

Paul,
his Apostleship,
the Collection,
and
the Unity of
Jews and Gentiles

Carsten Burfeind

Master of Arts

1995

*PAUL,
HIS APOSTLESHIP, THE COLLECTION,
AND
THE UNITY OF JEWS AND GENTILES*

A Dissertation submitted by
CARSTEN BURFEIND

for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

to the
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY
in the
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

DURHAM 1995

ABSTRACT

Carsten Burfeind

Paul, his Apostleship, the Collection, and the Unity of Jews and Gentiles.

Master of Arts

1995

In this dissertation the author questions an assumed consensus in New Testament scholarship. In the history of Pauline research Paul has always been treated as a systematic theologian. Thus e.g. the understanding of Paul's concept of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles has shaped views of scholars on Paul's understanding of his apostleship and his collection of money for the Jerusalem church. And the views on his office as apostle and on his task of the collection influenced each other. Investigating these issues the author makes four observations. a) It is Paul's basic conviction that the eschatological people of God is a unity of Jews and Gentiles with the Jews in the first place. b) This is the underlying concept of first Paul's apostleship: his role in God's plan of salvation is to proclaim among the Gentiles their final incorporation into the people of God, and, second, Paul's collection: it is a means of expressing unity between Paul's Gentile Christian churches and the mother church in Jerusalem. Thus, it is a sign of the Gentile Christians' recognition of the prime importance of the Jews and, at the same time, of Jerusalem's recognition of the incorporation of the Gentiles into the people of God. c) However, Paul does not elaborate this basic conviction when talking about his apostleship or his collection of money. d) Paul does not bring his role as an apostle into specific connection with his role as a collector of money. Thus, the author concludes that in order to establish the points Paul wishes to make he argues not on the basis of one theological system, but on the basis of several considerations and reasons. Paul, therefore, is no perfect systematic thinker, but rather a pragmatic churchman.

Εἰς ὁ θεός
Rm 3:30

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Es wurden keine Einträge für das Inhaltsverzeichnis gefunden.

Wählen Sie im Dokument die Wörter aus, die in das Inhaltsverzeichnis eingeschlossen werden sollen, und klicken Sie dann in der Formatierungspalette unter "Formatvorlagen" auf ein Überschriftenformat. Wiederholen Sie dies für alle einzuschließenden Überschriften, und fügen Sie das Inhaltsverzeichnis dann in das Dokument ein. Sie können ein Inhaltsverzeichnis auch erstellen, indem Sie auf die Option "Manuelle Formatierung" klicken und die Einträge dann manuell eingeben.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

PREFACE

In writing these lines a two-years' work comes to an end. During that time I became aware of an area of Pauline-research which formerly had been unknown to me. While working through a great number of English writings on Paul of the last twenty or so years and doing my own research, a picture of Paul the apostle and churchman took shape that differed greatly from what I had imagined before. The *new perspective* on Paul became my own perspective. Looking back my studies have been not only a two-years' academic work. More and more they became an imaginative task. To me Paul is no longer the leading exponent of Protestant theology; instead he is a vivid person in a fascinating, theological, social and historical setting.

I wish to thank Professor J.D.G. Dunn, who patiently supervised the progress of my work and inspired me with his own fascination of Paul. I also wish to thank Doctor A.J.M. Wedderburn, now Professor at Munich University, for supervising part of my work on the collection, Professor V. Stolle for thinking his way into my thesis and for helping me to find solutions to the conceptual problems that were raised, and Doctor A. Lenox-Conyngham, who spent many hours with proof-reading and correcting the grammar and style of writing of my thesis.

Today is the fifth anniversary of the opening of the German-German borders. But today is also the day of remembrance of the National Socialist pogrom against Jews in November 1938. At the »Synagogenplatz« in Heidelberg there stood a synagogue. It had been built during the years 1877/78. In the first light of day on 9 November 1938 it was desecrated and destroyed. The »Synagogenplatz« is no more than two hundred metres away from where I am writing these lines. I try to think of all the Jews who suffered and died during the time of the National Socialist dictatorship. And I think of the many German Christians, whose faith and belief did not protect them against racism. And I think of Paul, the Jew, the Christian, who struggled all his life for *the unity of Jews and Gentiles*.

9 November 1994
Heidelberg, Germany

Carsten Burfeind

ABBREVIATIONS

OLD TESTAMENT

Gen	Genesis
Ex	Exodus
Lev	Leviticus
Num	Numbers
Josh	Joshua
Jud	Judges
1 Sam	1 Samuel (1 Kingdoms in <i>LXX</i>)
2 Sam	2 Samuel (2 Kingdoms in <i>LXX</i>)
Job	
Ps	Psalms
Isa	Isaiah
Jer	Jeremiah
Lam	Lamentations
Ez	Ezekiel
Dan	Daniel
Hos	Hosea
Am	Amos
Nah	Nahum
Mal	Malachi

APOCRYPHA

Sir	Ecclesiasticus (Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach)
-----	--

NEW TESTAMENT

Mt	Matthew
Mk	Mark
Lk	Luke
Joh	John
Act	Acts of the Apostles
Rm	Romans
1 Cor	1 Corinthians
2 Cor	2 Corinthians
Gal	Galatians
Eph	Ephesians

Phil	Philippians
Col	Colossians
1 Thess	1 Thessalonians
2 Thess	2 Thessalonians
Phlm	Philemon
Heb	Hebrews
1 Pet	1 Peter
2 Pet	2 Peter
Rev	Revelation

OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Jub	Jubilees
-----	----------

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1 QS	<i>Serek hayyahad</i> (Community Rule) from Qumran
4 QMMT	<i>Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah</i> (unpublished scroll) from Qumran

JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS

Ant.	Jewish Antiquities
War	The Jewish War

OROSIUS, PAULUS

Historiarvm	Historiarvm adversvm paganos
-------------	------------------------------

DIO, CASSIUS

History	Roman history
---------	---------------

1. INTRODUCTION

During my theological studies I came across and was taught different approaches to the study of the New Testament.

a) There is the “attempt to find a single, once-for-all, unifying kerygma,”¹ the New Testament theology. Many theologians are of the opinion that there is one theological concept underlying all books of the New Testament. b) There is a concept of a *variety of theologies* within the New Testament. Working historical critical scholars realised that the authors of the books of the New Testament wrote in different situations and have, therefore, different theologies. From this arose such differing theologies of e.g. Paul and John.² c) With the debate about a *development* of Paul’s theology scholars started working on the theologies of the different letters of Paul.³ Parallel to this discussion it was also realised that Paul is no ‘perfect systematic thinker.’⁴ There are topics which stand side by side although it would have been possible for Paul to relate them to each other.⁵ He, then, is depicted as a pragmatic churchman rather as a systematic thinker.⁶

I take this last-mentioned approach as the starting-point of my thesis. Looking at the issues of Paul’s *apostleship*, his *collection of money* and his *concept of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles* my leading question will be whether these issues are interrelated issues in Paul’s thought, or not. Does Paul elaborate his concept of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles when talking about his apostleship and his collection?

The reason for taking these issues as examples for our investigation is twofold.

First, mainly since E.P. Sanders’ work on *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* a formerly unquestioned consensus in Pauline studies, namely the opposition of δικαιοσύνη ἐξ

¹ Dunn, *Unity*, p.32.

² See e.g. Bultmann, *Theologie*.

³ See e.g. the series edited by J.D.G. Dunn, *New Testament Theology*, Cambridge University Press.

⁴ See most recently Berger, *Theologieggeschichte*, p.440: “natürlich ist Paulus kein perfekter Systemdenker, und wie kein anderer hat er sich durch Situationen zu seinem Denken provozieren lassen und dabei unterschiedlichste Traditionen jüdischer Herkunft, an die er sich erinnern konnte, christianisiert.”

⁵ See e.g. Berger, *Theologieggeschichte*, p.485, referring to the fact that “nach wichtigen Aussagen des Paulus... die Durchbrechung der Sündenmacht und ihre Verurteilung auch ganz unabhängig von Tod und Auferstehung Jesu, nämlich durch seine Sendung in den Bereich der Sünde bewirkt worden sein kann; eine strikte Systematik liegt bei Paulus hier wie auch sonst nicht vor.”

⁶ See Berger, *Theologieggeschichte*, p.448: “Paulus ist ein Kirchenpolitiker, wenn man unter Kirchenpolitik versteht: die Kunst, nicht primär an Normen, sondern an der Wirkung orientiert, theologische Mittel einzusetzen, um die Probleme zu regeln, die sich aus dem Miteinander von Menschen im Raum kirchlicher Öffentlichkeit ergeben.”

ἔργων νόμου and δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, has been questioned. It has been recognised that Judaism is based on *grace* rather than *works of the law* as a means to earn salvation. As a result of this Paul's theology had to be re-considered, and it was now understood in terms of Jewish theology. With this new approach it has also been recognised that the relationship between Gentiles and Jews is one of the major issues in Paul's theology. Since, then, Paul's apostleship is the mission of a Jewish-Christian to the Gentiles, and since his collection is a collection of money from his Gentile-Christian churches to the Jewish-Christians in Jerusalem, both these issues, his understanding of his apostleship and his collection, can serve as test cases for this new approach to Paul.

Secondly, as will be seen in the following chapter on the history of research, the issues of Paul's apostleship, his collection and his concept of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles have always been closely related. Almost always the understanding of Paul's apostleship and his collection of money depended on the view of Paul's concept of the relations between Gentiles and Jews. Hence these issues can serve as a test case by means of which we may examine the views which depict Paul as a systematic thinker on the one hand, and as a pragmatic churchman on the other.

In the same chapter I summarise the history of research since F. C. Baur, concentrating on the issues which concern us: a) Paul's conversion/call; b) his mission ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; c) his collection of money, and how (or whether) scholars related them to each other.

Since Paul in Gal 1-2 refers to his revelation experience, his relations with the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, the discussion about Gentile-Jewish relations at the Jerusalem Council, the incident in Antioch and the collection for Jerusalem, most of my dissertation will concentrate on this text.

In the third chapter of the thesis, in which I investigate Paul's revelation experience and his apostleship, I will, therefore, mainly refer to Gal 1:15-16a. The other texts where Paul talks about his revelation experience I will discuss at the appropriate places. In examining Paul's concept of his apostleship I will investigate also Paul's concept of Jewish-Gentile relations.

In the fourth chapter, I will look at the texts referring to the collection of money in Gal 2:10, 1 Cor 16:1-4, 2 Cor 8, 2 Cor 9, Rm 15:14-33. Here also, however, our main text will be found in Paul's letter to the Galatians: Gal 2:10. This is Paul's shortest reference to his collection. But here he talks about its origin and it stands in the context of Gal 1:15-16a.

In a final conclusion I summarise the findings concerning Paul's concept of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles and relate them to his concepts of his apostleship and his collection of money. This will show us whether these issues are interrelated. And it will help towards answering our question whether Paul is in the first instance a systematic thinker or a pragmatic churchman.

2. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The convictions about the relationship between Paul and the Jewish Christians shaped in the first instance New Testament scholars' view of Paul's concept of his apostleship and his collection of money. Since F. C. Baur and the Tübingen school there have basically been three different concepts of the early Christian factions and their relationships: 1) the legalistic Jewish Christians with their centre in Jerusalem which were opposed to Paul and his Gentile churches which were free from the Jewish law; 2) the legalistic Judaizers as opposed to, on the one hand, Paul and his Gentile churches and, on the other hand, those Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, who were in agreement with Paul's law-free gospel; 3) The Judaizers, Jewish Christians in Jerusalem and Paul as one group. According to this concept Israel was in the centre of Paul's theology. The different factions did not agree upon the Gentiles' attitude to the law and their status within the people of God. But they had basically the same convictions about God's continuing covenant with his people.

I shall take these three groups of New Testament scholars as categories for the following history of research. However, the observations on the interrelation of issues in the history of research cannot be demonstrated in each statement of every single author, but only in an approximate pattern. Categorisation can never do full justice to all authors. Nevertheless it seems to be one possible way of systematising the statements and looking at the issues of our concern.

2.1. Paul versus Jerusalem (the Tübingen school)

Proposed by F.C. Baur it became the Tübingen school's view "that primitive Christianity must be seen as composed of two rival factions:"⁷ the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem and Paul and his Gentile churches. The thesis lying behind this proposal was that "das Judenthum ist als Gesetz der Gegensatz zu der Gnade des Christenthums."⁸ The moment when Paul realised that the gospel means the "Aufhebung des Gesetzes als des Heilsprinzips,"⁹ his revelation experience was described in terms of a conversion¹⁰ from Judaism to Christianity.¹¹ The Jerusalem apostles, however, were "noch

⁷ Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.lxxxix.

⁸ Baur, *Paulus*, vol.II, p.208.

⁹ Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.15.

¹⁰ Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.44-67, p.52 n.3; Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.7.

¹¹ See Baur, *Paulus*, vol.II, p.294.

ganz auf einem Standpunkt..., auf welchem sie über das Judenthum noch gar nicht hinausgedacht hatten.”¹² Hence Paul’s conversion meant a “völligen Bruch mit seiner Vergangenheit.”¹³ He now stood in sharp contrast to Jerusalem and thus also to the Jewish Christians.¹⁴

Since, therefore, Paul’s gospel of justification by faith is all important, but not his commission ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, it was only later on that according to Lietzmann Paul accepted the “Heidenapostolat als seinen Beruf.”¹⁵

The collection is - according to Baur - “das entgegenkommende Versprechen, das der Apostel aus Liebe zum Frieden noch gab.”¹⁶ But he did not really link his proposed “Auseinandersetzung zwischen Judenchristen und Heidenchristen, Judaisten und Paulus”¹⁷ with the collection. For Holl, however, οἱ πτωχοί and οἱ ἄγιοι are “Ehrenname[n] der Urgemeinde.”¹⁸ And since for Paul Jerusalem remains the centre of Christianity,¹⁹ because the Jerusalem Christians are “Augenzeugen des Lebens Jesu,”²⁰ he accepts with the collection εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων Jerusalem’s prime importance. “Die ‘heilige Stadt’ der Juden hat... eine rechtliche Bedeutung,”²¹ and εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων is, thus, “a euphemistic mention of a compulsory levy²² on the Gentile churches from the ‘mother church’ in Jerusalem.”²³ Hence, with this thesis Holl “holt(e)... nach, was die Tübinger versäumt hatten.”²⁴

2.2. Paul and Jerusalem versus Judaizers

Like the Tübingen school the following group of exegetes marks the contrast between Judaism and Christianity as the opposition of “meritorious works of the Torah”²⁵ and justification “mediated ‘through... faith’.”²⁶ Some speak, therefore, also

¹² Ibid., vol.I, p.137.

¹³ Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.52 n.3.

¹⁴ See Munck, *Salvation*, p.283; Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.123; Baur, *Paulus*, vol.I, p.137.

¹⁵ Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.7. (Emphasis by Lietzmann)

¹⁶ Baur, *Paulus*, vol.I, p.152.

¹⁷ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.9. See also Munck, *Salvation*, p.287; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.778.

¹⁸ Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.13.

¹⁹ See Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.63.

²⁰ Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.10.

²¹ Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.55.

²² “Gewisse Rechtsforderungen.” (Ibid., p.60, emphasis by Holl)

²³ Munck, *Salvation*, p.287.

²⁴ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.10. See Munck, *Salvation*, p.287; Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.58.

²⁵ Betz, *Galatians*, p.117.

of a 'conversion' of Paul.²⁷ However, this group of exegetes holds "in direct opposition to Tübingen... that, though their ministries differed, Paul's relationship with the apostles at Jerusalem was one of mutual recognition and acceptance."²⁸ Mußner even explicitly objects to Baur's construction that "immer nur zwei Gruppen vorausgesetzt werden, während es in Wirklichkeit drei waren: 1. die Jerusalemer Autoritäten..., 2. die 'Judaisten'..., 3. Paulus."²⁹ With the recognition of this "Einheit des Evangeliums und Apostolates,"³⁰ scholars began to realise that Paul relates his gospel and apostleship to Judaism.³¹ This would have been impossible on the basis of the Tübingen school's thesis. Betz, therefore, questions talking about a conversion of Paul from Judaism to Christianity. "The most one could say is that he was converted from one Jewish movement, the Pharisees, to another, the Christians."³² And others speak of a 'call' or 'commissioning' of Paul.³³

With this new approach to Paul emphasis was also laid on his commission ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.³⁴ For scholars who stress the opposition of ἔργα τοῦ νόμου and δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως Paul's "Völkermission"³⁵ is merely part of the "Gesamtbewegung des Evangeliums."³⁶ It does not mean the "offiziellen Auftrag zur Heidenmission,"³⁷ but merely that the Gentile mission is the logical consequence of the gospel.³⁸ Ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν stresses "nicht die Begrenztheit des Auftrags..., sondern gerade seine Unbegrenztheit."³⁹ However, Cranfield and Knox put emphasis on the fact that Paul's Gentile mission is the "divine purpose"⁴⁰ "rather than the result"⁴¹ of his revelation.⁴²

²⁶ Ibid., p.117. See Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p.114; Mußner, *Galaterbrief*, p.146; Nickle, *Collection*, p.132. Betz, however, contends that "the doctrine of justification by faith is part of a Jewish-Christian theology." (Betz, *Galatians*, p.115) And Burton and Betz hold that Paul would not have denied that Jewish Christians were "obligated to observe the Jewish Torah and to become circumcised" (ibid., p.82) as long as this was "confined to Jewish communities, concerned the Jews only, and did not affect the Gentiles." (Burton, *Galatians*, p.112)

²⁷ See e.g. Nickle, *Collection*, p.132; Oepke, *Galater*, p.61; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.95; Schlier, *Galater*, p.24; Mußner, *Galater*, p.80.

²⁸ Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.xc.

²⁹ Mußner, *Galater*, p.122 n.118. See Schlier, *Galater*, p.56.

³⁰ Ibid., p.37.

³¹ See Betz, *Galatians*, p.70; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.111; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.773 n.3.

³² Betz, *Galatians*, p.69.

³³ Bruce, *Galatians*, p.111; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.754; Knox, *Conception*, p.2; Nickle, *Collection*, p.132.

³⁴ Lightfoot, *Galatians*, however, does not even refer to the phrase.

³⁵ Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.120.

³⁶ Ibid., p.120. See Schlier, *Galater*, p.25.

³⁷ Mußner, *Galater*, p.87.

³⁸ See Nickle, *Collection*, p.132.

³⁹ Oepke, *Galater*, p.61. See Mußner, *Galater*, p.88; Schlier, *Galater*, p.27.

⁴⁰ Cranfield, *Romans*, p.754.

Thus scholars began to see Paul's mission "in den weltweiten Dimensionen von Gottes heilsgeschichtlichem Plan mit Heiden und Juden."⁴³ For some it was "a precondition of the *eschaton*."⁴⁴ Paul's call was, thus, also seen "in line with the tradition of the prophetic vocation."⁴⁵ Stuhlmacher even holds that "Paulus will... der Erlösung ganz Israels und der Parusie des Christus vom Zion her den Weg zu bereiten."⁴⁶ Others do not go that far. They hold that one should "avoid simply interpreting ideas of Second Isaiah into Paul."⁴⁷ Paul "did not think of himself as the only preacher to the nations."⁴⁸ It was not his aim to bring in the fullness of the Gentiles, and he did not think that he had already completed the preaching of the gospel so far as the East was concerned.⁴⁹

Since Jerusalem and Paul were thought to be in agreement, the collection was not anymore seen as a levy upon the Gentile churches. For Nickle and Stuhlmacher it denoted the "eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentile Christians to Jerusalem"⁵⁰ by which the Jews were "moved through jealousy to finally accept the gospel."⁵¹ However, Barrett rejects this view.⁵² And for others it was to bring "financial help from Gentile Christians... to Jewish Christians in Jerusalem who were poor."⁵³ It was "an act of love."⁵⁴ And since "the Gentile church owed the Jewish church an unpayable debt - the first Christians were Jews,"⁵⁵ it was also a means of unity of "the Gentile and Jewish parts of the Church."⁵⁶ Interestingly for Lightfoot, in sharp contrast

41 Ibid., p.754.

42 See Knox, *Conception*, p.2; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.95.

43 Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.210. See Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.120; Barrett, *Romans*, p.274f.

44 Knox, *Conception*, p.8. (Emphasis by Knox) See Barrett, *Romans*, p.276 and p.278; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.381. But see Cranfield, *Romans*, p.770.

45 Betz, *Galatians*, p.70. See Oepke, *Galater*, p.60.

46 Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.212. Contrast Käsemann, *Römer*, p.385.

47 Betz, *Galatians*, p.70 n.139. See Käsemann, *Römer*, p.381. See also Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92.

48 Knox, *Conception*, p.8. See Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92; Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.120.

49 See Knox, *Conception*, p.10; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.767. But see also Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.210.

50 Nickle, *Collection*, p.142.

51 Ibid., p.142. See Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.213

52 Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.28.

53 Ibid., p.27.

54 Cranfield, *Romans*, p.770. See also Schlier, *Galater*, p.46; Oepke, *Galater*, p.85; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.126; Mußner, *Galater*, p.126; Betz, *Galatians*, p.103; Nickle, *Collection*, p.100; Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.128; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.385.

55 Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.27.

56 Cranfield, *Romans*, p.770. See Mußner, *Galater*, p.126; Barrett, *Romans*, p.278; Burton, *Galatians*, p.113. Also Nickle, *Collection*, p.129; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.214; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.392; Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.131.

to the Tübingen school's view, the collection signifies "fresh obligations to the heathen converts."⁵⁷ The recipients were "practically confessing their dependence."⁵⁸

2.3. Paul and the Jewish Christians

With the following concepts the assumed opposition concerning the means of justification, which was prevalent in most of the above mentioned works, recedes into the background of the studies, or is even entirely abandoned. The Jewish roots of Paul's theology, his desire to maintain relationship with Israel and to remain in contact with salvation history as understood by the Jews come to the fore. The differences between Gentile Christianity, Jewish Christianity and Judaism become less significant.

Stendahl was one of the first to stress the fact that the relationship between Jews and Gentiles was "one of the most basic of the questions and concerns that shaped Paul's thinking in the first place."⁵⁹ It is the theological context of "Paul's doctrine of justification by faith."⁶⁰ For Paul Judaism is not "the prime example of a timeless legalism."⁶¹ Also Dunn⁶² abandons the view that Paul thought in terms of justification by faith as opposed to earning justification through works of the law. This is not a Jewish-Christian (Jewish-Pauline) opposition. Paul rather developed his own theology in (Jewish) terms of 'covenantal nomism.'⁶³ Dunn, therefore, stresses that Paul "claims to be wholly in continuity and succession with the main line of salvation revelation in the OT, *not* excluding the law."⁶⁴ Hence, Paul was not converted,⁶⁵ but "received a new and special calling in God's service."⁶⁶

⁵⁷ Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.304.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p.304.

⁵⁹ Stendahl, *Paul*, p.1. See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.35.

⁶⁰ Stendahl, *Paul*, p.26. (Emphasis by Stendahl)

⁶¹ Ibid., p.36f.

⁶² Building upon Sanders' study on *Paul and Palestinian Judaism (PPJ)* See e.g. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p.lxiii ff.

⁶³ See Sanders' definition of 'covenantal nomism': "covenantal nomism is the view that one's place in God's plan is established on the basis of the covenant and that the covenant requires as the proper response of man his obedience to its commandments, while providing means of atonement for transgression." (Sanders, *PPJ*, p.75)

⁶⁴ Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p.867. (Emphasis by Dunn)

⁶⁵ See Stendahl, *Paul*, p.15; Dunn, *Galatians*, p.3, says that in Gal 1:15-16 "it is evident that Paul saw this encounter with God's Son (on the 'road to Damascus,' according to Acts ix) not so much as a conversion, and much more as a commissioning - a commissioning specifically to preach the good news of this Jesus 'among the Gentiles'."

