own (sub)group identity and expectations. Unwilling to return to the practices of family and civic idolatry and wishing to ensure their welcome as Gentile guests who did not seek to threaten the status quo—that is, the privilege the Jewish communities had negotiated with the pagan communities that allowed them to continue in their own way of life by, for example, abstaining from local civic expression of the imperial cult—these Gentiles may have considered proselyte identity, which had long-standing tradition on its side as well, very appealing. The central issue was not about their faith in Jesus per se; rather, the objection to these Gentile guests arose when they sought to legitimate identity claims or behavior that departed from prevailing communal norms by appealing to the meaning of Christ for themselves. These Gentile guests seeking full membership standing were told that they could avoid the marginality of disputed status, whatever they might believe about some Judean martyr of the Roman regime, and become "children of the quintessential proselyte and righteous one, Abraham himself" (397).

⁹Two excursuses have not been reproduced here, the first one entitled "The Metaphorical Basis of the Family of God as Anti-structure" (270–73, original essay), and the second, "Social Consequences of the Believer's New Self-Understanding (Gl 3:28)" (273–76, original essay).

Nanos proposes that Paul's response to this development—from the θαυμάζω opening of 1:6, signaling a feigned “surprise,” to the ironic turns of phrase, rebukes, sarcastic comments, and relentless questioning—represents an ancient letter of ironic rebuke. Drawing on Nils Dahl's essay, Nanos argues that such a letter, as described in the ancient handbooks and exemplified in many surviving papyri, effectively expresses the author's disappointment that his addressees have behaved inappropriately to their relationship, that they should have known better than to treat this “other” message of Torah observance—“that is really bad for them” because it “subverts the good news of Christ”—as “good news” (399). Challenging the identities and labels usually attributed to the people influencing the addressees—for example, “Judaizers,” “opponents,” and “agitators”—Nanos refers to them as “influencers.” He separates references to them in the situational discourse of the letter from references to those who populate Paul's narratives about earlier situations in Jerusalem and Antioch, and he questions the prevailing view that they are in some way related to the Jerusalem Christ-believers, even that the situation involves an intramural struggle between supposed “Law-free” (Pauline) and other “Torah-observant” factions of “Christianity.” Instead, the central issues, according to Nanos, revolve around points about which we should expect Paul and the Jerusalem apostles to agree. Representatives of Diaspora Jewish communities in which these coalitions function as subgroups, however, would be expected to disagree fervidly on these points. For Nanos, the various comments in Paul's narrative units work together with his situational comments and bring clarity to his message that the addressees must maintain faithfulness to the values of this coalition even in the face of seemingly overwhelming disapproval. The addressees must resist the temptation to comply with both prevailing Jewish communal and pagan societal norms for identity and behavior in “the present evil age.” They may suffer in the present age for living according to this conviction but, according to Paul, they must do so in order to honor both the one in whom they believed and the one who brought them this message.

Dieter Mitternacht offers a new contribution to the debate, “Foolish Galatians?—a Recipient-Oriented Assessment of Paul's Letter.” Drawing from his 1999 dissertation, Mitternacht argues that Galatians represents a “letter of petition,” wherein Paul calls the addressees to imitate himself. He understands the situation in Galatia from Paul's perspective to involve “people in Galatia who are circumcised” but who do not “observe the whole law,” “advising the Galatian Christ-believers to do the same, and the advice appeals to them” (409). Mitternacht suggests Paul's rhetoric indicates that Paul “expects weighty opposition from the addressees,” for “whenever Paul appeals to the situation of the addressees, the rhetorical strategy shifts from argumentation to persuasion” (409). Paul creates “a rhetorical stage on which those whom he opposes are denigrated for their selfishness, those who are to be persuaded are ridiculed for their naiveté, and those of repute (especially Peter) are demonstrated to be inconsistent. The author himself emerges as the only reliable authority, divinely ordained and equipped” (409–10). Attending to the logic of Paul's rhetorical emphases and the historical social constraints on Jewish communities, Mitternacht argues that the conversion of Gentiles to faith in Christ led to their marginalization “from

both their potential social and religious homesteads”; that is, it resulted in distance from their former social location yet also failed to gain them status equality on prevailing Jewish communal terms unless they became proselytes (411). Mitternacht surmises that the tensions might have resulted from the influence of other Christ-believers in Galatia who were already proselytes beforehand, who by “their affiliation with the uncircumcised Christ-believers . . . may have drawn negative attention to themselves, felt threatened, and therefore urged them to consider circumcision both for their own and for the uncircumcised Christ-believers’ sake” (432). These kinds of social constraints resulted in questions about “the requirements of the life of faith working through love and in the imminent expectation of the new creation” (411). Galatians constitutes Paul’s reply. While they are awaiting redemption from the present evil age, he instructed them, “any attempt to circumvent confrontation with social and political power structures amounted to a rejection of Christ Jesus, who himself had confronted and suffered the sword of Rome” (411). Although circumcision may seem to the addressees to be “the lesser of two ‘trials,’” Paul called them to endure an even “bigger trial,” for he held that “in this present evil age the Christ-like life is to be essentially marked by the cross” (412). To argue this reading, Mitternacht investigates the meaning of Paul’s plea in 4:12 to “become as I, for I also as you!” and the correspondence of this understanding with his interpretation of the message of 3:1–5. One of the many methodological concerns Mitternacht raises in his rhetorical critique of Paul’s stereotyping of the addressees’ naiveté and the influencers’ selfishness, for example, is the need for interpreters not to become collaborators with the author in his rhetorical strategy. “As long as one accepts as incontestable Paul’s authority to correct, threaten, and judge, one will not come to terms with either the historical realities of the *first* communication situation or the rhetoric involved in any communication, and thus with the plausible effect of the letter on the addressees” (413, emphasis his). Mitternacht’s recipient- rather than a sender-oriented reading of Galatians challenges many of the present approaches to Paul’s rhetoric, the dynamics of the situation that it implies, and the meaning of Paul’s response.