⁶⁶ Ibid., p.7. (Emphasis by Stendahl)

Concerning Paul's call Holtz in particular argued that Paul relates his "Sendung durch Gott selbst,"⁶⁷ "den Inhalt der Botschaft,"⁶⁸ and his "Sendung zu allen Völkern"⁶⁹ to Deutero-Isaiah.⁷⁰ According to Munck Paul even sees his work to be "more important than that of all the figures in Old Testament redemptive history."⁷¹ The salvation of Israel and of the world depends on his own work.⁷²

In contrast to almost all the scholars mentioned in the sections above Paul's collection was understood in salvation-historical terms.⁷³ "Paul saw and acknowledged the salvation-history significance of Jerusalem and therefore of the mother church which belonged there."⁷⁴ Thus to Berger the collection is neither a "Analogie zur Tempelsteuer,"⁷⁵ nor "die Erfüllung der Verheißung der Völkerwallfahrt"⁷⁶ nor merely a charitable act. Instead it is modelled on the traditional Jewish category of almsgiving. "Die... heidenchristlichen Gemeinden des Paulus verhalten sich zur Gemeinde in Jerusalem (Judenchristen) wie 'Gottesfürchtige' und 'Sympathisanten' zu jüdischen Gemeinden."⁷⁷ It is, thus, "die einzig sichtbare Klammer zwischen Juden- und Heidenchristen."⁷⁸ With it Paul wanted to maintain "the unity of the eschatological people of God."⁷⁹ It is an expression of the "Erwählung des eschatologischen Gottesvolkes aus Juden und Heiden"⁸⁰ and becomes thus a "Modellfall"⁸¹ of Paul's theology. For Georgi, however, Paul wants to make the Jews jealous of the Gentile Christians. This is "die völlige Verkehrung der jüdischen eschatologischen Hoffnung."⁸² In this light the collection and the group of representatives of Paul's Gentile churches denote "die eschatologische Völkerwallfahrt nach Jerusalem."⁸³ Aus

⁶⁷ Holtz, *Paulus*, col.323.

⁶⁸ Ibid., col.323.

⁶⁹ Ibid., col.324.

⁷⁰ Ibid., col.328. See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.866; Aus, *Spain*, p.240.

⁷¹ Munck, *Salvation*, p.43.

⁷² See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.856; Holtz, *Paulus*, col.330; Munck, *Salvation*, e.g. p.41, p.43 and p.55; Aus, *Spain*, p.262.

⁷³ See, however, Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.213; Nickle, *Collection*, p.142.

⁷⁴ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.879. See Berger, *Almosen*, p.202.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p.181.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p.181.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p.198.

⁷⁸ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.22. See Berger, *Almosen*, p.199

⁷⁹ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.882.

⁸⁰ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.79.

⁸¹ Ibid., p.79.

⁸² Ibid., p.84.

⁸³ Ibid., p.85. See Bartsch, *Frucht*, p.107; Holtz, *Paulus*, col.328; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.860 and p.864.

even brings this into connection with Paul's travel plans to Spain namely, that it was Paul's conviction that only when he "has brought Christian representatives from *Spain* to Jerusalem as part of the collection enterprise" ⁸⁴ "the Messiah would return." ⁸⁵

2.4. Summary

Much has been written about Paul's apostleship, his collection and about his understanding of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles. In recent years it has been recognised anew that the relationship between Gentile Christians and Jews is one of the major issues in Paul's theology. This has not always been the case. It was the Tübingen school's view that there was a sharp contrast between Judaism and 'Paulinism.'

Stressing the difference between Judaism and Christianity Paul's experience of the Son of God has been described in terms of a 'conversion.' However, when scholars recognised that Paul thought his Gentile mission to be part of God's history of salvation, and that he, therefore, desired to maintain the relationship between his Gentile churches and Israel, his Christophany has been described as a 'call.' Paul's Jewishness is even more emphasised where it is recognised that justification by faith or works of the law is not a Christian-Jewish opposition.

Concerning Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles exegetes stressed either the *gospel* Paul proclaims or his mission ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Those exegetes, who were of the opinion that there was a sharp contrast between Judaism and Christianity concerning the means of justification, held that Paul was sent to preach the gospel of justification by faith to the Gentiles merely because it has to be proclaimed to all people. Other exegetes, however, who did not think in terms of a Jewish-Christian opposition, saw Paul as being called to proclaim the inclusion of the Gentiles into the (eschatological) people of God.

Also the understanding of meaning and function of the collection changed with differing opinions concerning Paul's concept of the eschatological people of God. Holding that there was a conflict between Jerusalem and Paul's Gentile churches scholars understood the collection to be a compulsory levy upon the Gentile Christians imposed by the mother church in Jerusalem. Since, however, scholars depicted Paul and the Jewish Christians as being in agreement about the gospel the collection was thought to be a charitable act. And taking Paul's understanding of his apostleship to be

⁸⁴ Aus, *Spain*, p.234. (Emphasis by Aus)

⁸⁵ Ibid., p.242.

part of his understanding of his Jewishness, the collection was also interpreted in Jewish terms of 'almsgiving' from Gentiles to Jews, or even in terms of the pilgrimage of the Gentiles to the Zion at the end of time.

Simplifying in tabular form we can summarise the findings thus:

	Paul vs. Jerusalem	Paul / Jerusalem vs. Judaizers	Paul and Jewish Christians
Conversion / Call / Commissioning	Conversion	Conversion / Call	Call / Commissioning
Apostleship ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν	Gospel to all people	Gospel especially to the Gentiles	Inclusion of the Gentiles
The Collection	Compulsory levy	Charitable act / Unity	Almsgiving / Unity / Pilgrimage

With these findings I think the problem to be dealt with in the following is set out clearly. Interrelation of issues is a necessary corollary to systematic theology. And Paul is thought to be one of the great Christian systematic theologians.⁸⁶ Hence, in the history of research scholars always related their understanding of Paul's thoughts on his apostleship and collection to the understanding of his concept of the relationship between Gentiles, namely the Gentile Christians, and Jews and Jewish Christians. Thus, most scholars treated Paul as a 'perfect systematic thinker.' The question is whether the different issues really are interrelated in Paul's thought.

To find an answer we must first examine Paul's understanding of his apostleship and its connection with his concept of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles.

⁸⁶

See e.g. Bultmann, *Theologie*, p.188: "die geschichtliche Stellung des Paulus ist dadurch bezeichnet, daß er, im Rahmen des hellenistischen Christentums stehend, die theologischen Motive, die im Kerygma der hellenistischen Gemeinde wirksam waren, zur Klarheit des theologischen Gedankens erhoben, die im hellenistischen Kerygma sich bergenden Fragen bewußt gemacht und zur Entscheidung geführt hat und so - soweit unsere Quellen ein Urteil gestatten - zum Begründer einer christlichen Theologie geworden ist." (My emphases)

3. PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP

3.1. Introduction

In examining Paul's apostleship we shall give a detailed exegesis of Gal 1:15-16a. It is a highly stylised block of text. Hence it is worth looking at each word and phrase separately. The order of the chapter is therefore given by Paul's own account of his revelation experience. This account can be subdivided into four sections, each of which describes a certain aspect of the revelation. First, there is Paul's reference to the one by whom he was sent: ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν [ὁ θεός]. Secondly, there is - according to my analysis given in the section on 'conversion, call, commissioning' - Paul's being set apart and being called before he was born: ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. Thirdly, there is Paul's commissioning, the revelation experience itself: ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. Fourthly, there is Paul's commission, the purpose of the revelation: ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

In the section on the aspect of Paul's revelation which describes the call I shall enter into the debate concerning the question whether Paul's revelation should be described in terms of a conversion, call or commissioning. Paul's other references to the revelation experience in 1 Cor 9:1, 1 Cor 15:8 and 2 Cor 4:6 I shall discuss in the section on Paul's commissioning. Since I distinguish between call, commissioning and commission, I also separate the discussion on parallel prophetic texts into a discussion of prophetic *call* experiences, prophetic and Mosaic *commissioning* and the prophets sent to the *nations*.

Our main concern in this chapter will be how Paul conceived of his apostleship, how he conceived of Jewish - Gentile relations and how these issues are related to each other.

3.2. The Context of Gal 1:15-16a

In Galatia Paul's authority was in question and accordingly his gospel was at risk. Already in the salutatio Paul countered accusations against himself by referring to his non-human but divine apostleship (οὐκ ἀπ', οὐδὲ δι', ἀλλὰ διὰ). This antithesis he takes up again in the thematic statement in verses 11-12⁸⁷. This time however it is linked with the gospel: it is οὐ κατὰ, οὐδὲ παρά, οὔτε (διὰ),⁸⁸ ἀλλὰ δι'. In this statement the 'not human' is differentiated into 'not in human terms' (οὐ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον) and 'not from a human being' (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην)⁸⁹. Jeremias⁹⁰ applies this structure on the one hand to 1:13-2:21 (not from human being) and on the other hand to 3:1-6:10 (not in human terms). The structure of the whole letter is therefore a chiasm.⁹¹

Having shown in Gal 1:13-14 that he was not prepared for the commission, for the message of the gospel and for his apostleship, Paul comes to speak about his call and about his revelation, the incident where he received his commission to preach the gospel among the Gentiles.⁹² He refers to this incident in a subordinate clause (ὅτε δέ). The main clause runs: εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην... οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον... ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον (16b-17). The action in his curriculum vitae goes from his ἀναστροφή ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ immediately to his ἀναστροφή ἐν τῷ Χριστιανισμῷ. There was no break in between (εὐθέως). Paul aims to show that he received his gospel all at once in a divine act. In his reply to the charges made by his Judaizing opponents in Galatia⁹³ Paul comes to speak about his relation to Jerusalem (17a, 18, 22, 2:1-10 and also 2:11-14 where we find the same grouping of people). He argues that immediately after the revelation he did not consult

⁸⁷ See Sandnes, *Paul*, p.53 who argues against Betz, that "the vv. 11 and 12 belong together forming the stasis." Verse 10 is then a transition from exordium (6-9) to the stasis. Furthermore 13-14 is a transition from the stasis to the narratio, the statement of fact. He also treats 15-16a as a unit referring to the revelation.

⁸⁸ For διδάσκω with διὰ see 2 Thess 2:15.

⁸⁹ See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.51f, who refers to Jeremias, *Chiasmus*, p.145-156. See also Mußner, *Galater*, p.77; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.89.

⁹⁰ Jeremias, *Chiasmus*.

⁹¹ See also the discussion on this issue by Longenecker (Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.21), who does not want to stress this chiasm too much.

⁹² The contrast between 1:13-14 and 1:15-16a shows that Paul received his gospel unprepared, but it also shows that he himself had no reason to become an apostle. "Nur ein Wunder konnte ihn herumholen." (Oepke, *Galater*, p. 59) "As a Jew he has had no reason to leave Judaism. This situation is of course emphasized in order to underscore the miraculous nature of his conversion." (Betz, *Galatians*, p.68f)

⁹³ See Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.35 (Explanation); Fung, *Galatians*, p.3-9, esp. p.7ff; Niebuhr, *Heidenapostel*, p.7ff.

any human being (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, 1:16b) ⁹⁴ and not even ⁹⁵ did he go to Jerusalem to consult the Jerusalem leaders who were apostles before him (1:17a). He “demonstrates that he has remained independent from the highest but human authorities in the church.” ⁹⁶ Only later he went to Jerusalem “getting to know Cephas,” ⁹⁷ while he remained unknown to the churches of Judea although he was already preaching the gospel (1:22-23). In 2:1-10 he describes his second visit to Jerusalem ⁹⁸ and how he stood firm concerning his gospel ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (2:2). He defeated some ψευδαδέλφους (2:4-5) and the authorities in Jerusalem accepted his gospel (2:9). He, therefore, was not influenced by the authorities. Finally he defended his gospel against Cephas and Judaizing influence in Antioch (2:11-14) ⁹⁹.

Hence although it is not the main clause all emphasis lies upon Gal 1:15-16a. Everything Paul is and does comes from God ¹⁰⁰. His radical change from Judaism, a life according to the law, to the law-free gospel, his change from depicting the Jewish Christians as fallen out of the לְקַח לְקַח to labelling them ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, all took place in the revelation, not immediately after it (1:16b-24) nor later on (2:1-14). His understanding of call and commission, of apostleship and gospel, is rooted in this revelation-experience.

⁹⁴ For ‘σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα’ meaning ‘human beings’ see Betz, *Galatians*, p.72f; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.54; Burton, *Galatians*, p.54.

⁹⁵ The οὐδέ is “climactic.” (Betz, *Galatians*, p. 73 n.171)

⁹⁶ Betz, *Galatians*, p.73. Given the total change in Paul’s life by his referring to the sole acting of God in Gal 1:15-16a, σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι can only be read in contrast to the ‘divine revelation.’ Even if προσανέθεμεν “had a technical meaning of consulting with someone who was recognized as a qualified interpreter about the significance of some sign” (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.67) the contrast between the ‘divine act’ and ‘flesh and blood’ shows how unnecessary and useless it would have been to ask someone about the meaning of the revelation. The revelation is totally different in quality and does not need to be explained or interpreted.

⁹⁷ See Hofius, *ἱστορήσαι*, p.73-85, and Dunn, *Reply*, p.138-139.

⁹⁸ He went κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν. “The point is that he went at heaven’s behest, not at Jerusalem’s, nor even Antioch’s.” (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.91) See also Mußner, *Galater*, p.102 and Fung, *Galatians*, p.87.

⁹⁹ With 2:11-14 Paul argues that it was Cephas, who acted κατὰ ἄνθρωπον in his ὑποκρίσει, and that he himself stood firm against the τίνες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου. Furthermore he shows his concern about Judaism even as an apostle by using the term ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ (1:13) and showing that he wanted to keep contact with Jerusalem as the origin of Christianity (μὴ πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, 2:2). Jerusalem was and remained to Paul the centre of Judaism and Christianity.

¹⁰⁰ It comes from God (and neither from a human being nor is it influenced by a human being): 1:13-2:14; and it is according to scripture: 3:1-6:10.

3.3. The Sender

3.3.1. "Ὅτε δὲ... [ὁ θεός]"

Defending his apostleship and his gospel Paul "appeals to the facts of his life."¹⁰¹ This "autobiographische Rechenschaftsbericht"¹⁰² is "vorwiegend durch das autobiographische Ich des Briefautors zusammengehalten"¹⁰³. In Gal 1:10-2:14a the first person singular dominates¹⁰⁴. Hence the change to the third person singular in 1:15-16a must have caught the attention of the reader. Suddenly the acting subject is God¹⁰⁵. This change of subject and the fact that 1:15-16a is a subordinate clause underlines that it does not continue Paul's account of his conduct.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless it is strongly linked with 1:13-14: ὅτε δέ takes up ποτε in 1:13. The curriculum vitae is divided into two parts: the one before the revelation and the one that started with the revelation.¹⁰⁷ Ὅτε δέ marks the "complete break"¹⁰⁸ in Paul's life.¹⁰⁹ Hence ὅτε δέ and [ὁ θεός] indicate¹¹⁰ that vv.15-16a are, on the one hand, distinctive in the context (subordinate clause, change of subject) and are also, on the other hand, the crucial factor in Paul's argumentation. This break was decisive for his life (ποτε - ὅτε, human - divine).

¹⁰¹ Burton, *Galatians*, p.43.

¹⁰² Niebuhr, *Heidenapostel*, 4f, concerning Gal 1:10-2:21.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p.4.

¹⁰⁴ The transition from this autobiographical passage to the argumentative text 3:1ff is not sudden. Gal 2:14b-21 marks this transition. The autobiographical part ends with 2:14a. (See Niebuhr, *Heidenapostel*, p.5)

¹⁰⁵ Since 1 Cor 1:21 and 10:5 - with Gal 1:15 the only passages in Paul where εὐδοκεῖν appears - run 'εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός' it is quite likely that one wanted to add ὁ θεός to Gal 1:15. "There is an obvious motive for the (correct) interpretative gloss, but none for its omission." (Burton, *Galatians*, p.51f) Hence ὁ θεός should be regarded as a gloss. It is, however, clear that God is the acting subject. Already the verb εὐδοκεῖν indicates a divine decision (see Betz, *Galatians*, p.69 n.130 and §3.3.2.). And for participle constructions where the subject is God but ὁ θεός is missing see - according to Schlier, *Galater*, p.25 and Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.30 - Gal 1:6, 2:8, 3:5, 5:8, Rm 8:11, Phil 1:6, 1 Thess 5:24.

¹⁰⁶ The action goes on with εὐθέως (1:16b). See §3.2..

¹⁰⁷ Given that the ἐτι in 1:10 refers to Paul's conduct in Judaism one can regard Gal 1:13-14 as divided into 1:13-14: 'men pleasing conduct before...' and 1:15-2:14: 'God-pleasing conduct after the revelation'.

¹⁰⁸ Fung, *Galatians*, p.63.

¹⁰⁹ Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.7, speaks of a "Blitzstrahl," thus relating Luther's to Paul's experience but making the point. See, however, Stendahl, who holds that "we all, in the West, and especially in the tradition of the Reformation, cannot help reading Paul through the experience of persons like Luther or Calvin. And this is the chief reason for most of our misunderstandings of Paul." (Stendahl, *Paul*, p.12)

¹¹⁰ With an exclamation mark as it were.

3.3.2. Εὐδόκησεν

God is the subject of εὐδοκεῖν. In the Old Testament the verb εὐδοκεῖν as well as the corresponding noun εὐδοκία is usually a translation of רָצוֹן / רָצוֹן.¹¹¹ In many Psalms and mainly in the Psalms it denotes God's good pleasure.¹¹² Particularly it means God's "good pleasure in his people and land"¹¹³.¹¹⁴ It denotes God's will to help in face of enemies and in grief.¹¹⁵ And it expresses a gracious care for his people¹¹⁶. Additionally God has set a certain time for this good will to be expressed.¹¹⁷

In the passages of the New Testament where God is the subject of εὐδοκεῖν Jesus is most of the times the object.¹¹⁸ God himself expresses his delight in Jesus. Most of the passages where εὐδοκεῖν is connected with Jesus are related to Isa 42:1.¹¹⁹ Even if the relation between Isa 42:1 and Jesus is a later tradition, there seems to have been an earlier tradition which applied the word εὐδοκεῖν to Jesus' commission.¹²⁰ In Hebrews it appears three times as a quotation from the Old Testament.¹²¹ Once it denotes God's good will towards and his plan for the 'little flock', his people.¹²² The noun εὐδοκία appears in a prayer of Jesus,¹²³ in the hymn of the angels¹²⁴ and in another hymnal text¹²⁵.

¹¹¹ In the Psalms the corresponding word for εὐδοκεῖν is eleven times רָצוֹן, twice another word (in Ps 51:19, 68:16). Once εὐδοκεῖν is without reference in the Hebrew text (LXX Ps 151). For εὐδοκία it is seven times רָצוֹן. Once there is no reference (Ps 141:5). Isa 42:1 has רָצוֹן but not εὐδοκεῖν in the LXX. However, in the New Testament Isa 42:1 is quoted and referred to with εὐδοκεῖν. (See below)

¹¹² Thus Ps 40:13, 44:3, 51:16, 68:16, 77:7, 85:1, 102:14, 119:108, 147:10.11, 149:4, (LXX) 151:5 εὐδοκεῖν and Ps 5:12, 19:14, 51:18, 69:13, 89:17, 106:4 εὐδοκία. Just only in Ps 49:13 and 102:13 εὐδοκεῖν and Ps 141:5 and 145:16 εὐδοκία means men's delight.

¹¹³ Compare Isa 62:4.

¹¹⁴ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.62.

¹¹⁵ Εὐδοκεῖν: Ps 40:13, 44:3, 77:7, 85:1, 119:108, 149:4. Εὐδοκία: Ps 5:12, 89:17, 106:4. See also 2 Sam 22:20.

¹¹⁶ Ἐλεός appears in the context of εὐδοκεῖν: Ps 77:7(9), 147:11 and εὐδοκία: Ps 69:13.

¹¹⁷ See Ps 69:13. Also Ps 102:13 where the word does not appear but the context is the same.

¹¹⁸ Jesus' baptism, Mt 3:17, Mk 1:11, Lk 3:22 and his transfiguration, Mt 17:5. Also 2 Pet 1:17. Even in Col 1:19 it is the πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα that delighted to dwell in Jesus.

¹¹⁹ See the motif in Mt 3:17, 12:18 and 17:5 and the discussion in the commentaries (e.g. Guelich, *Mark*, p.33ff, Nolland, *Luke*, p.161ff). "There can be no doubt that in Matthew the voice from heaven and Isa 42:1 are bound together," (Nolland, *Luke*, p.162) even if in Mt 12:18 the term ἐκλεκτός from Isa 42:1 "at the moment of combination with Ps 2:7" (Ibid., p.163) was replaced by ἀγαπητός. In Lk 3:22 Luke strongly alludes to Isa 42:1 (see Nolland, *Luke*, p.161-166), and Mark combines the "messianic king (Ps 2:7) and... God's chosen Servant (Isa 42:1)." (Guelich, *Mark*, p.34)

¹²⁰ If Mark was not thinking of Isa 42:1, εὐδοκεῖν nevertheless denotes God's good will towards Jesus and his decision to commission him. Jesus' baptism was his "commissioning by God" (Nolland, *Luke*, p.165).

¹²¹ Heb 10:38 (LXX Hab 2:4) and Heb 10:6.8 (Ps 40:7-9).

¹²² Lk 12:32.

¹²³ Mt 11:26 par.

Paul himself uses εὐδοκεῖν and εὐδοκία mainly with a human being as its subject.¹²⁶ Only three times is God the subject.¹²⁷ In 1 Cor 1:21 εὐδοκεῖν denotes a certain plan, a decision of God.¹²⁸

3.3.3. Summary

Εὐδοκεῖν means God's good pleasure directed towards his people. In his gracious and loving care for his people God follows a plan. He has set a certain time for his pleasure to come into effect. Εὐδοκεῖν appears mainly in hymns, psalms, prayers and divine sayings. It indicates biblical and liturgical language.¹²⁹

Introducing Gal 1:15-16a with this word the sentence which followed must have grasped the attention of the listeners (and readers) of the letter. Thus it would have had the weight Paul wanted it to have. He solemnly comes to speak about his call and commissioning. It was a divine decision to make Paul an apostle at a particular time. Thus Paul's life in Judaism was included in God's plan for him. Even more in calling Paul to be an apostle God showed his grace towards Paul and his care for his people. God "has fixed a time to bring Paul into"¹³⁰ his plan with his people. With his apostleship Paul is bound to Israel. It is a commission 'within' Israel.

¹²⁴ Lk 2:14.

¹²⁵ Eph 1:5.9.

¹²⁶ Εὐδοκεῖν: Rm 15:26.27, 2 Cor 5:8, 12:10, 1 Thess 2:8, 3:1 and εὐδοκία : Rm 10:1, Phil 1:15.

¹²⁷ Εὐδοκεῖν: 1 Cor 1:21, 10:5, Gal 1:15 and εὐδοκία: Phil 2:13.

¹²⁸ It has the same impact as in Lk 12:32 and Col 1:19 (see Sandnes, *Paul*, p.59). See also Schrage, *Korinther*, p.181, on 1 Cor 1:21: "Gott als Subjekt von εὐδοκεῖν gebraucht Paulus auch Gal 1,15 und auch dort für die freie souveräne Gnadenwahl, den von allem menschlichen Einwirken unabhängigen Heilsratschluß Gottes (vgl. auch Kol 1,19)."

¹²⁹ On εὐδοκεῖν in Galatians see also Betz, *Galatians*; p.69; Burton, *Galatians*, p.52; Dunn, *Galatians*, p.62f; Mußner, *Galatians*, p.81 and Sandnes, *Paul*, p.59.

¹³⁰ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.59.

3.4. The Call

3.4.1. Conversion, Call, Commissioning

In recent years there has been a discussion about describing Paul's revelation experience as a 'call' rather than a 'conversion.' I follow this argumentation. However, concerning the structure of Gal 1:15-16a and the parallel prophetic 'calls' of Jeremiah and Isaiah I argue for describing the revelation experience as Paul's 'commissioning.'

"With Augustine, Western Christianity with its stress on introspective achievement started,"¹³¹ and theology turned from the question about the history of salvation to the question about the "innermost individual soul."¹³² Justification by faith was understood as the antithesis to justification through works of the law. Paul's revelation experience was depicted as a "change of 'religion'," ¹³³ the "Jew became a Christian," ¹³⁴ as a 'conversion.' However, "für Juden war 'Erfüllung,' was für Heiden 'Erlösung' war. Juden hatten [with their entry into Christianity] das Ziel einer langen Wanderung erreicht, Heiden hatten sich dagegen nach einem ganz neuen Ziel umorientiert."¹³⁵ "Die Annahme der Botschaft setzte bei ihnen eine grundlegendere Wandlung voraus als bei den Juden."¹³⁶ Since Paul's audience is mainly a Gentile Christian audience in Gentile territory Paul's use of the term καλεῖν in the sense of God's calling "into the fellowship of his son Jesus Christ" ¹³⁷ could rightly be described as denoting a 'conversion' - for the Gentiles. But Paul himself did not experience "a conversion from one religion to another, but... a recall to a proper understanding of the grace-character of Israel's calling."¹³⁸ He is not 'called' out of the Jewish religion into Christianity but he changed within the Jewish religion from a persecutor to an

¹³¹ Stendahl, *Paul*, p.16

¹³² Ibid., p.17.

¹³³ Ibid., p.7.

¹³⁴ Ibid., p.11.

¹³⁵ Theißen, *Judentum*, p.337.

¹³⁶ Ibid., p.337.

¹³⁷ Burton, *Galatians*, p.20.

¹³⁸ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63.

apostle of Christ.¹³⁹ "He took this appointment [to proclaim the gospel of Christ] to be part of his Jewishness."¹⁴⁰ He is commissioned 'within' Israel and he "remains a Jew as he fulfils his role as an Apostle to the Gentiles."¹⁴¹ For Paul Christianity might be a "transvaluation of values"¹⁴² of Judaism but it is not the abrogation of salvation history and God's promises to Israel and thus the antithesis to Judaism. Hence Paul's and other Jews' entrance into Christianity means something different for them as opposed to an understanding of this experience on the part of the Gentiles.¹⁴³

Furthermore I prefer 'call' rather than 'conversion' because Paul does not stress that he was called to be a Christian but that he is called to be an apostle. In Gal 1:15-16a it is "primär an die Berufung zum Apostel gedacht."¹⁴⁴ In his reply to the charges Paul defends his gospel and thus also his apostleship. Hence καλέσας denotes God's call to Paul to be an apostle. "The 'I' in his [Paul's] writings is not 'the Christian' but 'the Apostle to the Gentiles'."¹⁴⁵ "The emphasis in the accounts [of Paul's revelation experience in Act 9, 22, 26 and Gal 1] is always on this assignment [to the Gentiles], not on the conversion."¹⁴⁶ "The mission is the point"¹⁴⁷ "rather than a conversion."¹⁴⁸ Paul's experience of seeing the Lord made him in the first instance an apostle, rather than a Christian.¹⁴⁹

Because of "the allusion to creation, the dualism dark-light, and the knowledge"¹⁵⁰ in 2 Cor 4 Sandnes stresses that "the Damascus event is described as a conversion."¹⁵¹ But the 'conversion' in 2 Cor 4 has to be seen in the light of the unveiling in 3:12ff. It is an unveiling of something which is already present, and not a conversion

139 "If we may speak of the event as a conversion, it was not a conversion from the religion of Israel to a new religion, but a conversion from one viewpoint within Judaism, regarding the relation of Israel to the other nations (the Gentiles), to another viewpoint - conversion from suspicion of and antipathy to non-Jews, to concern for their conversion to the gospel of the Jewish Messiah." (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.3)

140 Betz, *Galatians*, p.70.

141 Stendahl, *Paul*, p.11.

142 Räisänen, *Development*, p.416 n.1.

143 The realisation of his being called was of course Paul's entry into Christianity. But this is not the point of Paul's argument. Both Paul and his opponents were Christians. In question was his apostleship and gospel.

144 Schlier, *Galater*, p.25 n.5.

145 Stendahl, *Paul*, p.12.

146 Ibid., p.7.

147 Ibid., p.10.

148 Ibid., p.10f.

149 See §3.5.2.1..

150 Sandnes, *Paul*, p.143.

151 Ibid., p.143.

to something new. It is a 'conversion' to a new understanding of the old values and beliefs because it is an unveiled understanding. Even more also in Rm 4:17 "God's act of creation" ¹⁵² is described in terms of an "effective 'calling'." ¹⁵³

Gager has a psychological approach to Paul. Paul the persecutor experienced a "'stress experience' which frequently precede[s] and prepare[s] for conversions of various kinds." ¹⁵⁴ "Old value systems give way to new ones." ¹⁵⁵ Since "the fundamental system of values and commitments is preserved intact in this sort of conversion" ¹⁵⁶ Gager takes up the arguments that Paul did not change his religion. This aspect of conversion was not in Paul's mind, but instead the aspect of his commission. But this stressing by Paul of the commission aspect of his revelation can be explained in psychological terms as well. With his turning to the Gentiles Paul sought to reduce his discomfort because of the "*postdecision dissonance*." ¹⁵⁷ Hence Paul was converted. And following the pattern of religious conversion he stressed that the revelation experience actually was a commissioning. But Paul "gives us little evidence of his psychological development." ¹⁵⁸ He gives no evidence for a 'stress situation' as a persecutor and a 'postdecision dissonance' as a Christian.

For Segal "Paul is a convert in the modern sense of the word," ¹⁵⁹ that "conversion is a decisive and deliberate change in religious community, even when the convert nominally affirms the same religion." ¹⁶⁰ Although Segal does not want to "lose track of one connotation of the prophetic commission that Paul clearly intended," ¹⁶¹ he wants "to stress the wrenching and decisive change of Paul's entrance to Christianity." ¹⁶² "From the viewpoint of mission Paul is commissioned, but from the viewpoint of religious experience Paul is a convert." ¹⁶³ With this Segal makes a good point. One can probably look at aspects of Paul's experience in terms of a conversion, "properly speaking." ¹⁶⁴ The terminology depends on the viewpoint. But the

¹⁵² Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p.218.

¹⁵³ Ibid., p.218.

¹⁵⁴ Gager, *Conversion*, p.699.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p.699.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., p.700.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., p.700. (Emphasis by Gager)

¹⁵⁸ Segal, *Convert*, p.5.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p.6.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., p.7.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., p.6.

¹⁶² Ibid., p.6.

¹⁶³ Ibid., p.6.

¹⁶⁴ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.66.

term 'conversion' shifts the focus from what Paul himself intended and does not adequately explain what the revelation experience meant to him. It was his 'call' to apostleship and not to Christianity. And I think it is better to take Paul's viewpoint. Also because of the understanding of the term 'conversion' in the history of Pauline studies¹⁶⁵ I do not think that Paul's experience is "most conveniently referred to as a 'conversion'."¹⁶⁶

Hence "Paul always speaks of his entry into Christianity as a call or commissioning; he never speaks of it as a 'conversion'," ¹⁶⁷ and this is what we should do as well. Thus I do not think that Paul thought of a 'call' in two stages: 1) ἀφορίσας, 2) καλέσας so that καλέσας is equivalent to ἀποκαλύψαι because both denote the moment when Paul became a follower of Christ. ¹⁶⁸

Given that ὁ θεός is a gloss ¹⁶⁹ the participles ἀφορίσας and καλέσας constitute the subject. ¹⁷⁰ Grammatically they are "associated together." ¹⁷¹ They both are aorist participles under one personal pronoun, "under one article and joined by καί." ¹⁷² They should, therefore, be taken together as a parallelism. ¹⁷³

Furthermore in Gal 1:15-16a Paul uses Old Testament language. ¹⁷⁴ The meaning of καλέσας should not be interpreted in the light of its use in most of the Pauline texts but in the light of the Old Testament passages Paul has in mind and is referring to. In his allusion to Isa 49:1 in Gal 1:15 Paul replaces ἐκάλησεν (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου) with ἀφορίσας (με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου). And in Rm 1:1 Paul introduces himself in the form

¹⁶⁵ See §2.

¹⁶⁶ Räisänen, *Development*, p.416 n.1.

¹⁶⁷ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63.

¹⁶⁸ Thus Burton, *Galatians*, p.49. For καλεῖν denoting God's call "into the fellowship of his son Jesus Christ" (Burton, *Galatians*, p.20) see e.g. Rm 8:30, 9:24; 1 Cor 1:9.17f.20-24; Gal 1:6, 5:8. Sandnes asks "whether these participles should be considered as a call in two stages" (Sandnes, *Paul*, p.60f) before stating ("we must firstly point out", p.60) without proving that "καλέσας is coincident with ἀποκαλύψαι" (p.60). With this statement, however, he has already answered the question before investigating it! See also Betz, *Galatians*, p.70.

¹⁶⁹ See §3.3.1..

¹⁷⁰ "Das Verbum εὐδοκεῖν ist mit dem doppelten Partizipialsubjekt ὁ ἀφορίσας... καὶ καλέσας verbunden." (Mußner, *Galater*, p.81)

¹⁷¹ Burton, *Galatians*, p.49.

¹⁷² Ibid., p.49.

¹⁷³ Thus also Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.30 talking about a "couplet."

¹⁷⁴ See Sandnes, *Paul*, p.40 and below.

of a parallelism as κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ.¹⁷⁵ Hence also concerning Paul's understanding of his apostleship ἀφορίζειν and καλεῖν are interchangeable. They are "gleichzeitig, sachlich gleichbedeutend."¹⁷⁶ And since ἀφορίσας is because of the addition ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου an act prior to ἀποκαλύψαι, καλέσας should also be taken as an act prior to ἀποκαλύψαι. God had his plan for Paul. He set him apart and called him before¹⁷⁷ he was born. Thus all his life in Judaism he was already called to be an apostle. He just did not know it before the revelation and he did not have his commission. "The act of calling was made known to him in the revelation."¹⁷⁸ There God revealed his Son to Paul and made known to him that he is called and set apart for the commission to preach God's Son to the Gentiles. And thus the Damascus revelation was also "the moment in which he [Paul] was commissioned to preach the gospel."¹⁷⁹ "The encounter with the risen Christ focuses on his [Paul's] commissioning (Gal 1:15-16; 1 Cor 9:1-2), and in 1 Cor 15:10 on the gracious power which made his commissioning effective."¹⁸⁰ Hence the revelation experience clearly meant Paul's commissioning.

Even more Stendahl sees rightly that recognising the allusion to prophetic calls in Gal 1:15-16a "we would also have to use it [the term 'conversion'] of such prophets as Jeremiah and Isaiah. Yet we do not speak of their conversion, but rather of their call."¹⁸¹ But then we also have to note that Isaiah as well as Jeremiah are both 'called' before 'commissioned.' Jeremiah was τέθεικεν before he was born (Jer 1:5) but κατέστηκεν only σήμερον (Jer 1:10) (He was a prophet from within his mother's womb but he was only 'getting up' (ἵστημι) from 'sitting' (τίθημι) when he was commissioned.) And also Isaiah was first called (Isa 6:1-7) and only then commissioned (Isa 6:8-13).

Hence because of these four factors, 1) the grammatical structure of Gal 1:15-16a, 2) Paul's understanding of his 'transition' from Judaism into Christianity, 3) his use of καλεῖν and ἀφορίζειν and 4) the call and commissioning of Jeremiah and Isaiah, I think that in Gal 1:15-16a Paul describes neither his 'conversion-experience' nor his 'call-ex-

¹⁷⁵ See also Rm 9:10-13, where Jacob is depicted as being chosen (ἢ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθησις) ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος (Rm 9:12).

¹⁷⁶ Oepke, *Galater*, p.60.

¹⁷⁷ See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63, and §3.4.2.2..

¹⁷⁸ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.61. See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.64: "The separation and call of God were 'from my mother's womb', but they came to effect when God enacted his good pleasure to reveal his Son in me." (Emphasis by Dunn)

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p.66.

¹⁸⁰ Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p.17.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p.10.

perience' but his 'commissioning-experience.' The two acts of call and commissioning by God were different in time (from before his birth - when it pleased God) and quality (Paul's call - Paul's commissioning).¹⁸²

I, therefore, investigate in this §3.4. Paul's call, ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ and only in the next §3.5. the commissioning: ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί.

3.4.2. Ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου

3.4.2.1. Ὁ ἀφορίσας με

"The verb ἀφορίζειν is in LXX frequently used for places, times, animals or arrangements which are set apart and consecrated to the Lord."¹⁸³ It denotes the setting apart to the Lord of the firstborn (Ex 13:2), Mount Sinai (Ex 19:23), Jacob (Isa 29:22), David (Sir 47:2), the Levites (Num 8:11) and the land for the Levites (Lev 25:3.4, 27:21; Josh 21), the land for the Lord (Ez 45:1.4.13, 48:9.20) and the distinctiveness of Israel (Lev 20:26). Finally also the offering of things which are set aside from others is called the ἀφόρισμα (Ex 29:24.26.27; Lev 10:15, 14:12).¹⁸⁴ The term can also be used for the setting apart of something from Israel. Thus a diseased person shall be separated from the rest of Israel (Lev 13:4.5.11.21.26.31.33.50.54), and the house of this person shall be closed, set apart (Lev 14:38.46). In Isa 56:3 foreigners in Israel are described as fearing to find themselves separated from Israel, and in a wordplay God threatens to set apart the Levites from him (Mal 2:3). The setting apart from Israel, however, is always intended to keep Israel holy and clean, to keep Israel's distinctiveness.¹⁸⁵

Ἀφορίζειν thus occurs in the context of holiness (Ex 19:23, 29:27; Lev 20:25f, 27:21; Ez 45:1.4, 48:20)¹⁸⁶ and has a "cultic background."¹⁸⁷ It "refers to the setting

¹⁸² With this I also disagree with Lightfoot. For him ἐν ἐμοί in Gal 1:16 means "a revelation made through him [Paul] to others ." (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p.83, emphasis by Lightfoot). Thus he distinguishes between καλέσας and ἀποκαλύψαι. Hence ἀποκαλύψαι does not denote Paul's revelation on the way to Damascus. This is what is described with καλέσας. And since ἀφορίσας denotes Paul's being set apart from before his birth Lightfoot distinguishes between καλέσας and ἀφορίσας as well. With this interpretation Lightfoot argues from the back to the front. Decisive for his interpretation is ἐν ἐμοί. It remains, however, unclear how to connect ἵνα εὐαγγελίζομαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν with ἀποκαλύψαι ...ἐν ἐμοί. To make any sense of the phrase one would have to distinguish between ἀποκαλύψαι and εὐαγγελίζειν as well. But this is hardly possible, and Lightfoot completely avoids talking about ἵνα εὐαγγελίζομαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν at all.

¹⁸³ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.61.

¹⁸⁴ Compare Num 8:11 and Sir 47:2.

¹⁸⁵ See Ex 19:23.12: Mount Sinai is set apart and the people shall be set apart from Mount Sinai.

¹⁸⁶ See Sandnes, *Paul*, p.61.

aside as something 'holy' in contrast to the 'profane'." ¹⁸⁸ And it means being set apart "from others" ¹⁸⁹ for God. What is set apart belongs to God. ¹⁹⁰ Even more "immer bekommt das Erwählte dadurch eine Sonderstellung oder eine Sonderaufgabe." ¹⁹¹ It is set apart for a special purpose. ¹⁹²

Since Israel shall be separated and holy for the Lord the people in Qumran separated themselves from others (1 QS VIII, 11.13 and IX, 20, using the word כָּדָל). ¹⁹³ And also the name 'Pharisee' being a transcription of the Hebrew פָּרִישׁ and the Aramaic פְּרִישָׁא means the "separated one" ¹⁹⁴ or better the "one who separated himself." ¹⁹⁵

In the New Testament ἀφορίζεῖν thus denotes the separation of the righteous from the evil in the end of the age (Mt 13:49, 25:32), of the church from the world (2 Cor 6:17) and of the disciples from people who refuse to believe (Act 19:9). Paul and Barnabas are set apart (Act 13:2), Paul is set apart for the gospel (Rm 1:1) and Peter and other Jewish Christians separate themselves from Gentile Christians (Gal 2:12).

Hence using ἀφορίζεῖν Paul claims to be set apart from others for God. As a Jew he is set apart from his fellow Jews for a special purpose. Whereas most of the times in LXX God commands someone to set apart, only in a few passages is he the one himself who directly sets apart. ¹⁹⁶ The subject of Paul's being set apart, however, is God. He it was who set Paul apart.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., p.63.

¹⁸⁸ Betz, *Galatians*, p.70 n.134.

¹⁸⁹ The firstborn from the next born; the holy Mount Sinai from the surrounding land; Israel from the other people; the Levites from the other tribes; Jacob from his brother.

¹⁹⁰ Ex 13:12, 19:23; Lev 20:26; Num 8:11f; Ez 45:1.4.13, 48:9.20.

¹⁹¹ Mußner, *Galater*, p.83.

¹⁹² Ex 13:15 to sacrifice it; Ex 19:11f for the Lord to come to; Lev 20:16 to be the Lord's; Num 8:11f to serve the Lord.

¹⁹³ See Qimron, *Hebrew*, p.103, saying that פָּרִישׁ in 4QMMT is used "as a technical term for religious dissent", referring to Qimron/Strugnell, *Letter*, p.402, who say that "the sects halakha was more strict and literalistic than that of its opponents" "and this is why they separated themselves from the majority of the Jewish people. This fact is stated explicitly in the epilogue [of 4QMMT]: [פָּרִישָׁא בְּרִיבָהּ הָיָה]. "Here we have the earliest evidence for the term פָּרִישׁ being used to designate withdrawal from the general community."

¹⁹⁴ First probably not used by the Pharisees themselves but as a nickname like 'separatist.' See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63, and Weiss, *Φαρισαῖος*, p.13. The "application [of the term פָּרִישׁ] with regard to the Qumran sect confirms the view of S. Lieberman [S. Lieberman, *Tosefta Kifshuta*, Berakhoth, pp.53-54, according to Qimron/Strugnell, *Letter*, p.406] that the term פָּרִישָׁא originally designated any sect which withdrew from the rest of the people." (Qimron/Strugnell, *Letter*, p.402)

¹⁹⁵ Weiss, *Φαρισαῖος*, p.13.

¹⁹⁶ Lev 20:26; Isa 29:22 (compare Rm 9:10-13) and without being named also in Isa 56:3; Mal 2:3; Sir 47:2.

Presumably Paul also had his former life in Judaism in mind when choosing the word ἀφορίζειν. As a Pharisee Paul was separating himself from the other Jews.¹⁹⁷ But then God revealed to him that he had set him apart for a totally different purpose.¹⁹⁸ Paul's "attempt at 'separatism' within Judaism had been superseded by God's separating him for the gospel."¹⁹⁹

3.4.2.2. Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου

That he was set apart by God and dependent on nobody else Paul underlines even more in saying that he was set apart ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου. "Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός is a 'septuagintism'."²⁰⁰ Depending on the context²⁰¹ it means "either 'from my birth' or 'from before my birth.'"²⁰² However, even looking at the context of Gal 1:15 it is hard to decide what Paul had in mind here. Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου is an idiomatic expression and should not be stressed too much. Nevertheless, given that God was following his plan for his people in setting apart and calling Paul, the emphasis in Gal 1:15 lies on the fact that Paul has a fixed role in God's plan of salvation rather than on the right chronological order of Paul's call. And since God knew his plan of salvation before Paul's birth, because of this connotation of predestination in Paul's call,²⁰³ I would tend to translate this phrase as 'from before my birth.'²⁰⁴ "His time as a Pharisee (i.13-14) had been merely an interlude between the major phases of God's purpose."²⁰⁵

¹⁹⁷ It is hard to imagine that Paul as a Jew, probably taught in Jerusalem, did not know the meaning of the Hebrew root of the word "Pharisee" (against Betz, *Galatians*, p.70 n.134). As a zealous Pharisee he fought for the distinctiveness of Israel. And in Gal 2:12 he uses ἀφορίζειν denoting Peter's and other Jewish Christians' separating themselves from Gentile Christians. See also Mußner, *Galater*, p.83 n.31; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92; Schlier, *Galater*, p.25 n.3; Fung, *Galatians*, p.63 n.5. Different also Oepke, *Galater*, p.60. That the reader of the letter could have followed this allusion is not very probable. Nevertheless a "Pharisaic Judaizer would have had no trouble following the implications of either his [Paul's] language or his insinuation." (King, D. H., *Paul and the Tannaim: A Study in Galatians*, Westminster Theological Journal 45 (1983), p.340-370, according to Fung, *Galatians*, p.63 n.5)

¹⁹⁸ See Rm 1:1 (and note the parallelism: Paul is δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ and in Gal 1:10 he says that he would not be Χριστοῦ δοῦλος anymore if he would please men. Gal 1:15 he claims to be ἀφορισμένος and κλητός) and Act 13:2: ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν Βαρναβάν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς.

¹⁹⁹ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63.

²⁰⁰ Betz, *Galatians*, p.70 n.136. See also Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.30, and Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92, saying "Septuagintalism".

²⁰¹ See Jud 13:5, 16:17; Ps 22:10, 58:3, 71:6; Isa 49:1; Mt 19:12; Lk 1:15; Act 3:2, 14:8.

²⁰² Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.30.

²⁰³ "Pls weiß sich zum Heidenapostel prädestiniert," Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.8. See also Act 22:14, where Ananias tells Paul that God 'προεχειρίσατο' him.

²⁰⁴ Thus also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63; Fung, *Galatians*, p.63; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92.

²⁰⁵ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63.

3.4.2.3. Summary

To sum up: Whatever Paul is he is not that through being instructed and being sent by a human being. God determined Paul's life and work as an apostle. Paul's own decision was to live as a Pharisee but this decision was superseded by God. God chose Paul and is thus the only authority for and behind Paul. Furthermore Paul claims to have been set apart by God for a special purpose. He has a special role in God's plan of salvation.

3.4.3. Καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ

As seen above in this context the words ἀφορίζειν and καλεῖν are interchangeable. Both phrases constitute a parallelism. Given the use of biblical language in Gal 1:15 and that εὐδοκεῖν indicates hymnic language the parallelism is presumably modelled on the typical Semitic *parallelismus membrorum* as in the psalms.²⁰⁶ These two phrases interpret each other. Ἀφορίσας and καλέσας, and ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου and διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ correspond.

3.4.3.1. Καὶ καλέσας

Given that Paul alludes to Old Testament prophetic calls in 1:15b²⁰⁷ and that the call is a call to a special "life-work"²⁰⁸ the use of καλεῖν in Isaiah is striking.²⁰⁹

Israel/Jacob is chosen and called (Isa 48:12). He is God's servant (Isa 41:9). He is called and thus is God's (Isa 43:1). Cyrus the anointed one is called (Isa 45:1ff). The Servant of the Lord is called (Isa 42:6). He is called from (before) his birth (Isa 49:1.6).²¹⁰ In the same context the term ἐκλεγεῖν appears (Isa 41:8.9, 42:1.6, 44:1, 45:4, 49:7).²¹¹ Those who are called are chosen out of others. Hence the use of καλεῖν in this context in Isaiah strongly reminds us of the meaning of εὐδοκεῖν and ἀφορίζειν.

²⁰⁶ It does not need to be a conscious allusion. Paul was well acquainted with the psalms.

²⁰⁷ See §3.4.4..

²⁰⁸ Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92.

²⁰⁹ See Betz, *Galatians*, p.70 n.137.

²¹⁰ See also Isa 22:20 where Eliakim as God's servant is going to be called.

²¹¹ "Most rewarding [for the origin of the New Testament usage of καλεῖν] is the second part of Is. At Is 41:9 ἐκάλεσά σε finds significant exposition in the words which follow at once: καὶ εἶπά σοι Παῖς μου εἶ ἐξελεξάμην σε is thus equivalent to ἐκλέγεσθαι." (Schmidt, *καλέω*, p.490) Schmidt also quotes Isa 42:6, 46:11, 48:12,15, 50:2, 51:2, 41:1, 45:3. See also Isa 42:1.

Thus Paul's claim to be called by God is a claim to be chosen as well. He is a servant of God.²¹² Like the call of Eliakim (Isa 22:20), Cyrus (Isa 45:1ff) and the Servant of the Lord (Isa 49:1) Paul's call is an act of God in the history of salvation and the salvation of his people.²¹³ We have already seen that Paul did not depict himself as being called *out of* Israel. To be set apart always means to have an outstanding role *within* Israel. God's good pleasure is effective within and for Israel.

3.4.3.2. Διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ

In calling Paul God is independent, free and sovereign. He set Paul apart for his purpose before Paul was born. Hence it was an act of God's grace.²¹⁴ The emphasis of the parallel formulations ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου and καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ differs a little. Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου stresses the predestination, that Paul did not contribute to his call. Whereas διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ stresses the grace character of his call, that he was unworthy of being called. Εὐδοκεῖν implies gracious care as well.²¹⁵

In the Pauline writings χάρις has a special connotation when attributed to God. It then means "favour towards men contrary to their desert."²¹⁶ And since God's grace acts in Christ and through his work (Rm 5:15, 3:24, 5:2) χάρις "is the basis of the whole work of salvation."²¹⁷ In Gal 1:15, however, Paul talks about the grace character of his call and commissioning.

In 1 Cor 15 χάρις appears in the same context as in Gal 1: Paul speaks about his revelation (1 Cor 15:8 - Gal 1:15-16a), his apostleship (1 Cor 15:9 - Gal 1:15-16a) and his conduct in Judaism as a persecutor of the church of God (1 Cor 15:9 - Gal 1:13-14). Just because (δέ) of the χάρις θεοῦ he is an apostle. It is the basis of his apostleship at the beginning (Gal 1:15) and during (1 Cor 15:10) his work. Thus Paul founded the church in Corinth κατὰ τὴν χάριν (1 Cor 3:10). His παράκλησις and his reminding is grounded in the χάρις ἣ δοθεῖσά μοι (Rm 12:3, 15:15).²¹⁸ The χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ which manifests itself in Christ works through Paul as well. Χάρις καὶ ἀποστολή (Rm 1:5) is "fast ein

²¹² עֶבֶד, παῖς, δοῦλος in Isa 41:9, 42:1, 45:4, 22:20, 49:5f. For δοῦλος see also Rm 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1.

²¹³ "For the sake of the servant Jacob and the chosen Israel" (Isa 45:4) and "to bring Jacob back, to gather Israel" (Isa 49:5).

²¹⁴ Διὰ is instrumental and could be translated as 'in the exercise of' (see Burton, *Galatians*, p.52). See also Fung, *Galatians*, p.63 n.6.

²¹⁵ See §3.3.2..

²¹⁶ Burton, *Galatians*, p.424. Thus in Rm 4:4.16, 3:24, 5:15, 6:14f, 11:5f; Gal 5:4.

²¹⁷ Ibid., p.424.

²¹⁸ "Was er [Paul] ist, wurde er durch Gnade, die ihn zugleich als Instrument benutzt und ihm Vollmacht gibt. (Käsemann, *Römer*, p.12)

Hendiadyoin.”²¹⁹ Through his apostleship salvation comes to God's people.²²⁰ And this the Jerusalem leaders recognised (Gal 2:9).

3.4.3.3. Summary

Charged with having no real authority and preaching a false gospel Paul refers to God. Thus the opponents are told that they actually accuse God himself. Paul argues “daß wirklich Gott hinter Paulus und seinem Werk steht.”²²¹ No one else except God is the authority behind him. And this came not only with the revelation. God separated Paul before he was born. Already then God decided that he will send Paul to preach the gospel to the Gentiles. Hence in calling Paul God's grace acted in salvation history.

3.4.4. A prophet-like call?

Since Paul in Gal 1:15b alludes to the call of Old Testament figures, the discussion concerning Gal 1:15b revolves around the meaning and function of this phrase, the function of this phrase as an allusion to Old Testament prophets and the question whether Paul had a single Old Testament figure in mind or not.

Having investigated the meaning and function of this phrase we now look at the fact that Paul uses prophetic vocabulary.

However, each of the phrases in Gal 1:15-16a has particular connotations derived from particular texts and contexts. Hence only after investigating the whole text can we determine whether it all amounts to a consistent picture. At this stage of the investigation we are, therefore, concerned with the models of Paul's call only.

The texts with which we are concerned are Isa 49:1ff and Jer 1:4ff.²²²

Isa 49:1 ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου ἐκάλησεν τὸ ὄνομά μου.

Isa 49:5 ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας δοῦλον ἐαυτῷ τοῦ συναγαγεῖν τοὺν Ιακωβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς αὐτόν.

²¹⁹ Ibid., p.12. But see Sandnes, *Paul*, p.150, who distinguishes between χάρις and ἀποστολή.

²²⁰ Including the Gentiles: ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Rm 1:5); εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη (Rm 15:6); ἵνα εὐαγγελίζομαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Gal 1:16).

²²¹ Mußner, *Galater*, p.118.

²²² The delimitation of these texts in the commentaries varies a little. Oepke, *Galater*, p.60, detects an “Anklang an Jer. 1,5” and refers to Isa 49:1; Burton, *Galatians*, p.52, has Isa 49:1 and refers to Jer 1:5; Mußner, *Galater*, p.82-85, refers to Jer 1:4-10 and Isa 49:1-6 (with the vague distinction that Paul refers “vor allem” to Jeremiah and “besonders” to Isaiah, p.82!); Fung, *Galatians*, p.63, lists Isa 49:1ff and Jer 1:4f; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92, and Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.30, refer to Jer 1:5 and Isa 49:1-6; Dunn, *Galatians*, p.63, lists Jer 1:5 and Isa 49:1.6; Sandnes, *Paul*, p.61, refers to Jer 1:5 and Isa 49:1.5; Schlier, *Galater*, p.25, compares Jer 1:5 and Isa 41:9; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p.82, refers to Isa 44:2.24 and 49:1.5.

Isa 49:6 ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν.

Jer 1:5 πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ ἐπίσταμαί σε καὶ πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐξελεῖν ἐκ μήτρας ἡγίακά σε, προφήτην εἰς ἔθνη τέθεικά σε.

The similarities to Gal 1:15 are striking. The Servant of the Lord is called (Isa 49:1, ἐκάλησεν, κληθῆναι in 49:6) ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου; he is formed ἐκ κοιλίας to be God's δοῦλος (49:5, παῖδα in 49:6) and a light to the Gentiles (49:6). Also Paul is Χριστοῦ δοῦλος.²²³ God knew Jeremiah before he was ἐν κοιλίᾳ. And Jeremiah was consecrated (ἡγίακα) before he was born (πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐξελεῖν ἐκ μήτρας). With this he was appointed to be a prophet to the nations (προφήτην εἰς ἔθνη, Jer 1:5). Here the motif of predestination clearly appears, as it is alluded to in Gal 1:15b.²²⁴ Κοιλία and μήτηρ are mentioned, and ἀγιάζειν reminds us of the "cultic background of ἀφορίζειν."²²⁵

The link, therefore, from the Jeremiah text to ἀφορίζειν in Gal 1:15a is ἀγιάζειν. In Isa 49 this line is drawn with καλεῖν. It appears in Isa 41:9, 42:6, 43:1, 45:1ff, 48:12, 49:1.6 and 22:20 and refers to God's Servant (παῖς, δοῦλος, עַבְדּוֹ).²²⁶ The term to choose (ἐκλεγείν) appears in the context of καλεῖν (Isa 41:8.9, 44:1, 45:4, 48:1.6, 49:7), ἐκ κοιλίας (Isa 44:2.24.21) and εὐδοκεῖν (Isa 42:1). Thus ἐκλεγείν denotes God's free and sovereign will.²²⁷ God chooses and calls as he pleases.²²⁸

Hence in these Isaiah passages (Isa 40-49) we find a 'semantic field.'²²⁹ It is constituted by καλεῖν, ἐκλεγείν,²³⁰ ἀφορίζειν, ἀγιάζειν, εὐδοκεῖν, κοιλία μητρός, δοῦλος and the idea of grace.²³¹ And although Jer 1:5 cannot be "excluded as a proof-text for the interpretation"²³² because ἐν κοιλίᾳ, ἐκ μήτρας and ἡγίακα belong to the semantic field

²²³ Gal 1:10; Rm 1:1; Phil 1:1.

²²⁴ See §3.4.2.2..

²²⁵ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.63 n.57. Against Holtz, who does not see this link. "Diese beiden Wendungen [ἀφορίσας με and ἡγίακά σε] können keinesfalls als sachliche Varianten angesehen werden." (Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 325)

²²⁶ Israel/Jacob as the servant and the Servant of the Lord.

²²⁷ See Isa 45:4, ἐγὼ καλέσω σε, σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνων με

²²⁸ See also Isa 41:8: Jacob is the one ὃν ἠγάπησα and Isa 44:2: Israel is ὁ ἠγαπημένος, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην. Compare also Rm 9:10-13: Jacob, the loved one, is mentioned as an example of God's free will, of the κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις and the decision to love him ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος.

²²⁹ "Semantische Felder sind mehr oder weniger konventionelle Wortverbindungen." (Berger, *Exegese*, p.138)

²³⁰ The word is a "sachliche Parallele" to ἀφορίσας. (Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 325) See also Schlier, *Galater*, p.25 n.1, quoting Isa 41:9. Against Sandnes, *Paul*, p.63 n.57, who argues that "it is entirely unproven that Paul recalls Isa 41 as well."

²³¹ Additionally "bestimmte Formen sind typisch für bestimmte semantische Felder. Sie garantieren Kontinuität." (Berger, *Exegese*, p.154) And we find the form for our semantic field in the hymnic character of Gal 1:15-16a, Isa 40-49 and Jer 1:5-10. All these texts are not just mere narrative texts.

²³² Sandnes, *Paul*, p.63.

as well, nonetheless the similarities between the Isaiah texts and Gal 1:15b are much stronger.²³³ In Isaiah the whole semantic field is very dominant, whereas only ἀφορίσας, κοιλίας and ἐκ μητρός are related to Jeremiah. In Jeremiah the “Wortgeflecht”²³⁴ is not very strongly represented. Additionally the term καλεῖν is missing in Jer 1:5,²³⁵ and Jeremiah is explicitly called to be a ‘prophet’ whereas Paul “never calls himself a prophet.”²³⁶

Thus, we can say so far that Paul deliberately²³⁷ alludes to Old Testament prophetic texts. Even more there is clear evidence that he deliberately alludes to Isaiah and the Servant of the Lord.

²³³ See Dietzfelbinger, *Ursprung*, p.61 n.76. Also worth mentioning is that Jer 1:5 is formulated in direct speech attributed to God, whereas Isa 49:1 is formulated in the third person singular as the speech of the Servant of the Lord, and Isa 49:5 is a participial construction. This relates the participial construction found in Gal 1:15a even more to Isa 49:1.5. Additionally striking is that Paul does not mention the verb ‘to form,’ πλάσαι, although it occurs in both texts. This is probably an indication that Paul was quoting from memory. But it can also be read as proof that Paul had Isaiah, rather than Jeremiah, in mind. Because in Jer 1:5 only πλάσαι has God as the subject and πλάσαι is, therefore, quite important in the Jeremiah text. See also Sandnes, *Paul*, p.61f, who says that “these observations [“that the similarities between Gal 1:15b and Isa 49:1.5 are more significant than those with Jer 1:5” (ibid., p.61)] are confirmed by Gal 1:24 καὶ ἐδόξασον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν θεόν which is reminiscent of Isa 49:3 καὶ ἐν σοὶ δοξασθήσομαι and by Gal 2:2b μὴ πῶς εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον which is reminiscent of Isa 49:4 κενῶς ἐκοπίασα καὶ εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύον μου.”

²³⁴ Berger, *Exegese*, p.138.

²³⁵ I do not think that in Gal 1:15 καλεῖν is “das eigentlich tragende Element der Aussage” (Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 325 and Mußner, *Galater*, p.82 n.27 following Holtz). It is interchangeable with ἀφορίζειν. However in Jeremiah it is missing whereas it appears in Isaiah in the idiomatic expression ἐκάλησα τὸ ὄνομά μου (see e.g. Gen 3:20, 11:9, 16:11; Hos 1:4.6.9; Isa 62:2).

²³⁶ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.14.

²³⁷ It is hard to imagine that someone acquainted with the Old Testament would not have realised these allusions. The question “whether this vocabulary is accidental or intentional” (Ibid., p.48), therefore, has to be answered: intentional. Paul must have been very well acquainted with Isaiah, esp. Isa 40-55 (see Ibid., p.62 and esp. p.62 n.51, Koch, *Schrift*, p.33, and Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 327f). And he never quotes from Jeremiah (see Koch, *Schrift*, p.33; Holtz, *Paul*, col. 326f).

3.5. The Commissioning

3.5.1. Ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί

Paul now comes to speak about his commissioning. So far he has argued that it is God himself in his good will towards his people who made him an apostle. God had an eye upon Paul.²³⁸

In Gal 1:15 Paul reminds the Galatians of things they already know (ἠκούσατε, Gal 1:13). As if it were a matter of fact and taken for granted he talks about his prophet-like call. After the introduction with ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν his readers must have been even more astonished at this way of speaking. With this interpretation of his apostleship Paul emphasises his outstanding role and independence from any human being.

In Gal 1:16a he comes to speak about the fact that he received his particular gospel and commission through the revelation which he received. The divine act of revelation was his commissioning. Thus ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί does not refer to Paul's missionary activity.²³⁹

The phrase consists of three terms which denote how God commissioned Paul:²⁴⁰ 1) ἀποκαλύψαι; 2) τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, 3) ἐν ἐμοί.

3.5.1.1. Ἀποκαλύψαι

Ἀποκαλύπτειν means to unveil, to show what is hidden.²⁴¹ It can also be used in the sense of revealing things to the ears of somebody, of telling somebody what he or she did not know.²⁴² This usage already implies the meaning of making known something to somebody that he or she did not know before. In this sense it involves "perception and understanding by the mind."²⁴³ Thus it occurs especially with God as

²³⁸ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.83, saying that it was God "der schon immer sein Auge auf Paulus geworfen hatte."

²³⁹ Against Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p.82f. See §3.4.1..

²⁴⁰ The emphasis in Gal 1:15-16a lies upon ἵνα.

²⁴¹ Thus e.g. in Ex 20:26; frequently in Lev 18 and 20; Hos 2:10; Mi 1:6; Nah 3:5; Isa 3:17; Jer 13:26; Ez 13:14, 16:36.37.

²⁴² Thus e.g. in Josh 2:20; 1 Sam 20:2.13, 22:8.17.

²⁴³ Burton, *Galatians*, p.434.

the subject. He discloses things to people that only he knows²⁴⁴ including his own acting in past, present and future and in general what is to come.²⁴⁵

In the New Testament it thus²⁴⁶ mainly denotes God's unveiling of secrets in the final age²⁴⁷ and in particular his unveiling of things in the last days and on the last day.²⁴⁸ Thus it also denotes the coming of the Messiah and of the new heaven and new earth.²⁴⁹ Hence the last day can be called the ἡμέρα ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως (Rm 2:5) and the book in the New Testament which talks about the last things to happen is the ἀποκάλυψις of John. Ἀποκαλύπτειν has thus a striking eschatological dimension.²⁵⁰ God is always the subject of the revelation.²⁵¹ In the New Testament ἀποκάλυψις and ἀποκαλύπτειν is clearly a divine act.

Hence in revealing his Son to Paul God gave Paul an insight into his history of salvation.

It had been God's plan to bring salvation through Jesus Christ and it had been his plan to reveal this to Paul. Like all witnesses of the resurrection Paul saw the divine Christ. This makes an apostle.²⁵² It is "die eschatologische Enthüllung Christi (für den Apostel) vorausgenommen."²⁵³

3.5.1.2. Τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ

In his reply to the point at issue in Galatia Paul refers to God. He it was who set apart and called Paul and revealed his Son to him. Already in Gal 1:1 Paul stressed that he is an apostle through God, who equally was the author of the commission to his Son

²⁴⁴ Job 12:23; Ps 119:18; Sir 1:6(7).30, 42:19, 4:18; Lam 4:22.

²⁴⁵ Num 22:31; 1 Sam 9:15; 2 Sam 7:27; Ps 98:2; Sir 42:19; Am 3:7; Isa 52:10, 53:1, 56:1; Dan 2:19.22.28.29.30.47, 10:1 (except 2:22 in Theodotion).

²⁴⁶ "The NT inherits OT revelation....The NT constantly presupposes the OT." (Oepke, *ἀποκαλύπτω*, p.580)

²⁴⁷ Mt 11:25, 11:27, 16:17; Lk 2:35, 10:21 (Mt 11:25), 10:22 (Mt 11:27); Joh 12:38; Rm 1:17; 1 Cor 2:10; Gal 3:23; Phil 3:15; Eph 3:5; and ἀποκάλυψις in Eph 3:3; Gal 2:2; Eph 1:17; Rm 16:25.

²⁴⁸ Mt 10:26; Lk 12:2 (Mt 10:26); 1 Cor 3:15; 2 Thess 2:3.6.8.

²⁴⁹ Lk 17:30; Rm 8:18; 1 Pet 1:5, 5:1 and with ἀποκάλυψις Rm 8:19; 1 Cor 1:7; 2 Thess 1:7; 1 Pet 1:7.13, 4:13.

²⁵⁰ "In the epistles, too, its true *locus* is in eschatology." (Oepke, *ἀποκαλύπτω*, p.583, emphasis by Oepke)

²⁵¹ Except Mt 11:27; Lk 10:22 and Rev 1:1, where Jesus is the subject, and 2 Cor 12:1.7; Gal 1:12, where it is not entirely clear whether it is subjective or objective genitive, whether God or Jesus is the subject. On Gal 1:12 see Dunn, *Galatians*, p.53: "The forward reference to i.15-16... indicates that 'Jesus Christ' is not thought of as the source of the revelation..., but as its content."

²⁵² See §3.5.2.1.. "Am Charakter des Damaskusereignisses hängt die Gültigkeit seines Apostolats: Nur wenn es Osterereignis ist, ist er Apostel." (Dietzfelbinger, *Ursprung*, p.59)

²⁵³ Schlier, *Galater*, p.26.

which he received at his baptism.²⁵⁴ Since God is the highest possible instance to whom one can refer and the one about whom there is no theological dissent between Paul and his opponents - as there is with Christ regard to and the law - Paul claims the highest authority which his opponents cannot deny.

Since Paul stresses God's sole acting in the history of salvation, ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Gal 1:12 should be taken as a objective genitive, rather than subjective genitive. Paul received and learned the gospel not through a human being but through a revelation in which God acted.²⁵⁵ Also in Gal 1:16 Paul does not speak, therefore, of a "Selbstoffenbarung Christi."²⁵⁶

God revealed τοὺν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.²⁵⁷ This is the object to ἀποκαλύπτειν.²⁵⁸ Sonship is one of the blessings of Israel²⁵⁹ and closely connected with the question about observance of the law and the boundaries of the people of God. Hence with the motif of sonship Paul is at the heart of Jewish theology and at the heart of the issue in Galatia. This is "why Paul here introduces the christological title 'Son of God'"²⁶⁰ although he uses κύριος as a christological title very often and υἱός only a few times.²⁶¹ Already in the salutatio Paul three times refers to the fatherhood of God (Gal 1:1.3.4), and "sonship is one of the principal motifs of this letter:"²⁶² to be κληρονόμος one has to be a υἱὸς θεοῦ (4:7); to be a son of God one has to be a son of Abraham (3:29), and to be a son of Abraham one has to be in Christ (2:20). He is the Son of God in whom all believers become the seed of Abraham and thus sons of God as well.²⁶³

²⁵⁴ Paul is apostle through 'Jesus Christ and θεοῦ πατρός.' But God acts through Christ. It was God who raised Christ from the dead (τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν). Also in 1:3 Paul refers to τοῦ πατρός and κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός adding Jesus' work in a participial construction (1:4), but again referring to the fact that Jesus' work was κατὰ τὸ θελημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ἡμῶν. And the following praise (1:5) refers to God alone.

²⁵⁵ Against e.g. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.23f. God is almost always the subject of ἀποκαλύπτειν. In the Pauline writings it is only three times not clear, depending on the translation of the genitive construction.

²⁵⁶ Schlier, *Galater*, p.26.

²⁵⁷ "For Paul the idea [the concept of the 'Son of God'] contains both the dignity of the Son and His subordination to the Father." (Schweizer, *υἱός*, p.382) However, the title 'the Son' "naturally suggests the counterpart 'Father,' while "Son of God' stresses supremacy over all 'sons of men." (Ibid., p.371) Hence in Gal 1:16 the emphasis lies on the supremacy of the father.

²⁵⁸ "The accusative τοὺν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, 'his Son,' is the direct object to the verb ἀποκαλύψαι, and so cannot be taken as anything other than the content of what was revealed to Paul on the Damascus road." (Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.31)

²⁵⁹ See Rm 9:4-5.

²⁶⁰ Betz, *Galatians*, p.70.

²⁶¹ 15 times; Rm 1:3.4.9, 5:10, 8:3.29.32; 1 Cor 1:9, 15:28; 2 Cor 1:19; Gal 1:16, 2:20, 4:4.6; 1 Thess 1:10.

²⁶² Dunn, *Galatians*, p.64.

²⁶³ It is "nirgendwo bei Paulus so stark wie hier in Gal 3 die Rolle Jesu Christi in der Vermittlung dieser Kindschaft betont." (Berger, *Abraham*, p.58)

That Paul used υἱός and not κύριος deliberately in accordance with the issue raised in Gal 3ff is furthermore underlined by the fact that in the letter to the Galatians he uses the term υἱός as a christological title as many times as κύριος,²⁶⁴ and the word υἱός itself even more often than κύριος.²⁶⁵ And this proportion is strikingly unique in the Pauline writings.²⁶⁶

Thus I do not think that one can argue that Paul uses υἱὸς θεοῦ in Galatians for the reason that “‘Son of God’ as a Christological title was derived by Paul from his Jewish Christian heritage.”²⁶⁷ Its use must be seen as dependent on the context of the letter.²⁶⁸

Before we look at the commission we have to investigate how this revelation came to Paul. We therefore have to examine, first, the phrase ἐν ἐμοί, secondly, other Pauline texts which refer to the revelation experience and, finally the relation between these texts and those texts in the Old Testament which refer to the calling of prophets and their commissioning experiences.

3.5.1.3. Ἐν ἐμοί

Ἀποκαλύπτειν appears 26 times in the New Testament (9 times in Paul's letters): 8 times absolutely;²⁶⁹ twice in connection with a different preposition than ἐν;²⁷⁰ 11 times the mere dative follows, denoting the person to whom the revelation was made.²⁷¹ Apart from Gal 1:16 the preposition ἐν follows ἀποκαλύπτειν four times.²⁷² In

²⁶⁴ Κύριος: Gal 1:3.19, 6:14.18; υἱός: Gal 1:16, 2:20, 4:4.6.

²⁶⁵ Κύριος altogether 7 times (included is 6:17) and υἱός 13 times.

²⁶⁶ In Rm κύριος appears 46 times, 18 times obviously related to Christ; υἱός 12 times and 7 times related to Christ (without taking into account text criticism). In 1 Cor the relations are even more striking. According to the problem in Corinth that Paul wants to reunite the Corinthians under the one Lord Jesus Christ κύριος appears 70 times, υἱός only twice. In 2 Cor κύριος appears 30 times, υἱός 4 times. In Phil κύριος appears 16 times, υἱός not at all. He refers to Christ as his κύριος, who alone has power over him. 1 Thess has 25 times κύριος and 3 times υἱός. In all their afflictions (1:6, 2:13ff, 3:4) Jesus is the only Lord of the Thessalonians. In Phlm the issue is to accept the former slave Onesimus again. Thus Paul reminds Philemon, the former κύριος, that Jesus is the only Lord and Onesimus a brother ἐν Χριστῷ.

²⁶⁷ Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.31.

²⁶⁸ Against Luck, *Evangelium*, e.g. p.201f, who explains Paul's gospel on basis of the revelation of God's 'Son.' Paul's insight "daß Christus und die Tora zu einem Entweder-Oder geworden sind" (ibid., p.202) can also be seen as a result of a revelation of the one who had died on the cross, was thus cursed by the law and whom the persecuted Christians had proclaimed as the Messiah. Compare Luck's own statements on p.200f.

²⁶⁹ Mt 10:26; Lk 2:35, 12:2, 17:30; Gal 3:23; 2 Thess 2:3.8; 1 Pet 5:1.

²⁷⁰ Rm 1:18 (ἀπό), 8:18 (εἰς).

²⁷¹ Mt 11:25.27, 16:17; Lk 10:21.22; Joh 12:38; 1 Cor 2:10, 14:30; Eph 3:5; Phil 3:15; 1 Pet 1:12.

none of these four passages does ἐν denote the mere dative. Its meaning is either temporal ²⁷³, local ²⁷⁴, modal ²⁷⁵ or instrumental. ²⁷⁶ Thus Gal 1:16a would mean either local (within Paul God's son is unveiled ²⁷⁷), modal (because of Paul's call and commissioning Jesus is unveiled), or instrumental ('through me' as through Paul's ministry Jesus is revealed to others). ²⁷⁸

The above mentioned mystical and psychological interpretation, both expressing the possibility that ἐν ἐμοί is to be understood in its local meaning, fails to take into account the other Pauline references to the revelation experience, where Paul clearly speaks of an outward vision. ²⁷⁹ And the idea that this difference between the outward vision in the Damascus road experience and the significance of the phrase ἐν ἐμοί in Gal 1:15-16a can be taken as evidence for the fact that Gal 1:15-16a cannot be seen as referring to the Damascus road experience of Paul ²⁸⁰ is challenged by the fact that Paul speaks of a return to Damascus. ²⁸¹

How Christ as the Son of God can be revealed to others through Paul's being called and commissioned (modal) is hard to imagine. In Paul and in his work the grace of God given to him can be seen (Gal 2:9) but hardly Jesus as the Christ or Jesus as the Son of God.

As argued above ²⁸² ἐν ἐμοί can hardly mean 'through me' (instrumental); at least not only 'through me.'

Hence the remaining alternatives are the understanding of ἐν ἐμοί as a mere dative object ²⁸³ or as a - in a sense different from the mystical or psychological interpre-

²⁷² Gal 1:16; Rm 1:17; 1 Cor 2:10; 2 Thess 2:6; 1 Pet 1:5.

²⁷³ 2 Thess 2:6; 1 Pet 1:5.

²⁷⁴ Rm 1:17.

²⁷⁵ Rm 1:17 (the εὐαγγέλιον is the way on which the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ "als endzeitliche Offenbarung in die Welt einbricht." Käsemann, *Römer*, p.27), 1 Cor 3:13 (see Schrage, *Korinther*, p.302).

²⁷⁶ 1 Cor 3:13 (if ἐν πυρί is to be connected with ἔργον), Rm 1:17 (through the gospel the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is revealed).

²⁷⁷ In psychological terms or as a ecstatic inward experience (Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.6). According to Lietzmann ἀποκάλυψις in Gal 1:12 has to be compared with Gal 2:2; 1 Cor 14:6.26; 2 Cor 12:1.7. In this line also stands Gal 1:16 as referring to the Damascus experience.

²⁷⁸ Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p.83. A temporal understanding can be excluded.

²⁷⁹ Ὁράω in 1 Cor 9:1 and 1 Cor 15:8. See however Michaelis, ὁράω, p.358, who holds that "one can conclude from 1 C. 9:1 merely that Paul saw in it [the revelation event] the basis of his apostleship."

²⁸⁰ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.84 n.34.

²⁸¹ Gal 1:17. See Betz, *Galatians*, p.70 n.141.

²⁸² See §3.4.1..

²⁸³ Oepke, *Galater*, p.60f and ἐν, p.539; Betz, *Galatians*, p.71 with reference to ecstatic and visionary character of the experience.

tation - local ἐν, regarded as an adverbial qualification denoting the inwardness of the change in Paul's life and thought through the revelation he received.²⁸⁴

In connection with ἀποκαλύπτειν the understanding of ἐν ἐμοί as a mere dative has no support in the New Testament. The local understanding has maybe one proof text (Rm 1:17). Thus we cannot argue directly from identical texts and formulations.²⁸⁵

Oepke argues with reference to Rm 1:19 and 2 Cor 4:3 that "speculations on inwardness of the Damascus experience have no philological basis."²⁸⁶ Referring, however, to Rm 1:19 Oepke does not distinguish between ἀποκαλύπτειν and φανεροῦν. And in connection with φανεροῦν, ἐν and the mere dative are interchangeable.²⁸⁷ It denotes the seeing with the eyes of something that is manifested. "The appearances [of Jesus described with the term ὁράω] are to be described as manifestations in the sense of revelation rather than, making visible."²⁸⁸ Ἀποκαλύπτειν, however, denotes the making visible, including the perception of mind.²⁸⁹ It denotes the aspect of 'seeing with the mind' rather than 'seeing with the eyes.' And 2 Cor 4:3 has to be taken together with 2 Cor 4:4. 4:4 takes up ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις with ἐν οἷς. The gospel is veiled ἐν οἷς because their minds are blinded. Hence it is an inward veiling.

Oepke argues from the use of the preposition ἐν and is probably right that ἐν ἐμοί is in some cases interchangeable with ἐμοί. I prefer, however, to argue from the meaning and grammatical use of ἀποκαλύπτειν. Without making an absolute distinction we can say that ἀποκαλύπτειν stresses the aspect of a "subjective revelation,"²⁹⁰ totally inward or "accompanied by actual perception"²⁹¹ and resulting in knowledge. "Φανεροῦν throws emphasis on the fact that that which is manifested is objectively

²⁸⁴ Fung, *Galatians*, p.64, points to the coincidence of the inward and outward revelation, as does Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92f; Schlier, *Galater*, p.27, stresses that ἐν denotes the "Intensität" of the vision. Mußner, *Galater*, p.86f does not decide between 2) and 3); Dunn, *Galatians*, p.64, refers to the radical change in Paul's life through the outward revelation and refers also to 1).

²⁸⁵ This might be the reason for the confusion in the argumentation for one or the other: Mußner argues that it is possible to regard ἐν as a "Präpositionalausdruck anstelle eines Dativs," (Mußner, *Galater*, p.86) for "Paulus verbindet das personale Objekt zu ἀποκαλύπτειν auch sonst mit dem bloßen Dativ." (Ibid., p.86 n.45. He refers to 1 Cor 2:10; Phil 3:15; Eph 3:5) However, with exactly the same argument that ἐν is missing in other passages Schlier and Dunn draw the opposite conclusion: ἐν ἐμοί does not denote the mere dative "da das ἐν bei ἀποκαλύπτειν sonst fehlt." (Schlier, *Galater*, p.27, referring to 1 Cor 2:10, Eph 3:5, 1 Pet 1:12) "When Paul wanted to use a dative with the verb 'reveal' he did so." (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.64, with reference to 1 Cor 2:10, 14:30, Phil 3:15)

²⁸⁶ Oepke, *ἐν*, p.539.

²⁸⁷ See Schlier, *Galater*, p.27 n.1.

²⁸⁸ Michaelis, *ὁράω*, p.539.

²⁸⁹ See Burton, *Galatians*, p.434.

²⁹⁰ Burton, *Galatians*, p.433.

²⁹¹ Ibid., p.433.

clear, open to perception.”²⁹² It “suggest[s] external visions rather than internal experiences.”²⁹³

Hence God revealed his Son to Paul. In this revelation Paul realised that Jesus is the Son of God. Using ἐν ἐμοί instead of ἐμοί Paul even more stresses “the personal transformation effected by this revelation from heaven.”²⁹⁴ “‘In me’ underscores the idea of inwardness already implied by the verb ‘reveal’.”²⁹⁵ Paul stresses the “intensely personal character of God’s revelation to him.”²⁹⁶ Through the revelation God gave Paul insight into his knowledge and thus changed Paul’s understanding of Christ and God’s plan of salvation. Contrasting, however, his persecution and his mission Paul emphasises that it is a “transformation not so much of person as of purpose and commitment.”²⁹⁷

This is also against an understanding of Paul’s experience interpreted as an ecstatic experience.²⁹⁸ Paul did not have a vision “in the course of his ecstasy.”²⁹⁹ The experience was also external.

To support his argument, that Paul experienced an ecstasy, Betz refers to 2 Cor 12:2.3. I do not, however, think that 2 Cor 12:2.3 refers to the same revelation as Gal 1:15-16a.³⁰⁰ Concerning 2 Cor 12 Michaelis argues that “Paul says nothing about seeing the κύριος in his rapture, and the passages in which he does speak about seeing the Lord always refer to the one experience, i.e., that on the Damascus road.”³⁰¹ Michaelis thus concludes that “to the degree that the rapture of 2 C. 12:2 ff. was definitely an ecstatic experience, we are forced to conclude, in line with his [Paul’s] own judgement as to the special role of the ecstatic element in the pneumatic life..., that the Damascus experience could not have for him characteristics of ecstatic

²⁹² Ibid., p.433.

²⁹³ Betz, *Galatians*, p.71.

²⁹⁴ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.64.

²⁹⁵ Fung, *Galatians*, p.64.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., p.64.

²⁹⁷ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.64. Paul is not here thinking primarily of the fact that he is no longer destroying the church and that in his work Christ is being revealed. Such a consideration may have been part of his thought but it does not occupy the first place. Such a consideration would be the result of the ἀποκάλυψις ἐν ἐμοί rather than the ἀποκάλυψις ἐν ἐμοί itself.

²⁹⁸ “Paul’s experience was ecstatic in nature.” (Betz, *Galatians*, p.71)

²⁹⁹ Ibid., p.71.

³⁰⁰ See Luck, *Evangelium*, p.196.

³⁰¹ Michaelis, *ὁράω*, p.357.

rapture.”³⁰² Also Rengstorf speaks of a “renunciation of any ecstatic basis for the apostleship.”³⁰³

3.5.2. The parallel revelation-texts

Since I am in this thesis concerned with Paul's understanding of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles concerning his apostleship and collection, and since Gal 1:15-16a is the only Pauline text about his revelation experience which is directly related to the Gentiles it is not necessary to investigate 1 Cor 9:1, 15:8f and 2 Cor 4:6. All the same, these texts are important for understanding the point Paul makes in Gal 1:15-16a.

The three texts to be examined are:³⁰⁴

1 Cor 9:1: οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος; οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἑώρακα;

1 Cor 15:8f: ἐσχατον δὲ πάντων ὥσπερ εἰ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὥφθη κάμοί. Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος.

2 Cor 4:6: ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν, Ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ

3.5.2.1. 1 Cor 9:1 and 15:8

In 1 Cor 9:1 Paul defends his claim that he has freedom as an apostle ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι (9:5). Therefore he claims to be an apostle and to stand thus on the same level as the other apostles (and the brother of the Lord and Cephas). He, therefore, refers to the fact that he saw ‘Jesus our Lord’ (9:1). Seeing the Lord makes an

³⁰² Ibid., p.357. The formulation of this argument is however slightly unfortunate. The second half of the argument should run: ‘and the passages where he speaks about the revelation experience always speak of seeing the Lord. Only if references to the revelation are always connected with a reference to seeing the Lord could one conclude that the revelation is not in his mind when the reference to seeing the Lord is missing. It is, however, striking that 1 Cor 9:1 speaks of seeing Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, 1 Cor 15:3.8 of an appearance of Χριστός, Gal 1:16 of unveiling τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ and 2 Cor 4:6 of φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ, whereas we have no reference to Jesus Christ, neither as God's Son nor as the Lord in 2 Cor 12. Furthermore πρὸς ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων (2 Cor 12:2) does not at all fit into the Pauline chronology (for an overview and a discussion see e.g. Holtz, *Thessalonicher*, p.19-23, esp. 19-20).

³⁰³ Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich, *ἀπόστολος*, p.440.

³⁰⁴ “Daß 2Kor 4,6 vom Damaskusereignis handelt, ist umstritten.” (Dietzfelbinger, *Ursprung*, p.49) But see e.g. Dietzfelbinger's argumentation (ibid., p.49-51). 2 Cor 12:1-10

apostle. But also being successful as an apostle proves his apostleship (9:2).³⁰⁵ He founded the Corinthian congregation.

Paul uses the verb *έώρακα*.³⁰⁶ The perfect tense indicates that Paul's seeing the Lord has a lasting effect on him: he is consequently an apostle.

In 1 Cor 15 Paul again refers to an appearance of Christ to him. He gives a short summary of the gospel (*γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, 15:1*):³⁰⁷ Christ died, was buried and rose on the third day. Then he appeared to Cephas, the Twelve, more than five hundred, James, all the apostles and also Paul. They all witnessed that Christ is risen. Paul uses the aorist form of *όράω* because the appearance of Christ is an historical act in the past and can now be referred to in the confession of faith.

In this text as well seeing the Lord and apostleship are closely connected. Paul saw Christ and is - although unfit to be called an apostle and thus *ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων*³⁰⁸ - nonetheless an apostle.³⁰⁹

Both texts 1 Cor 9:1 and 15:8 use the term *όράω* for Paul's encounter with the risen Christ. Paul saw an objective manifestation of Christ. He did not have an ecstatic vision nor did he have a mere internal revelation of knowledge. Combining 1 Cor 9:1, 15:8 and Gal 1:16a we can thus say that Paul experienced an external vision and an internal revelation in one. *Ἀποκαλύψαι* does not exclude "actual perception."³¹⁰ And "we should not suppose that Paul feels he contradicts himself in Gal 1 :16 and 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8."³¹¹ In all three texts Paul refers to the one experience which started his apostolic career. But the function of the three texts is different. In 1 Cor he stresses his freedom

³⁰⁵ See 2 Cor 3:2f and Gal 2:9. "The apostle had a unique ministry within the Pauline church: he had been personally commissioned by the risen Christ in a resurrection appearance (I Cor. 9.1; 15.7; Gal. 1.1,15f.); he was a successful missionary and church founder (I Cor. 3.5f., 10; 9.2; 15.9ff.; II Cor. 10.13-16); his was a distinctively eschatological role (Rom. 11.13-15; I Cor. 4.9)." (Dunn, *Unity*, p.111) See also Act 5:34-42, esp. Act 5:38f.

³⁰⁶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν *έώρακα* (9:1) seems to be a "nicht von ihm [Paul] geschaffene(n), sondern übernommene(n) Osterformel." (Dietzfelbinger, *Ursprung*, p.55)

³⁰⁷ Compare Gal 1:11.

³⁰⁸ He is not the last one to whom the Lord appeared, but the most unfit of all apostles.

³⁰⁹ In 15:10 Paul refers to the grace-given character of his apostleship. This links 1 Cor 15:5ff with Gal 1:15-16a, and *ἀποκαλύψαι* with *ᾤφθη*.

³¹⁰ Burton, *Galatians*, p.433.

³¹¹ Betz, *Galatians*, p.71. See also Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.31; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.92f; Dunn, *Galatians*, p.64; Mußner, *Galater*, p.84f and p.84f n.38.

as a true apostle and the reality of Christ's resurrection. And in Gal 1:15-16a he stresses the change of his purpose and commitment through his encounter with Christ.³¹²

3.5.2.2. 2 Cor 4:6

The formulation in 2 Cor 4:6 is less direct but more metaphorical. Paul refers primarily to himself.³¹³ Πρὸς φωτισμός is the "enlightenment which came to Paul, not a description of his commission."

Paul defends the apostolic ministry in general and his own apostleship in particular. God shone into his heart giving him knowledge of the glory of God. As Moses saw "God's glory and his face,"³¹⁴ so Paul saw Christ, God's glory. And with this seeing the face of Christ Paul was enlightened with knowledge about the gospel. Thereby he becomes qualified for his apostolic ministry. He himself was unfit in himself (3:4-6) but the encounter with Christ made him qualified.

In Gal 1:16 Paul stresses the inwardness of his experience using ἀποκαλύπτειν and ἐν ἐμοί. This is similar to 2 Cor 3f, where ἀποκαλύπτειν and καλύπτειν are strongly represented. Ἀποκαλύψαι ἐν ἐμοί is then the removing of the κάλυμμα ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ νοήματος (see 3:14f) resulting in the possession of knowledge.³¹⁵

Hence the argumentation in this text is very much the same as in the other three texts. Having to defend his gospel and his apostleship Paul refers to the χάρις given to him (2 Cor 3:1-3; 1 Cor 9:2; Gal 2:9, 1:15) and to his encounter with the Lord, the commissioning to the exercising of his apostleship and to the preaching of the gospel. A "'revelation of Jesus Christ' had normative force."³¹⁶

³¹² In Gal 1:15-16a Paul does not say that Christ appeared to him nor that he saw Christ. He stresses that it was an inward not an external revelation, experienced by him, of the 'Son of God.' (Not of 'Christ' or the 'Lord') Since, however, that fact of apostleship and seeing the Lord are closely related, Paul's aim in Gal 1:15-16a is not so much directed to establishing his apostolic authority but primarily to defending his gospel to the Gentiles.

³¹³ See Sandnes, *Paul*, p.137.

³¹⁴ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.139.

³¹⁵ According to Donaldson, *Zealot*, p.682, this inwardness can be described in terms of a "paradigm-shift, a transfer of allegiance from one set of world-structuring convictions to another." The "new conviction that Jesus has indeed been raised functioned as an 'anomaly,' precipitating a crisis for the old [Torah-] paradigm. This crisis found its resolution in a new paradigm in which Christ, rather than Torah, is understood as the divinely given means of determining membership in the community destined for salvation."

³¹⁶ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.54.

3.5.3. Prophetic- and Mosaic-like commissioning

Following Sandnes I do not think that Paul had especially Isa 42:6f and 49:6 in mind when writing 2 Cor 4:6. ³¹⁷ Πρὸς φωτισμόν means the enlightenment within Paul and not the enlightenment of others as in Isa 42 and 49. 2 Cor 4:6a seems to allude to Gen 1:3 rather than to Isa 9:2. And altogether Paul refers to Moses' encounter with God on Mount Sinai rather than to Isa 6:1-3. The context of 2 Cor 3 demands that we interpret 2 Cor 4:6 in this light. Probably the motif of being ἱκανός reflects Moses' insufficiency. ³¹⁸

However, compared with Gal 1:15-16a and the commissioning of prophets in the Old Testament it has to be seen that the motif of insufficiency plays an important role for Paul (διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ Gal 1:15; χάριτι θεοῦ εἰμι ὃ εἰμι, 1 Cor 15:10) as it does also for the prophets, especially Isaiah (Isa 6:5-7). Even more, seeing God's glory "frequently refers to God's manifestation in a vision." ³¹⁹ "It is a relative stable element in prophetic commission-texts that the call took place in the framework of a vision of the glory of God." ³²⁰ Thus, although the context of 2 Cor 4 demands comparison with Moses the vocabulary also recalls prophetic commissioning experiences. The fact that the term ἱκανός appears in 1 Cor 15:9 as well, shows that it is not bound to a particular context of a Moses-tradition. In 2 Cor 4:6 Paul does not, therefore, refer to a throne vision. ³²¹

³¹⁷ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.144 .

³¹⁸ See *ibid.*, p.7f and Ex 4:10.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.142.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, p.141f.

³²¹ Against *ibid.*, p.143. Also Mußner. *Galater*, p.85, following Betz, *Vision*, p.118: "Paulus [has] bei seiner Berufung den himmlischen, zur Rechten Gottes inthronisierten Jesus gesehen." I do not, however, think that Isa 6 is the only possible answer to the question: "wie war es möglich, daß Paulus diese Vielfalt von Tatsachen und Aufgaben [the revelation is 1) "Ostergeschichte;" 2) Not "Bekehrung" but "Berufung;" 3) "Übergabe des Evangeliums;" 4) Gentile mission] aus dem Erlebnis der Christusvision ableiten konnte?" (*Ibid.*, p.117). Betz argues 1) that Paul's connecting the fact of having seen the Lord and being an apostle in 1 Cor 9:1 is related to Isa 6:1.8 where Isaiah says εἶδον τὸν κύριον and ἀπόστειλόν με. The problem that Isaiah saw God whereas Paul saw Christ is solved by the fact that Isaiah - according to the Targum - just saw God's δόξα and not God himself. "So hat auch Paulus bei seiner Berufung den himmlischen, zur Rechten Gottes inthronisierten Jesus gesehen;" (*ibid.*, p.118). 2) Isaiah, as well as Paul, refers to his insufficiency. 3) Isaiah, as well as Paul, received his message and to whom he should announce it in the 'call.' The problem arising from the fact that Isaiah has a "Verstockungswort" (*ibid.*, p.119) to be given to Israel whereas Paul has the gospel to be given to the Gentiles is to be solved by the fact that - according to Acts - Paul only goes to the Gentiles because of their readiness belief and the stubbornness of Israel. But on point 3) it is clearly a Lucan concept to connect Isa 6:9f and Paul in Act 28:25-28. Paul himself never uses Isa 6 to describe his mission. On point 2) the motif of insufficiency is a motif in Paul and it occurs in Isa 6 as well. This has to be noted. But the Pauline text where it occurs is in the first instance referring to Moses' encounter with God (2 Cor 3f). The motif can, therefore, not just be traced back to Isa 6. On the first point the motif of having seen the Lord and thus being an apostle is a constant motif in Paul's descriptions of his Christophany and can be interpreted as being part of the background of Isa 6. However, the fact that Paul has seen God's δόξα like - according to the Targum -

3.5.4. Summary

To sum up: the four Pauline texts about Paul's revelation experience, the point where he started his apostolic career and realised that this was God's plan for him, speak, on the one hand, of an external vision (1 Cor 9:1, 15:8) and, on the other hand, of an internal revelation (2 Cor 4:6; Gal 1:16a). "The outward vision and the inward illumination coincided."³²² His gospel was given by God through revelation. It gave him knowledge about and insight into the gospel and a new understanding of the Jewish religion.

Having seen the Lord Paul ranks together with Cephas, James and the other apostles (1 Cor 15). As they received the gospel from God, so did Paul. Thus he did not need to go to Jerusalem after the revelation.

Paul received eschatological insight into and knowledge of God's will. Hence, with his revelation, a new stage in the salvation of God's people begins. Although Gal 1:16a itself does not very strongly recall prophetic language, Paul relates his commissioning to the prophetic commissioning just as he relates his call to the prophetic calls. And when relating himself to Moses the points of comparison are those which made Moses "the greatest of the prophets in Jewish tradition."³²³ Paul was given insight into (one of) God's secrets. He saw Christ in order to proclaim what he had seen among the Gentiles as good news.

Isaiah, and the fact that this *δόξα* is Christ has only 2 Cor 4:6 as a proof text. There, however, it denotes an inward enlightenment and not an external vision. Furthermore the motif is connected with Moses' encounter with God in 2 Cor 3 and not so much with Isa 6.

³²² Bruce, *Galatians*, p.93.

³²³ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.139.

3.6. The Commission

3.6.1. "ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν"

We now look at the divine purpose of the revelation, the commission. With Paul taking up his apostolic career the plan of salvation enters a new stage. And since Christ is the ultimate and only way of salvation the plan of salvation enters its last stage.³²⁴ God sent his Son when the time was fulfilled (Gal 4:4).

For the investigation we subdivide the commission into 'delivery' (εὐαγγελίζωμαι); 'message' (αὐτόν); 'audience' (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν).

3.6.1.1. "ἵνα"

"ἵνα either denotes the purpose of the revelation (final: 'in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles') or the consequence (consecutive: 'with the consequence that I now preach him among the Gentiles').

Taking ἵνα in its consecutive sense leads to problems in Paul's argumentation: in question was the validity of Paul's law-free Gentile mission. Just saying: 'when God revealed his Son in me with the consequence that I now preach him among the Gentiles I immediately did not consult...' would not have answered the question as to why his gospel has to be considered as a result of the revelation of Christ.

Hence ἵνα denotes the divine purpose of the revelation. "The force of the syntax is that the revelation of Christ had no other purpose than this preaching."³²⁵ "It was a new perception of Christ which made the transformation (from zealot within Judaism to 'apostle to the Gentiles') both possible and necessary."³²⁶ It was the only and logical conclusion to be drawn from the revelation experience.³²⁷ For Paul the Gentile mission lies implicit in the phrases τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ and εὐαγγελίζειν αὐτόν.³²⁸

³²⁴ See Mußner, *Galater.*, p.82 n.26.

³²⁵ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.55. Also Segal, *Convert*, p.13 and Haacker, *Berufung*, p.11: "Ziel dieses Offenbarungsaktes ist nicht die persönliche Glaubenserkenntnis des Paulus als Individuum, sondern seine Sendung, sein Apostolat."

³²⁶ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.67. See Haacker, *Berufung*, p.11: the revelation is a "'Erkenntnis Christi,' das meint die aus der Ostererscheinung gewonnene Botschaft, das christologische Bekenntnis, das Paulus früher leidenschaftlich bekämpft hatte und in das er jetzt einstimmen mußte."

³²⁷ Taking ἵνα in its final sense we must be aware of the fact that Paul did not say: ὅτι εὐαγγελίζομαι αὐτόν.... nor: εὐαγγελίζειν με αὐτόν.... Tracing his gospel back to the revelation Paul would not have missed out the point that God actually said to him: 'go, and preach my son among the

3.6.1.2. The Delivery: Εὐαγγελίζομαι

The verb is subjunctive present tense. In contrary to the aorists εὐδόκησεν, ἀφορίσας, καλέσας and ἀποκαλύψαι, εὐαγγελίζομαι denotes the current situation, the “continued preaching,”³²⁹ as the purpose of the revelation.³³⁰

With εὐαγγελίζομαι Paul takes up Gal 1:8.9.11 (εὐαγγέλειν) and Gal 1:6.7.11 (εὐαγγέλιον). Within Galatians the words occur only in Gal 1-2 (and Gal 4:13). There, however, we find it quite often.³³¹ This again is an indication of the fact that Paul is interested not so much in defending and establishing his own personal authority, but rather in defending his gospel as the only εὐαγγέλιον.³³² Paul's opponents claimed to give good tidings (Gal 1:6.8.9), but there is only the one gospel, that which Paul proclaims.

“Die Septuaginta übersetzt die Wurzel [בשר] nahezu exklusiv mit Wortbildungen des Stammes εὐαγγελ-.”³³³ Nevertheless, it is wrong “בשר und Derivate prinzipiell als Ausdruck für Froh- und Freudenbotschaft zu verstehen.”³³⁴ In the Old Testament the “Grundsinn ‘Frohbotschaft’ [of the noun בְּשָׂרָה is] nicht eindeutig gegeben.”³³⁵ The verb בשר is merely “im Sinne von ‘botschaften’ gebraucht;”³³⁶ so is the participle מְבַשֵּׂר. However, in Deutero-Isaiah the participle is a fixed religious term. And “von

Gentiles.’ The commission is, however, not introduced as direct nor as indirect speech of God. Hence it seems to be Paul's interpretation of the revelation experience rather than the literal command of God as in Act 26:14-18. Nevertheless he leaves no doubt that his interpretation really is the divine purpose of the revelation. See Luck, *Evangelium*, p.191: “Wie daraus [from the revelation of the son of God] dann die Folge abzuleiten sei: damit ich ihn unter den Heiden verkündigte, ist auf jeden Fall nicht unmittelbar daraus erkennbar. Deshalb hat man auch seit den Tagen der Apostelgeschichte die Vision, auf die das Wort »offenbaren« hinweist, mit einer Audition verbunden.”

³²⁸ According to Gal 1:15-16a it was, therefore, not just ‘embryonically’ included (against Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.24). Paul stresses that he got his commission all at once. See e.g. Luck, *Evangelium*, esp. p.203ff.

³²⁹ Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.32 and Burton, *Galatians*, p.53.

³³⁰ It does not merely denote what “zur Zeit, da Paulus schreibt, Wirklichkeit geworden ist,” (Oepke, *Galater*, p.61) but rather Paul's mission as a whole, from the very beginning to the present situation. Thus it does not necessarily exclude the meaning of the aorist, “daß Paulus sogleich nach der Bekehrung mit der Heidenpredigt beginnen sollte und begann.” (Ibid., p.61) “Die Offenbarung des Sohnes wirkt sich... in der gegenwärtig (conj. praes.) geschehenden apostolischen Darbringung des Evangeliums aus.” (Schlier, *Galater*, p.27) Paul's whole ministry is a result and the purpose of the revelation.

³³¹ It appears 14 times as a noun or verb in Gal 1-2: Gal 1:6.7.8(twice).9.11(twice).16.23, 2:2.5.7.14.

³³² See Sandnes, *Paul*, p.51.

³³³ Stuhlmacher, *Evangelium*, p.109.

³³⁴ Ibid., p.109.

³³⁵ Ibid., p. 113.

³³⁶ Ibid., p.115.

Jes. 61,1ff. an gewinnt die jüdische Redeweise vom Heilsboten ihr plastisches Gewicht und ihre Heilsfunktion.“³³⁷

In Judaism, then, the use of the noun *קָרַב* “nähert sich... technischer Ausdrucksweise.”³³⁸ The verb becomes almost a technical term for positive and negative “Rede Gottes und der Propheten.”³³⁹ And the texts in Isaiah which speak of the *קָרַב*, finally, “werden zu Interpretamenten der endzeitlichen Heilserwartung.”³⁴⁰ This “Belegstellen [of the participle *קָרַב* in post-biblical Jewish writings have] sprachlich positiven Sinn, so daß sich Aussagen für einen Gericht proklamierenden *קָרַב* nicht nachweisen lassen.”³⁴¹

Hence “im Blick auf die neutestamentliche Verwendung des Stammes *εὐαγγελ-* läßt sich ohne Übertreibung sagen, daß... der neutestamentliche Sprachgebrauch traditionsgeschichtlich befriedigend aus dem sich im semitisch-sprachigen Judentum und Alten Testament abzeichnenden Traditionen heraus erklärt werden kann.”³⁴²

Since “die Wurzel *קָרַב* von der Septuaginta stets mit dem Stamm *εὐαγγελ-* und seinen Derivaten übersetzt wird, sofern nicht der negative Sinn des Hebräischen im Griechischen ein Ausweichen auf eine andere Wortgruppe erzwang”³⁴³ “gehört [the *LXX*]... zum sprachlichen und sachlichen Fundamentalbestand des urchristlichen Evangeliums.”³⁴⁴ Even the connotation of a “(prophetischen) Gotteswortes”³⁴⁵ is derived from the *LXX*. In religious context *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* is thus “not just speaking and preaching; it is proclamation with full authority and power.”³⁴⁶

Standing in this tradition and “angespornt von der... (Evangeliums-) Verkündigung der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde, prägt das junge Missionschristentum eine eigenständige Terminologie: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον meint die rettende Heilsbotschaft.”³⁴⁷ In the New Testament it is thus always used in the religious sense.³⁴⁸ And “das Verbum

³³⁷ Ibid., p.121.

³³⁸ Ibid., p.135.

³³⁹ Ibid., p.141.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., p.151.

³⁴¹ Ibid., p.153.

³⁴² Ibid., p.153.

³⁴³ Ibid., p.164.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., p.179.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., p.179.

³⁴⁶ Friedrich, *εὐαγγελίζομαι*, p.720.

³⁴⁷ Stuhlmacher, *Evangelium*, p.287.

³⁴⁸ *Εὐαγγέλιον* in the New Testament “is used only in the singular, only in the sense ‘good news’, and only with reference to the good news of salvation.” (Burton, *Galatians*, p.422)

εὐαγγελίζεσθαι scheint seine terminologische Fixierung... vom Substantiv τὸ εὐαγγέλιον her erhalten zu haben.”³⁴⁹

Paul's use of the word group has to be seen against this background.³⁵⁰ With εὐαγγέλιον Paul means “einen relativ geschlossenen, die Offenbarung Gottes und die Christologie umfassenden Geschehenskreis.”³⁵¹ It is a technical term for the preaching of the gospel.³⁵²

On the grounds of such a fixed concept of the word group εὐαγγελ- and Paul's use of prophetic tradition in Gal 1:15-16a, esp. Isaiah, the use of the word group in Isaiah 40-66 is “most significant.”³⁵³

There εὐαγγελίζειν appears in Isa 40:9 (twice), 52:7 (twice), 60:6, 61:1.³⁵⁴ In Isa 40:9 the herald of good tidings, ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος, shall go up on a high mountain and proclaim the victory and the coming of God.³⁵⁵ In Isa 52:7 we find the same motif: ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρέων, ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοῆν εἰρήνης, ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθά, ὅτι ἀκουσθὴν ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου. The heralds of good tidings proclaims the good news of God's victory to Zion.³⁵⁶ In Isa 60:6 the nations are included in the proclamation of the victory of the God of Israel. And in Isa 61:1 the prophet himself becomes the messenger of good tidings, proclaiming the year of the Lord's favour.

Because of the fact that the verb denotes prophetic and divine speech only Paul and other apostles are the subject of εὐαγγελίζειν. In Rm 10:15 the apostles are the εὐαγγελιζόμενοι who proclaim the good tidings.³⁵⁷ Most of the times, however, the subject of verb and noun is Paul himself.³⁵⁸

³⁴⁹ Stuhlmacher, *Evangelium*, p.63. See *ibid.*, p.59f and Gal 1:8.9 and esp. 1 Thess 3:6.

³⁵⁰ See *ibid.*, p.289.

³⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p.58.

³⁵² “Paul uses the word... always... with reference to the preaching of his gospel.” (*Ibid.*, p.27) See Schlier, *Galater*, p.27 n.4.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, p.708. (Emphasis by Friedrich) Although the line of tradition does not directly go from the Isaiah texts to Paul he could easily have fallen back on the Isaiah texts once the word group has taken on a technical meaning.

³⁵⁴ The “prominence [of the term εὐαγγέλιον] in the second half of Isaiah (40:9; 52:7; 60:6; 61:1) was certainly influential in Jewish thinking in the period leading up to Jesus.” (Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p.10)

³⁵⁵ On the question whether Zion/Jerusalem is subject or dative object of the proclamation see Sandnes, *Paul*, p.167 n.46.

³⁵⁶ Here Zion obviously is the dative object of the proclamation. Hence “it was easy for the tradition to connect Isa 40:9 with Isa 41:27, and particularly 52:7” (*ibid.*, p.167 n.46) even if in Isa 40:9 originally Zion was meant to be the subject.

³⁵⁷ For the plural reading in Isa 40:9 and Isa 52:7 see *ibid.*, p.166-170, Friedrich, *εὐαγγελίζομαι*, p.715f and p.719 and Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, p.171f.

³⁵⁸ Verb: Rm 1:15, 15:20; 1 Cor 1:17, 9:16.18, 15:1.2; 2 Cor 11:7; Gal 1:11.16.23, 4:13. Paul and his co-worker in 2 Cor 10:16. Different are 1 Thess 3:6, and Rm 10:15 and Gal 1:8f. Noun: Rm 1:1.9.16, 2:16, 15:16.19; 1 Cor 4:15, 15:1; 2 Cor 2:12. In 1 Thess Paul always uses the first person plural. So he does in 2 Cor 4:3f.

Hence as the host of prophets has seen the victory of God and proclaims it to the people so also Paul has seen the Lord and proclaims him to the Gentiles.³⁵⁹

3.6.1.3. The Message: Αὐτόν

Concerning Paul's gospel in Gal 1:16 I would not agree with Betz who says that we would "expect a neuter object to the verb, instead of the personal object Christ."³⁶⁰ We need rather some kind of explanation as to how αὐτός is good news to the Gentiles.³⁶¹

The verb εὐαγγελίζειν is used very often intransitively. Only four times in the Pauline writings is it followed by an accusative: εἰρήνη and/or³⁶² ἀγαθά as a quotation from Isa 52:7 (Rm 10:15), αὐτόν (Gal 1:16), τὴν πίστιν (Gal 1:23) and τὴν πίστιν and τὴν ἀγάπην (1 Thess 3:6).³⁶³

The noun εὐαγγέλιον stands absolute as well. God is the subject of it. It is his good news.³⁶⁴ The content is Christ,³⁶⁵ God's Son³⁶⁶ or the glory of Christ.³⁶⁷

In Gal 1:16 the accusative of content,³⁶⁸ αὐτόν, refers to and picks up τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. Paul proclaims to the Gentiles that Christ is the Son of God. The heralds in Isa proclaim: 'here is your God' (Isa 40:9) and: 'your God reigns' (Isa 52:7). This is good news, for it means salvation for God's people, to whom the good tidings are proclaimed. Hence the fact that 'Jesus, the Son of God' is 'proclaimed' among the Gentiles means that they are being addressed as the people of God. Jesus' Sonship means salvation for the Gentiles.

Defending his apostolic authority it would have been sufficient for Paul to say that God revealed his Son in him that he might preach him. But Paul defends his apostleship to the Gentiles. Hence he goes on saying that he is commissioned to preach αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

³⁵⁹ Maybe Isa 40:9 and 52:7 is the background for the fact that for Paul having seen the Lord and being an apostle are as closely related as for Isaiah seeing God's victory and proclaiming are related.

³⁶⁰ Betz, *Galatians*, p.72.

³⁶¹ Like: 'to preach God's son as good tidings, that he....' See Rm 1:2-5 and 1 Cor 15:1-8.

³⁶² Τὸν εὐαγγελιζόμεον εἰρήνην is probably an addition.

³⁶³ In 1 Thess 3:6 it is, however, not used in the sense of proclaiming the gospel of Christ.

³⁶⁴ Rm 15:16; 2 Cor 11:7; 1 Thess 2:2.8.9.

³⁶⁵ Rm 15:19.29; 1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 2:12, 9:12, 10:14; Gal 1:7; Phil 1:27; 1 Thess 3:2.

³⁶⁶ Rm 1:9: εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ

³⁶⁷ 2 Cor 4:4: εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

³⁶⁸ See Burton, *Galatians*, p.26f.

3.6.1.4. The Audience: Ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

Ἐν is local and thus parallel to ἐν ἐμοί³⁶⁹ The revelation in Paul was τὸ φωτισμός within Paul (2 Cor 4:6), and the gospel he is preaching is τὸ φωτισμός for the people whose minds are not blinded (2 Cor 4:4).³⁷⁰ Hence ἀποκαλύψαι - εὐαγγελίζομαι, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ - αὐτόν and ἐν ἐμοί - ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in Gal 1:16a correspond.

In the LXX ἔθνος is most of the times a translation of עַם, אֲמִתּוֹ, as λαός is a frequent translation of אֱלֹהִים. "The plur. אֲמִתּוֹ came to be used as a tech. term for the Gentiles, and the sing. אֱלֹהִים for the holy people."³⁷¹ Ἐθνη / אֲמִתּוֹ in the sense of Gentiles "is often [used] with no sense of a plurality of nations. The word is used non-sociologically to describe all the individuals who do not belong to the chosen people."³⁷²

Except in the quotation in Rm 10:19 (twice) Paul uses the word only in the plural. It occurs 29 times in Romans,³⁷³ four times in 1 Cor, once in 2 Cor, 10 times in Galatians and twice in 1 Thess. These statistics already show the importance of the term ἔθνος in Romans and Galatians, the letters where Paul is most of all concerned with the relationship between Jews and non-Jews, between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians.³⁷⁴ The frequency of the word becomes even more striking when we look at the fact that it occurs in Romans in chapters 1-4, 9-11 and 15 (16) and in Gal only in Gal 1-3.

That Paul uses ἔθνος only in the plural and mainly in Romans and Galatians already refers to the use of ἔθνη / אֲמִתּוֹ in the Old Testament as a term denoting the distinctiveness of the nations from the Jews, and thus the distinctiveness of Israel. "Of some 160 instances [where ἔθνος appears] in the NT, about 40 are quoted from the OT, and there are many others more or less clear reminiscence or echoes."³⁷⁵ Ἐθνη here clearly means distinctiveness from the Jews: in Rm 2:14.24, 3:29, 9:24.30, 11:11.12.13.25,

³⁶⁹ It is, however, a mere hypothesis to presume that ἐν ἐμοί is standing "unter Parallelisierungszwang im Hinblick auf das nachfolgende ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν." (Mußner, *Galater*, p.87f n.45)

³⁷⁰ "In v.4 the phrase means the enlightenment which the gospel brings to the converts. Similarly, in v.6 it must refer to the enlightenment which came to Paul." (Sandnes, *Paul*, p.138) "That Paul as an apostle brings enlightenment to others by preaching the gospel is implicit in 4:4, but is not, as far as we can see, the point presented in 4:6." (Ibid., p.138) See also Kim, *Origin*, p.9f.

³⁷¹ Bertram, *ἔθνος*, p.365.

³⁷² Ibid., p.367.

³⁷³ Rm 10:19 is included.

³⁷⁴ See especially Rm 3:24.29, 9-11, 15:7-13 and Gal 2.

³⁷⁵ Schmidt, *ἔθνος*, p.369.

15:9.10.12.16.18.27,³⁷⁶ 1 Cor 1:23,³⁷⁷ 2 Cor 11:26 (ἐκ γένους,... ἐξ ἐθνῶν) and 1 Thess 2:16.³⁷⁸ In the letter to the Galatians the distinction is made very clearly in Gal 2:8 and 2:9 (περιτομή - ἔθνη), 2:12.14.15 (Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτολοί), 3:8.14 and also 2:2 as referring to 2:8f.³⁷⁹ "The phrase ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς in Gl. 2:14 makes it clear that the distinction from Judaism is always decisive."³⁸⁰ Concerning the law the Gentiles live ἐθνικῶς and not Ἰουδαϊκῶς. Thus they are ἁμαρτωλοί³⁸¹ and do not - from a Jewish point of view - belong to God's people.³⁸²

In Gal 1:16 Paul depicts himself as being sent to the nations different from the Jews.

Paul once persecuted the Jews who were open to Gentiles. Being zealous he forced them to live again ἐν Ἰουδαϊσμῷ. The Gentiles were depicted as standing outside the boundaries of Israel. Then in the revelation God showed Paul that the boundaries are to be redefined. The Gentiles become sons of Abraham through Christ, as well. Thus Paul changed from being a persecutor of the Hellenists³⁸³ to being an apostle to the Gentiles. "All the previous effort to maintain 'the assembly of God' as something distinct and separated from the Gentiles by definition had now to be abandoned."³⁸⁴

Since, however, in Galatia precisely this apostleship to the Gentiles, the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας (Gal 2:7) was in question the polemical aspect of this addition is obvious. However, also in other letters - mainly in the letter to the Romans - Paul claims to have been sent to the Gentiles: Paul received grace and apostleship εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Rm 1:5); he praises his ministry to be ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος (Rm 11:13); he is a λειτουργὸς Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη (Rm 15:16); Christ accomplished what Paul preaches εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν (Rm 15:18). And in 1 Thess 2:14-16 Paul refers to the incident in Thessalonica where the Jews hindered him from preaching τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (2:16).

³⁷⁶ Furthermore also 1:13 (see 11:13) and 1:5 (see 11:13, 15:16, 15:18).

³⁷⁷ Also in 5:1, 10:20 and 12:2, where τὰ ἔθνη is opposite to being a Christian. "Christians are considered true Israel and the church as Israel κατὰ πνεῦμα" (Ibid., p.371)

³⁷⁸ And probably also 4:5.

³⁷⁹ See Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.32; Schlier, *Galater*, p.27; Burton, *Galatians*, p.53.

³⁸⁰ Schmidt, ἔθνος, p.369. See also Gal 2:7, ἀκροβυστία - περιτομή.

³⁸¹ Grammatically it would be possible to read: 'we, born Jews and not out of the Gentiles, are sinners but we know that...' The context of food-laws, Judaism, Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆν and Ἰουδαῖζειν demands, however, to take ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτολοί together. The Gentiles do not know and thus do not observe the law. Thus they are sinners.

³⁸² See Rm 15:10, ἔθνη - λαός.

³⁸³ See Hengel, *Zealots*, p.149: "zeal for Yahweh was always directed exclusively against the faithless people of Israel itself." See also Haacker, *Berufung*, p.8.

³⁸⁴ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.66.

It is, however, striking that Paul in Gal 1:16 does not simply say τοῖς ἔθνεσιν but ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. With this he does not stress that he is sent to the individual people or to the Gentiles as the non-Jewish people but into Gentile territory.³⁸⁵ Paul's argumentation in Gal 1:16b-24 is, on the one hand, that "he did not consider it necessary to go to anyone else."³⁸⁶ On the other hand, however, Paul's description of the way he went and the action he took after his revelation shows that he immediately fulfilled his commission and therefore only stayed in Gentile territory, distinct from Jewish Judea. He went only into the area surrounding Judea. First he went to Arabia in the South-East of Judea, then to Damascus in Syria, in the North-East. After this he went for a short visit to Jerusalem, then to Syria and Cilicia in the North-West and far North. In Judea he remained unknown.³⁸⁷

This distinction of Gentile territory and Judea corresponds to Paul's Judaistic commitment before his revelation. Like the zeal of God and the zeal of Phinehas, Elijah and Mattathias, Paul's zeal had been active only within Israel. And the country determined the borders for the ethnic and religious group. The desire to keep the ethnic Israel ritually clean meant keeping the country Israel clean.³⁸⁸ Thus the Jews lived in Jewish territory, the Gentiles in Gentile territory.

However, since the Gentile territory denotes the territory of the religious and ethnic group of the non-Jews Paul did not make a difference between being sent to the Gentiles and being sent into Gentile territory. Being sent to the Gentiles for Paul does not mean going and preaching to all the non-Jews living in Judea as well as in Gentile territory. It means preaching in the other areas of the world, despite the fact of the Jews being found in the Diaspora³⁸⁹.³⁹⁰ He is sent by God to the Gentiles, and thus he goes

³⁸⁵ See Longenecker, *Galatians*, p.32; Schlier, *Galater*, p.27; Burton, *Galatians*, p.53.

³⁸⁶ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.67.

³⁸⁷ Paul was "departing... to Gentile territories and remaining unknown to the Judean churches." (Verseput, *Paul*, p.39) See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.79: "The only thing that interested Paul about it [the "phase of his personal history" mentioned in Gal 1:21-24]... was that throughout it he had been far away from Judea and the Jerusalem leadership." However, I think that Paul's departure into Gentile territory is an important aspect of his argumentation as well.

³⁸⁸ Thus the zealots wanted to re-establish the theocracy, God's reign over his people, in the promised land in political and religious aspects. Hengel, *Paulus*, p.229, speaks of an "überragende Bedeutung der rituellen Heiligkeit des Landes Israel." "Das ganze von Gott seinem erwählten Volk verheißene Land sollte zum Heiligtum Gottes werden." (Ibid., p.227)

³⁸⁹ See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.66: "the formulation does not exclude Paul's preaching to other than Gentiles."

³⁹⁰ Hence the term "Zuständigkeitsbereich" (Sandnes, *Paul*, p.59) fits better than 'audience.' 'Audience' pays attention to the group or individuals listening, whereas "Zuständigkeitsbereich" stresses the fact that Paul is talking about a sphere, an area ('Bereich'). 'Audience' denotes the Gentiles, "Zuständigkeitsbereich" the Gentile-territory.

into Gentile territory. Hence preaching in Jewish synagogues is no contradiction to Paul's commission.³⁹¹ He is open to preaching to Jews as well.³⁹²

In his conduct in Judaism Paul's commitment, his zeal, was limited to the Jews only. Salvation, sonship, was limited to the Israel within the covenant, and was bound to the law. Thus proclaiming the inclusion of the Gentiles and the opening up of the borders could not have meant that his commission is limited.³⁹³ His commission is rather "freed from previous limitations."³⁹⁴ Hence ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is, on the one hand, the sphere of Paul's mission and thus denotes some kind of limitation (Gal 2:9, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοῖς δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν). On the other hand, it expresses the open-

³⁹¹ It can only be taken as a contradiction if one fails to realise that Paul in Gal 1:16a is not merely saying τοῖς ἔθνεσιν but ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (thus Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.7). We can only briefly refer to the discussion about Paul's missionary activity and strategy. Two authors with a different opinion are e.g. Kim, *Origin* and Sanders, *PLJP*. Both argue that Paul depicts himself as being sent to the Gentiles (Kim, *Origin*, p.56-66 (esp.57f) and Sanders, *PLJP*, p.179-190). Sanders stresses that Paul's letters do not refer to preaching in synagogues. Holding this position he denies "the evidence of the letters themselves, not just Paul's self-descriptions, but his characterisations of his converts and the contents." (p.188) Concerning Paul's self-descriptions Sanders refers to Rm 11:13; Gal 1:16, 2:2.7.9; Rm 1:5 15:18, 1:13f; 1 Thess 2:16; Rm 15:16 (p.181). Concerning the converts he refers to Gal 4:8; 1 Cor 12:2, 6:9-11; 1 Thess 1:9; Phil 3:2 (p.182). Concerning the content Sanders argues that "Paul wrote from a Jewish perspective," (p.183), and although some arguments "might have puzzled" (p.183) the Gentile audience, he "seems to have been able to get his main point across." (p.183). "So he styled himself, and so he acted." (p.190). Sanders admits, however, that "occasional or opportunistic proclamation to Jews need not be outside the scope of the apostle to the Gentiles." (p.190 and also p.204 n.71). Kim, on the other hand, argues that "it was only natural for him [Paul] to turn to synagogues which were familiar to him as places where the word of God was proclaimed and where he expected to find many Gentiles, the 'God-fearers'." (p.61) Referring to Act 13:5-14, 14:1, 17:1f, 10:17, 18:4.19, 19:8 he says that this is not "purely the Lucan *heilsgeschichtliche* scheme nor Paul's lack of conviction about his call to the Gentile mission." (p.61, emphasis by Kim) Paul himself suggests that he also reached Jews (1 Cor 9:20ff.32f; 2 Cor 11:24; 1 Thess 2:15f). He used the "network of the synagogues." (p.61) "It provided Paul... with a temporary lodging and mediated job." (p.61) "Der Speiseraum [of a Synagogue in the Diaspora] mochte... zur Unterbringung von jüdischen Reisenden dienen." (Hengel, *Synagogeninschrift*, p.171f) "Als Paulus in Korinth die dortige Synagoge aufsuchte [Act 18:2-4], erbrachte dies zunächst nicht etwa missionarische Kontakte, sondern solche beruflicher Art, die ihm Arbeit und Auskommen sicherten." (Ibid., p.171f) Furthermore it provided an "opportunity to preach" (Kim, *Origin*, p.61, see Act 13:14ff) and "a well prepared audience, namely the 'God-fearers'." (Ibid., p.62) We may add to Kim's arguments that the separation of the Christian church from the synagogue was still in process when Paul became an apostle. It is most likely that the development of the Christian church goes from Hebrew synagogues to the Hellenists to the God-fearers, and thus in the Diaspora directly from the synagogues to the God-fearers. This picture is drawn mainly from Acts, nevertheless it provides quite a natural picture of the first Christian communities in Gentile territory. Concerning 1 Thess 2:15f it has to be said that Paul does not speak of preaching to the Jews. Thus is Sanders right. In Acts, however, the same event is reported (Act 17) referring to Paul preaching in the synagogue. This picture corresponds well to the aspects of zeal occurring in 1 Thess 2:14-16. Zeal acted within Israel and the Jewish communities and hardly against Christian missionaries preaching in the market place to Greek people. "Punishment [2 Cor 11:24] implies inclusion." (Sanders, *PLJP*, p.192, emphasis by Sanders) Hence I think that Acts gives an accurate picture of the missionary activity of Paul. It has to be noted, though, that Paul depicts himself as being sent to the Gentiles, and that he at the same time never directly refers to preaching in the synagogues and to Jews.

³⁹² Excluded is, however, that Paul thought of his commission as preaching to Jews εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστει (Rm 1:5). Here I disagree with Schlier who argues that it is not said, "daß ausschließlich Heiden von ihm [Paul] zum Gehorsam des Glaubens zu bringen sind." (Schlier, *Galater*, p.27)

³⁹³ Against Betz, *Galatians*, p.72 and Schlier, *Galater*, p.27.

³⁹⁴ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.66. See also Oepke, *Galater*, p.61.

ing up of the boundaries, namely that God's salvation is not limited to the Jews anymore.

3.6.2. Prophets to the nations

We saw that Paul's revelation was his being commissioned to preach to the Gentiles what he has seen. Preaching to Jews in the Diaspora was neither excluded nor was it explicitly included. It was, however, part of Paul's missionary strategy and the most natural way for him to travel round and to reach the Gentiles. Paul's message is summed up in the one sentence: 'Jesus Christ is Son of God.' The final proclamation of God's victory and God's reign reaches and concerns not only Israel but also the Gentiles.

The fact that Paul had to deliver a message from God to a certain audience aligns him with the Old Testament prophets. Both Paul and the Old Testament prophets "experienced, in form of a revelation, being sent and commissioned to deliver a message from God. This formed the basis and starting point of their career. ...The commission to be carried out was in both cases to be communicated to a certain audience." ³⁹⁵

That Paul is sent to the Gentiles means that he can be compared only with Isaiah and Jeremiah. They are the only "Völkerpropheten" in the Old Testament tradition. ³⁹⁶

Paul's message is the εὐαγγέλιον. Paul uses verb and noun 13 times in the two chapters Gal 1 and 2. ³⁹⁷ It is an important term for the issue discussed in Galatia. The question is to be clarified who preaches the true gospel, Paul or his opponents (1:6-9). However, despite the fact that the use of εὐαγγελίζεῖν can be explained by the context of Gal 1:16, Paul derived the verb from Isaiah since in 1:15 he has alluded to a whole semantic field from Isaiah. Εὐαγγελίζεῖν is not part of this semantic field. It occurs, however, in the same context of Isa 40-66: the messengers proclaim the 'εὐαγγέλιον' and in Isa 61:1 the Servant of the Lord, who is called and chosen from his mother's womb, is sent to proclaim the good news (εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με). This proclamation reaches the coastlands ³⁹⁸ and the ends of the earth, ³⁹⁹ the people

³⁹⁵ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.18.

³⁹⁶ Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 324. Jonah (3:1-10) can be excluded as a model of Paul's commission.

³⁹⁷ Compare Phil 1:5-27 where the noun appears six times and 1 Cor 9:12-23 where noun and verb appear nine times within only twelve verses.

³⁹⁸ Isa 41:1, 42:4, 49:1, 51:5, 66:19.

³⁹⁹ Isa 49:6.

from far away.⁴⁰⁰ It is proclaimed to the nations⁴⁰¹ and they come to Zion.⁴⁰² In the same way Paul is sent ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. And he went straight into Gentile-territory to fulfil this commission and plans to go to Spain (Rm 15:24) which was in New Testament times “regarded as the ‘end(s) of the earth’.”⁴⁰³ He goes from Israel into the world to proclaim the good news that now faith has become the entry requirement into the people of God.

Most striking, however, is Isa 49:6 (and Isa 42:6). As seen above Isa 49 played already an important part in Paul's understanding of his call.⁴⁰⁴ Isa 49:6 reads: τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. This reminds us of 2 Cor 4:6. Even if 2 Cor 4:6 has to be read against the background of 4:4 which means that πρὸς φωτισμόν has to be understood as an inward light, Paul brings the light of the gospel of the glory of God, the εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν (4:3), to the ἀπιστοί (4:4).

Jeremiah 1:5ff (esp. verse 10) speaks of a commission ἐπὶ ἔθνη καὶ βασιλείας ἐκριζοῦν καὶ κατασκάπτειν καὶ ἀπολλύειν καὶ ἀνοικοδομεῖν καὶ καταφυτεύειν. Unlike Isaiah he is sent *against* nations and kingdoms.

However, there was a tendency in early Judaism to “assimilate [the prophets] to the consolations found in Deutero-Isaiah.”⁴⁰⁵ Thus in Jewish tradition (e.g. Sir 49:6-7) “Jeremiah is... described as a prophet of the final salvation... in a way which connects him to the message of final restoration in other prophets.”⁴⁰⁶ He was not here so much depicted as being sent against nations but rather to preach and predict “restoration and salvation for Israel.”⁴⁰⁷ In Jewish tradition Isaiah is “the consolation-prophet *par excellence*,”⁴⁰⁸ but he is not the only consolation prophet. But nevertheless, Jeremiah was depicted as preaching comfort to Israel. To build up and to plant (Jer 1:10) is directed to Israel. Hence proclaiming good tidings *to the nations* has hardly any basis in Jeremiah's call and commission.

⁴⁰⁰ Isa 49:1, 66:19.

⁴⁰¹ Isa 42:1.6, 49:6, 52:10, 66:18ff.

⁴⁰² Isa 49:7.22f, 60:3ff, 61:5ff, 66:18ff.23.

⁴⁰³ Aus, *Spain*, p.244. See Isa 49:6.

⁴⁰⁴ See §3.4.4..

⁴⁰⁵ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.38. See on the following *ibid.*, p.21-43.

⁴⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p.35.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p.37.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p.43. (Emphasis by Sandnes)

Only the Servant of the Lord is explicitly sent in order that salvation may reach the nations (Isa 49:6). And like the Servant of the Lord Paul is commissioned "mit der Heilssendung an die Welt."⁴⁰⁹ Additionally both Paul's and the Servant's "exclusive and underscored"⁴¹⁰ commission are "trotz ihres Universalismus deutlich auf Israel gerichtet."⁴¹¹

Paul's apostolic self-understanding as an apostle to the nations is influenced by Isa 42 and 49.⁴¹² And I think that the Servant of the Lord is a real parallel to Paul's 'Zuständigkeitsbereich' and self-understanding.⁴¹³ Paul's commission is closely related to the commission of the Servant of the Lord.

⁴⁰⁹ Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 328.

⁴¹⁰ Sandnes, *Paul*, p.65.

⁴¹¹ Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 328.

⁴¹² See Blank, *Paulus*, p.227f. Blank, however, argues that Paul depicts himself as "missionarischen Gottesknecht" für die Heidenvölker. Er versteht sich dagegen nicht als der leidende Gottesknecht von Isa 52/53." (p.227, emphasis by Blank) This distinction can be made because the "Diasporajudentum versteht den Knecht kollektiv von Israel; das palästinensische Judentum dagegen 'durchgängig messianisch'." (p.227, emphasis by Blank). Thus we have a "missionarischen Knecht" in the Diaspora and a "leidenden Knecht" in Palestine (p.227, emphasis by Blank). Paul's self-understanding is derived from the missionary servant and thus from the Hellenistic Jews in the Diaspora. (p.228). This is the reason why it was easy for Paul to accept the law-free Gentile mission: he knew that "Gesetz und Beschneidung sich bislang als der größte Hemmschuh jüdischer Heidenmission erwiesen hatten." (p.229).

It is a good argument to distinguish between Isa 42, 49 and 52/53, and thereby to avoid a conflict in relating Isa 52/53 to Jesus as well as to Paul (See Holtz, *Paulus*, col. 329f, for whom it seems to be an impossible idea to relate Isa 52/53 to Paul because Paul would then identify with his Lord). But already concerning εὐδοκεῖν we saw a relation between both Paul and Jesus and Isa 42:1 (see §3.3.2.), and we should be cautious in assuming that Paul understood Isa 52/53 only messianically and that he did not connect it at all with his own suffering as an apostle (see 2 Cor 6:1-10 with the quotation from Isa 49:8). Additionally understanding Paul against the background of Diaspora Judaism and relating him to a Jewish mission among Gentiles is difficult in the light of Gal 1:13-14. Paul seems to be strongly influenced by Palestinian Judaism. He was presumably taught in Jerusalem and he acted as a zealous Pharisee in and around Jerusalem, within Judea. Zeal "against Hellenistic/Gentile encroachment," (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.66) defending the purity of Israel "with the sword if necessary" (ibid., on 'that I might preach him among the Gentiles') can hardly be understood within the context of Diaspora Judaism, which depicted itself "gegenüber der heidnischen Umwelt als den beauftragten Knecht, der den Heidenvölkern die wahre Religion zu bringen hatte." (Blank, *Paulus*, p.227f)

⁴¹³ Against Sandnes, *Paul*, p.65, who holds that "the OT examples of prophetic preaching to the nations... are not real parallels" to Paul.

3.7. Conclusion

With this chapter I hope it has been shown that Paul's concept of the people of God as being a unity of Jews and Gentiles with prime importance of the Jews is the underlying concept of his apostleship.

For Paul his revelation experience had the one and only purpose of commissioning him to go to the Gentiles. This commission meant the complete reversal of his commitment and purpose in life. Having formerly being zealous within Judea and excluding the Gentiles from the people of God, he was now supposed to go into Gentile territory and to proclaim the inclusion of the Gentiles. His commission, therefore, did not mean to him the abrogation of salvation history and the establishment of an entirely new people of God, but rather the opening up of the borders of Israel. Israel remains the centre of the people of God.

With the Gentiles' inclusion and thus with God's delight in calling and commissioning Paul God's good will towards his people came into effect. Moreover, the mere fact that Paul is sent by God to proclaim a message of salvation to the Gentiles means that they are being treated already as the people of God. Using the word ἀποκαλύπτειν Paul says that with his commission he received insight into God's plan of salvation. He is, therefore, not converted away from Israel, but rather set apart for a special purpose within God's people.

However, in Gal 1:15-16a Paul does not systematically argue on the grounds of this conviction about the eschatological people of God. The relationship between Jews and Gentiles and the fact that Paul's apostleship is bound to Israel within God's continuing plan of salvation is not emphasised by Paul. He merely stresses that he is sent by God to the Gentiles without saying anything about their relationship to the Jews. When defending the rights of the Gentiles and his law-free Gentile mission Paul does not say anything about the rights of the Jews as observant Jews. He argues for his commission to the Gentiles and for the freedom of the Gentiles without explicitly referring to the fact that his commission was a commission within the people of God.

His point, however, he brings across quite strongly. For his commission to the Gentiles Paul argues on three different levels: 1) textual; 2) historical; 3) theological.

On the level of the text there are always corresponding pairs of words and phrases: ἀφορίσας and καλέσας, ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου and διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἀποκαλύψαι and εὐαγγελίζομαι, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ and αὐτόν, ἐν ἐμοί and ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; all terms correspond. Gal 1:15-16a is a highly stylised and structured block of text.

On another level Paul does not argue on a rational basis why he goes to the Gentiles, but rather binds his commission to the historical event of his revelation experience.

On the third level Paul interprets his experience theologically in the light of Old Testament prophetic call and commissioning. He thus argues with traditional images and models which have authority in themselves. He clearly aligns himself with the Servant of the Lord. He is thus a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ continuing the work of the Servant of the Lord. His is a very special role in God's plan of salvation. With his commission the history of salvation enters its last stage.

4. THE COLLECTION

4.1. Introduction

It is commonly recognised that Gal 2:10 refers to a collection of money.⁴¹⁴ Gal 2:10 is seen by many scholars as proof for the fact that the collection originated in Antioch. According to this view Paul later on developed his own concept of the collection and started raising money in his congregations. Some have, therefore, argued that Gal 2:10 speaks of a collection different from the one mentioned in 1 Cor, 2 Cor and Rm.⁴¹⁵

However, irrespective of whether we can see a development in Paul's thinking on this matter of a collection of money or whether his understanding remained constant throughout, all scholars appear to agree that the collection is raised for the church in Jerusalem.⁴¹⁶ It is, thus, an indication of the relationship between Jerusalem, Antioch and Paul's churches. Moreover, the fact that it is raised exclusively for Jerusalem shows its theological significance.⁴¹⁷ Understanding the background of the collection in all its stages means understanding the ecclesiology of those who took part in it.⁴¹⁸ This is the reason why one chapter of this dissertation about Paul and the unity of Jews and Gentiles is devoted to Paul's concept of the collection.

In the last chapter I discussed the relationship between Jews and Gentiles and followed the argumentation of the works of e.g. Stuhlmacher, Nickle, Holl, Munch, Georgi, Bartsch and Aus mentioned in §2.3.. Concerning Paul's apostleship there are also parallels to some of the works mentioned in §2.2.. According to the findings in the

⁴¹⁴ See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.116; Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.30; Betz, *Galatians*, p.103.

⁴¹⁵ See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.33; Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.39f: pointing out that, on the one hand, Paul mentions the Jerusalem agreement in Gal 2:10 "near in time to the writing of 1 Corinthians," where "preparations for the collection are, as we have seen, in hand, and instructions have been issued to the churches involved," but that, on the other hand, there are "differences between what was envisaged at the Jerusalem meeting and what Paul was now undertaking." Also Taylor, *Antioch*, p.116: "direct identification between the Jerusalem agreement and Paul's collection would be erroneous," and p.198: "the collection Paul undertook during his last years of freedom is not identical to that agreed between the Jerusalem and Antioch churches at the Jerusalem conference."

⁴¹⁶ See e.g. *ibid.*, p.118f.

⁴¹⁷ See *ibid.*, p.116-122, esp. 118f; Berger, *Almosen*, p.181: the money is, on the one hand, collected for "wirkliche Arme," but, on the other hand, "hat die Kollekte nach Gal. ii. 10 eine bestimmte kirchenpolitische Relevanz, die theologisch begründet sein muß. Nur so wird die Angabe hinter V. 9 verständlich."

⁴¹⁸ See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.10.

history of research that the understanding of Paul's concept of the people of God had an effect upon the understanding of Paul's collection, and that Paul's role as an apostle was transferred to his role in the collection enterprise, it could be assumed that in the following chapter on the collection I shall also consider the eschatological and highly theological interpretations of the collection from such writers as Stuhlmacher, Nickle, Holtz, Munck, Georgi, Bartsch and Aus. By and large I accept their conclusions. However, I think that although the inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of God and their recognition of the Jewish Christians is the main issue concerning the collection, nonetheless I do not think that Paul systematically develops this idea when writing about the collection. Thus he does not bring his special role as apostle to the Gentiles into specific connection with his role in the collection from the Gentiles for Jerusalem.

Evidence must now be provided for this statement

In doing so I shall briefly set out the chronological order of the events reported in Gal 1-2. Then I shall investigate Paul's collection, in four stages. First, I shall set out the wider context of Paul's reference to the collection in Gal 2:10. To understand the collection we have to understand its origin. Thus I shall investigate the cause and the outcome of the Jerusalem Council and of the Antioch Incident. In addition to an understanding of the agreement reached concerning the collection these sections will directly provide us with material concerning Paul's understanding of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles. Secondly, I shall look at the collection agreement in the context of the agreement reached at the Jerusalem Council. Thirdly, a discussion of the key words οἱ πτωχοί, μνημονεύωμεν and σπουδάζειν and of the concept lying behind the collection agreement will be given. On the basis of our findings on Gal 2:10 we shall, fourthly, examine the other collection references in 1 Cor 16:1-4, 2 Cor 8, 2 Cor 9, Rm 15:14-33. They will show us whether there was one concept lying behind the collection from the beginning, or whether (and how) the concept developed.

4.2. Pauline Chronology

Before investigating Gal 2:10 we shall set out the framework of a chronology of Paul's life.

We have two external dates which are referred to in Acts:

Act 18:2 connects the appearance of Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth with the edict of Claudius. Because of a report of Orosius that Claudius expelled the Jews (or some Jews) "in the ninth year of that emperor's reign (i.e. from 25th Jan. 49 - 24th Jan. 50 C.E.)" ⁴¹⁹ this edict is usually dated 49 CE. ⁴²⁰ Some, however, identify the edict with a reference of Cassius Dio ⁴²¹ where he says that in his first year as emperor Claudius did not expel the Jews but merely forbade them to hold their meetings. They, therefore, date the edict in 41 CE. ⁴²²

However, Cassius Dio explicitly says that Claudius did not drive the Jews out of Rome (οὐκ ἐξήλασε μὲν) ⁴²³. ⁴²⁴ And I think there is not sufficient evidence to combine Orosius' and Cassius Dio's report into one event in 41 CE. ⁴²⁵ Rather, Orosius and Cassius Dio refer to two different events, one in 41 CE when the Jews were not ex-

⁴¹⁹ Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.57. See Orosius, *Historiarum* VII 6,15: Anno eiusdem nono expulsos per Claudium Vrbe Iudaeos Iosephus refert. sed me magis Suetonius mouet, qui ait hoc modo: Claudius Iudaeos impulsore Christo adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.

⁴²⁰ Taylor, *Antioch*, p.55; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.12; Dunn, *Romans*, p.xlix. See also the discussion in Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.183f, Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, p.131.

⁴²¹ Dio, *History*, LX, 6, 6: Τοὺς τε Ἰουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αὐτοῖς, ὥστε χαλεπῶς ἂν ἄνευ παραχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν τῆς πόλεως εἰρχθῆναι, οὐκ ἐξήλασε μὲν, τῷ δὲ δὴ πατρίῳ βίῳ χρωμένους ἐκέλευσε μὴ συναθροίζεσθαι.

⁴²² Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.183f; Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, p.139; Haenchen, Ernst, *Apostelgeschichte*, p.60.

⁴²³ Dio, *History*, VI,6.

⁴²⁴ See Dunn, *Romans* 1-8, p.xlix; Jewett, *Dating*, p.36ff and p.126 n.116. Since "the Jews had been equally numerous when Tiberius expelled them from Rome in A.D. 19" (Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, p.134) Cassius' explanation that Claudius did not expel them because of their number is - according to Murphy-O'Connor - "totally implausible." (ibid., p.134) However, the high number of Jews might be Cassius' own interpretation and not the actual reason of the fact that Claudius did not expel them. Additionally to Murphy-O'Connor a passage in Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium*, that Augustus did not expel the Jews from Rome and did not prevent them from meeting (ibid., p.136f) shows that Claudius in fact did expel the Jews from Rome. However, Philo would probably have referred to an expulsion had he known about it. Moreover, the assumed expulsion happened in 41 CE when - according to Murphy-O'Connor - Philo completed his *Legatio ad Gaium*. The fact, then, that this passage appears roughly in the middle of the *Legatio ad Gaium* and is thus probably written before 41 CE rather suggests that Philo had heard rumours about the fact that Claudius wants to expel the Jews. Hence he referred to Augustus, Claudius' model as a Roman ruler (see ibid., p.137), in order to prevent - or show his discomfort with- a possible expulsion.

⁴²⁵ See Sellin, *Hauptprobleme*, p.2987; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.54f.

pelled and the other in 49 CE when they were expelled.⁴²⁶ Hence I would date the edict of Claudius to 49 CE.

The second fixed date, the Gallio inscription,⁴²⁷ refers to Gallio's proconsulship in Achaia (Act 18:12). This is commonly dated 51-52 CE.⁴²⁸

Both, the edict of Claudius and the Gallio inscription, are referred to in Act 18:1-17: Paul came from Athens to Corinth (Act 18:1) where he met Aquila and Priscilla who had only recently (προσφάτως, 18:2) come from Rome because of the edict of Claudius. Hence Paul could have met them already in 49 CE. Paul had been in Corinth for about 18 months when the Jews brought him before Gallio.⁴²⁹ Counting 18 months back from the proconsulship of Gallio in 51/52 CE Paul probably arrived in Corinth in late 49 CE or early 50 CE⁴³⁰.⁴³¹ He then left Corinth in late 51 CE or more probably in early 52 CE.⁴³²

In addition to these two external dates we have one more fixed time span which can help us to determine the terminus a quo for another date in Paul's chronology.

⁴²⁶ See e.g. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p.xlix. See also Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.57f and Watson, *Paul*, p.93, saying that "disorders among the Roman Jews because of the preaching of the Christian gospel had been going on for some time before Claudius finally lost patience and expelled them in AD 49." The Jews "constantly made disturbance." (ibid., p.92f, emphasis by Watson)

⁴²⁷ See Sellin, *Hauptprobleme*, p.2987 n.243: the Gallio inscription is the "einzige(n) bisher unumstößliche(n) Fixpunkt urchristlicher Chronologie."

⁴²⁸ Ibid., p.2987; Schille, *Apostelgeschichte*, p.365; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.54f; Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, p.149; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.183; Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p.60ff

⁴²⁹ Since ἀθυπάτου ὄντος (Act 18:12) can be translated as 'while Gallius was proconsul in Achaia' the proconsulship of Gallio and the 18 months could be an overlapping time span. However, it is probable that the Jews were opposed to Paul for quite a while, but only with the change of the proconsul were they encouraged to bring Paul before the tribunal.

⁴³⁰ See Vielhauer, *Literatur*, p.73. The distance between Athens and Corinth is so little that we can assume that Paul could have travelled at any time of the year. See also Murphy-O'Connor *Gallio*, p.317.

⁴³¹ It is quite possible that Act 18:12 indicates another Lukan source of a stay of Paul in Corinth.

⁴³² A trip like the one reported in Act 18:18-22 can hardly be undertaken in winter (see Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3078-3082). And even a trip from Corinth to Ephesus (when deleting the whole passage Act 18:18-23; see Sellin, *Hauptprobleme*, p.2989) is easier to imagine in early 52 CE than in late 51 CE. Paul stayed the winter 51/52 CE in Corinth rather than taking up the risk of having to spend the winter somewhere on the way because of a delay or an early winter. Furthermore ἱκανός (Act 18:18) could indicate that Paul after the tribunal stayed till the winter was over. If the trial was in summer/autumn 51 CE Paul could have waited till spring 52 CE before undertaking the journey to Jerusalem mentioned in Act 18:18-22 or he could have gone directly to Ephesus (Act 19:1; see ibid., p.2988f). According to Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3079 the sea was dangerous from 15. September - 10. November and from 10. March - 26. May. Maybe Paul stayed in Corinth even till May 52 CE. See Vielhauer, *Literatur*, p.79: Paul could have started his third missionary trip (Act 18:23ff) "frühestens im Frühling 52..., da er den Taurus passieren mußte." In favour of the dates early 50 CE and late 51 CE see Murphy-O'Connor, *Gallio*, p.317.

In Gal 1:17f Paul says that he went from Damascus to Jerusalem. In Act 9:23-25f we hear that he soon after his 'conversion' fled from Damascus and went to Jerusalem. Finally in 2 Cor 11:32f Paul speaks of his flight from the ethnarch of King Aretas who guarded Damascus. The Nabatean King Aretas VI. ruled over Damascus between 37 and 39/40 CE.⁴³³ He died between 38 CE and 40 CE, most probably in 39 CE.⁴³⁴ This gives us the terminus ante quem for Paul's flight from the ethnarch of King Aretas.⁴³⁵ 37 CE, the year when Aretas took over the rule of Damascus is - according to Jewett⁴³⁶ - the terminus a quo for Paul's flight⁴³⁷.⁴³⁸

The main problem for Paul's chronology is how to relate μετὰ ἔτη τρία (Gal 1:18), διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν (Gal 2:1) and ἔπειτα in Gal 1:18,21,2:1. Does μετὰ ἔτη τρία refer to the return to Damascus (Gal 1:17) or to the revelation (Gal 1:15f)? Does διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν refer to the beginning of the mission in Syria and Cilicia (Gal 1:21), to the first trip to Jerusalem (Gal 1:18) or to the revelation? Does ἔπειτα always refer to the directly preceding mentioned event? Mußner is probably right in saying that ἔπειτα in Gal 1:21 is "in zeitlich anreihendem Sinn verstanden"⁴³⁹. This, however, does not necessarily mean that ἔπειτα in Gal 1:18 refers in the same way to the (probably) second visit to Damascus (Gal 1:17). Concerning Gal 2:1 Mußner himself does not understand ἔπειτα this way. He relates it to Gal 1:18.⁴⁴⁰

Striking is that Paul adds a number of years only when he speaks of his visits to Jerusalem (Gal 1:18, 2:1). If Paul was interested in listing all that he had done independently he probably would have mentioned how long he had stayed in Arabia and

⁴³³ See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.51; Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, p.129; Jewett, *Dating*, p.30-33; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.20f n.10; Hyldahl, *Chronologie*, p.17 n.38 and p.123 and p.123 n.21. Aretas died between 38 CE and 40 CE, according to Jewett, *Dating*, p.30 most probably in 39 CE.

⁴³⁴ Jewett, *Dating*, p.30

⁴³⁵ According to Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.20f n.10 and Hyldahl, *Chronologie*, p.123 this is the only information we can get from 2 Cor 11:32f.

⁴³⁶ Jewett, *Dating*, p.30-33.

⁴³⁷ See also Bruce, *Galatians*, p.95ff.

⁴³⁸ Wedderburn, *chronologies*, p.105 is surely right in questioning Jewett's argumentation saying that we do not "know enough about what control, total or partial, the presence of the ethnarch implies to be certain of these [Jewett's] arguments" and that we cannot be "sure that Luke is correct in connecting Paul's escape with the first Jerusalem visit." I see, however, no reason why not to connect Act 9:23ff with 2 Cor 11:32f and Gal 1:17f. The order 'from Damascus to Jerusalem' appears in Act 9:23f as well as in Gal 1:17f. On "Nabatean control of Damascus" (Murphy-O'Connor, *Gallio*, p.317 n.8) see Taylor, *Ethnarch*, p.724: "There is in fact no direct evidence for Nabataean control of Damascus at any point in the period we are considering outside 2 Cor 11, 32-33." "We are left, therefore, with Paul." (p.725) And the context of 2 Cor 11, 32-33 strongly suggests that the ethnarch of king Aretas was indeed the Nabataean governor of Damascus." (p.727)

⁴³⁹ Mußner, *Galater*, p.93.

⁴⁴⁰ As does Jewett, *Dating*, p.52. Jewett also takes ἔπειτα Gal 1:18 as referring to Gal 1:15f and not to Gal 1:17.

Syria and Cilicia. He, however, does not want to show for how long he stayed in which place, but instead how long after the commissioning he went up to Jerusalem. It is not his activity, but his independence which is the centre of his argumentation.⁴⁴¹ I think, therefore, that Paul went both three years and 14 years after his commissioning up to Jerusalem. Maybe Paul counted in the “ancient method of reckoning time,”⁴⁴² counting each fractional year as a full year.⁴⁴³ Hence his commissioning happened around 35 CE, his first trip to Jerusalem around 37 CE and his second trip around 47/48 CE⁴⁴⁴.

Since, therefore, it is not necessary to split up Act 18:1-17 into two visits to Corinth,⁴⁴⁵ and since I have dated this first visit of Paul in Corinth⁴⁴⁶ as lasting from 50 CE till 51/52 CE and the Jerusalem Council to 48 CE, Act 18:22 cannot refer to the Jerusalem Council.⁴⁴⁷ The independent mission to Greece and Corinth happened, therefore, after the Jerusalem Council.⁴⁴⁸

This view is supported by the accounts of Act 15-18. In Act 15 Paul and Barnabas go up to Jerusalem (cf. Gal 2:1) to discuss the problem of the circumcision of the Gentiles (cf. Gal 2:3). They come to an agreement (cf. Gal 2:9) and go back to Antioch (cf. Gal 2:11). In Antioch there occurs the Antioch Incident (cf. Gal 2:11-14a) which re-

⁴⁴¹ See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.72: “The emphatic denial of verse 17 [Gal 1:17]..., the fact that two of the ‘then’ conjunctions refer to visits to Jerusalem..., and the disclaimer of i.22..., all make it clear that it was his relationship with Jerusalem and the Jerusalem leadership in particular... which was Paul’s primary concern.”

⁴⁴² Jewett, *Dating*, p.53.

⁴⁴³ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.93 and p.101. Since “history, after all, is the area of the unique rather than the average” (Jewett, *Dating*, p.54) one should maybe reckon with a possible 16 to 17 years span from commissioning to Jerusalem Council. But maybe the unique history lasted in this very case actually only 12/13 years. (Against *ibid.*, p.53)

⁴⁴⁴ See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.51f. Even if Paul did not count the years in the ancient method (see Jewett, *Dating*, p.52-54) this would - since the year 37 CE is a fixed date - shift the year of Paul’s commissioning back to 34 CE and the trip to Jerusalem forward to 48 CE (maybe late 48 CE).

⁴⁴⁵ Following Knox, *Paul*, e.g. p.68f and p.72f, Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, Murphy-O’Connor, *Corinth*, and Jewett, *Dating*, identify Act 18:22 with Gal 2:1ff and thus date Gal 2:1ff after Paul’s first visit to Corinth (see Sellin, *Hauptprobleme*, p.2987; Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.37f; Watson, *Paul*, p.56f) They, therefore, have to read a lot into the rather dubious remark in Act 18:22 (see Sellin, *Hauptprobleme*, p.2988f; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.53; Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.37, speaks of a “cryptic reference.”) and to deny “the correlations between Act 15 and Gal 2.1-10.” (Taylor, *Antioch*, p.53) With this also the chronology of Acts has to be entirely changed, separating Act 18:1-17 into two different visits to Corinth (see e.g. Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p. 174-195, esp. 195) and predating Paul’s (independent) mission in Greece/Corinth before his break with Antioch (Lüdemann) or postponing the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident after Paul’s mission in Greece (Murphy-O’Connor and Jewett). But “it is more difficult to explain then Barnabas’ association with Paul in Gal 2.1,9, since Acts seems to imply that they parted company, as a result of a personal disagreement, in Act 15.39-41, before the second missionary journey.” (Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.37; see also Watson, *Paul*, p.57)

⁴⁴⁶ For the second visit see 2 Cor 9:1-5.

⁴⁴⁷ Sellin, *Hauptprobleme*, p.2990, holds that Paul went directly from Corinth to Ephesus in autumn 51 CE, thus omitting Act 18:22 as unhistorical.

⁴⁴⁸ See *ibid.*, p.2988 and p.2988 n.251.

sults in the break between Paul and Barnabas (Act 15:36-41).⁴⁴⁹ Afterwards Paul goes on his journey to Greece where he visits Galatia (Act 16:6-8, cf. Gal 4:13) and Corinth (Act 18:1-17). According to this view Paul would have had at least two years to travel from the Jerusalem Council to Corinth (48-50 CE).⁴⁵⁰ Furthermore it means that the Antioch Incident happened quite soon after the Jerusalem Council.⁴⁵¹

To summarise:

I agree with many scholars that Paul was commissioned around 35 CE, that he went up to Jerusalem for the first time after his commissioning around 37 CE and again to the Jerusalem Council in 48 CE. Soon after the Jerusalem Council there occurred the Antioch Incident before Paul left without Barnabas on his trip to Corinth - including Galatia, Philippi, Thessalonica and Athens - where he arrived around 50 CE. Important for us is the fact that I follow Gal 2 in its relative chronology and without a big time span between the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident, and also that the Antioch Incident marked Paul's break with Barnabas and with Antioch.

This is the chronological context of the agreement concerning the collection which we find in Gal 2:10.

449 It is a "triple breach - with Jerusalem..., with Barnabas..., and with Antioch." (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.130)

450 If we date the Council in late 47 CE and the arrival in Corinth in late 50 CE (counting 18 months back from the end of Gallio's rule in early 52 CE) Paul would have had even more time. Against Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3097 n.122, who reckons with Paul's arrival in Corinth in 49 CE which would not give Paul enough time from the Jerusalem Council in 48 CE.

451 See Hill, *Hellenists*, p.115-117. Vielhauer, *Literatur*, p.70-81, argues that "die sog. 1. Missionsreise hat nicht vor sondern nach dem Apostelkonvent stattgefunden." (ibid., p.76) In Gal 1:21 Paul would have mentioned it because he wanted to show that he had "lange Zeit und in großer Ferne völlig unabhängig von Jerusalem gewirkt" (ibid., p.74; see also Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3087) According to Wedderburn, *chronologies*, p.104 "this is an important point" and "a convincing one." It should not, however, be ignored that Paul in Gal 1:17-23 does not stress the fact that he was on missionary trips in Arabia, Damascus and Syria and Cilicia (against Vielhauer, *Literatur*, p.74: "während dieser Jahre hat Paulus missioniert"). The main point is the independence of Jerusalem. Independence of his mind and not of his mission is what Paul aims at in Gal 1 and 2. Furthermore Paul does not stress "die Länge der Zeit seines unabhängigen Wirkens." (ibid., p.74) Then he would have connected a number of years with his trips to Arabia and Syria/Cilicia. But instead he connected it with his trips to Jerusalem. Here again Paul stresses the fact that he was for many years distant from Jerusalem, but not that he was for many years an active missionary. Finally Paul did not put emphasis on the fact that he acted in "räumlich weit entfernten Gegenden," (ibid., p.76) but merely that he was removed from Jerusalem. It does not need to be far. In mentioning Arabia, Syria and Cilicia he mentioned the areas surrounding Judea. His stay in Gentile territory next to Judea has also an symbolic meaning in his claim for being sent to the Gentiles. See Hengel, *Mission*, p.18. Hence I do not think it was necessary for Paul to mention his mission in Pamphylia and Pisidia in Gal 1:21. His independence was sufficiently proven by the fact that he, only for a short time and only after many years, went up to Jerusalem.

4.3. Agreement in Jerusalem: Eschatology

Between his visits to Jerusalem Paul had associated with the church in Antioch where Barnabas seems to have been one of the leaders.⁴⁵² In the delegation⁴⁵³ he is Paul's senior partner.⁴⁵⁴

According to Act 15:1ff Paul and Barnabas were appointed (τάσσω) to go up to Jerusalem. Paul himself speaks of an ἀποκάλυψις (Gal 2:2). This has to be read in the context of Gal 1:12.16. Paul is dependent on God alone and in Gal 2:2 is not summoned by Jerusalem to account for his work.⁴⁵⁵

That the revelation in Gal 2:2 has to be related to a prophecy of Agabus (Act 11:27-30) could well be the case,⁴⁵⁶ "but Paul's language suggests rather a revelation received by himself."⁴⁵⁷

As a third member of the delegation they took Titus with them. That Gal 2:1 is "nicht kurz formuliert καὶ Τίτου, sondern umständlicher συμπαράλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον"⁴⁵⁸ probably indicates that he is subordinate to Paul and Barnabas.

According to Paul the purpose of the visit was to lay before (ἀνεθέμην) the Jerusalem leaders the gospel he preaches among the Gentiles (Gal 2:2).⁴⁵⁹ Since in questions about circumcision Jerusalem still was the recognised authority - at least for Jewish Christians in Antioch and for the Judaizers - this visit should end the difference

⁴⁵² See Hill, *Hellenists*, p.105. See also Act 11:22.30, 13:1ff, 15:2.

⁴⁵³ For the fact that it actually was a delegation as Act 15:1ff reports see Taylor, *Antioch*, p.96-103, esp. p. 102f; Hengel, *Mission*, p.18; Dunn, *Incident*, p.132; Holtz, *Apostelkonzil*, p.114 and p.120; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.16.

⁴⁵⁴ See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.102, Holmberg, *Paul*, p.18, Bruce, *Galatians*, p.107. See also Act 9:27, 11:25f. Against Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.14 n.9; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.94; Burton, *Galatians*, p.69. Both, however, were sent by and had the confidence of the Antioch church. Maybe only the fact that Barnabas was one of the leaders of the Antioch church and that he had a "Mittelstellung" between the "Urgemeinde und dem werdenden Heidenchristentum" (Oepke, *Galater*, p.73) made him practically senior partner in the delegation. He had "das besondere Vertrauen der Urgemeinde" (Mußner, *Galater*, p.101) for they knew him very well. See Act 4:36f, 9:27, 11:22f. See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.89. However, "Paul says 'I went up with Barnabas', rather than 'Barnabas and I went up'," (ibid., p.89) "as though Barnabas played no role in the whole matter." (Ibid., p.94)

⁴⁵⁵ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.102; Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3096.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., p.3096 n.119; Mußner, *Galater*, p.102 n.11.

⁴⁵⁷ Bruce, *Galatians*, p.108. See also Schlier, *Galater*, p.35.

⁴⁵⁸ Mußner, *Galater*, p.101.

⁴⁵⁹ "Ἀνατίθεσθαι τινί τι tells us nothing about the relative status of the parties involved." Dunn, *Relationship*, p.466. It merely means submitting something for consideration and opinion and not submitting to the authority of Jerusalem. See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.91f; Fung, *Galatians*, p.86; Burton, *Galatians*, p.71; Mußner, *Galater*, p.102. Against Holtz, *Apostelkonzil*, p.121; Schlier, *Galater*, p.35.

of opinion ⁴⁶⁰ between Antioch and the “unauthorised but influential visitors from Jerusalem.” ⁴⁶¹

Paul, therefore, on the one hand, stresses that he was only asking for Jerusalem’s opinion without being subordinate to their authority. By adding why he laid the gospel before them (μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, Gal 2:2) he shows, however, on the other hand, that “the judgement of the Jerusalem church mattered” ⁴⁶² to him.

There are mainly three possibilities in which to translate the phrase μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον: final, as an indirect question or as an expression of fear. ⁴⁶³

Because of the past tense indicative ἔδραμον I reject with the majority of scholars a translation in a final sense. ⁴⁶⁴ I do not think that Paul formulates an indirect question either. ⁴⁶⁵ Taking it as such the following ἀλλ’ is irritating. Ἀλλ’ can only mean that the fact that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised runs contrary to the fear that he could have been compelled. ⁴⁶⁶ I, therefore, favour the third possibility: μή πως introduces an expression of fear. ⁴⁶⁷ Hence Paul attributes at least some authority to the Jerusalem leaders. He argues for independence as well as recognition of his gospel from the Jerusalem church. ⁴⁶⁸

“His gospel made claims regarding its continuity with Israel’s promise and hope.” ⁴⁶⁹ He preached the gospel of the inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of God. ⁴⁷⁰ But without the Jewish Christians’ approval of this gospel his work - the inclusion of the Gentiles into God’s people - would be ineffective because the Gentile

⁴⁶⁰ Γενομένης δὲ στάσεως καὶ ζητήσεως οὐκ ὀλίγης, Act 15:2.

⁴⁶¹ Hill, *Hellenists*, p.117. “There is no evidence that the Jerusalem apostles authorised this opposition to the mission to the Gentiles.” (ibid., p.117 n.52)

⁴⁶² Dunn, *Relationship*, p.467.

⁴⁶³ See Oepke, *Galater*, p.74; Burton, *Galatians*, p.72ff.

⁴⁶⁴ See ibid., p.74; Mußner, *Galater*, p.102; Oepke, *Galater*, p.74; Schlier, *Galater*, p.36; Holtz, *Apostelkonzil*, p.121f n.5; Dunn, *Relationship*, p.467.

⁴⁶⁵ Against Mußner, *Galater*, p.102f; Oepke, *Galater*, p.74; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.18.

⁴⁶⁶ “The Jerusalem apostles had tried to persuade Paul to accede to the demand [to circumcise Titus], but did not insist; they were sympathetic to the demand, but... did not press the point.” (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.96)

⁴⁶⁷ This is the usage in Gal 4:11 (φοβοῦμαι... μή πως εἰκῇ κεκοπίᾳ εἰς ὑμᾶς) and 1 Thess 3:5 (ἐπειψα...μή πως ἐπείρασεν), as well. See Schlier, *Galater*, p.36. And also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.93: “genuine anxiety is expressed here.” Against Oepke, *Galater*, p.74. See also 2 Cor 12:20: φοβοῦμαι...μή πως...εὖρω ὑμᾶς....

⁴⁶⁸ Holmberg, *Paul*, p.15, speaks of a “dialectic between being independent of and being acknowledged by Jerusalem” as “the keynote of this important text.” See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.69.

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid., p.94

⁴⁷⁰ See Dunn, *Relationship*, p.468: Paul “had been preaching that acceptance of the good news of Jesus Christ without circumcision brought Gentiles into the people of God, made them heirs of God’s promise to Abraham together with believing Jews.”

church would be separated from the Jewish church.⁴⁷¹ Paul feared for unity. The unity not of 'the' church⁴⁷² but of God's renewed people, the Jewish believers and Paul's Gentile converts, was at stake if the Jerusalem leaders disagreed with Antioch's circumcision-free gospel and thus agreed with the Judaizers.

The Judaizers' challenge to the circumcision-free gospel of the Antioch church (Act 15:1 ἐὰν μὴ περιτμηθῇτε τῷ ἔθει τῷ Μωϋσέως, οὐ δύνασθε σωθῆναι), the question "ob die Beschneidung aller Glieder der Gemeinde... heilsnotwendig ist"⁴⁷³ is the cause of the dissent in Antioch and it is also the issue at the Jerusalem Council.⁴⁷⁴

The question was: how can Gentiles be included into the people of God,⁴⁷⁵ how can they belong to the covenant? And since - especially during the Maccabean period - circumcision became "the mark of the covenant people for most people of Paul's time"⁴⁷⁶ and a "fundamental principle"⁴⁷⁷ of Judaism some Jewish Christians like the Judaizers held that Gentiles had to be circumcised to belong to the covenant people.⁴⁷⁸

The Jerusalem leaders, however, recognised Paul's apostleship and gospel. Concerning his law-free gospel to the Gentiles⁴⁷⁹ they did not lay anything upon Paul and recognised that he worked for the same gospel as Peter and the Jerusalem church.⁴⁸⁰ "They could not question the source of Paul's success without questioning also Peter's."⁴⁸¹ This agreement (κοινωνία, Gal 2:9) included the division of labour: the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem and especially Peter should go to the Jews (ἡ περιτομή) and Paul and the Antioch church should continue with his work among the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη / ἡ ἀκροβυστία).

⁴⁷¹ See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.94.

⁴⁷² See Dunn, *Relationship*, p.476 n.32, saying that it is not certain "that Paul at this stage had a concept of 'the (world-wide) church' (singular)."

⁴⁷³ Holtz, *Apostelkonzil*, p.115.

⁴⁷⁴ This shows already the fact that Titus is mentioned in Gal 2:1.3. See *ibid.*, p.118. However, I do not think that the ψευδαδελφοί in Gal 2:4f are the Judaizers from Act 15:1f. The issue of the Judaizers is Gentile observance, the issue of the false brethren is Jewish observance (τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν). Against e.g. Taylor, *Antioch*, p.99; Dunn, *Relationship*, p.471. See §4.4..

⁴⁷⁵ See Dunn, *Incident*, p.131.

⁴⁷⁶ Dunn, *Issue*, p.305. (Emphasis by Dunn)

⁴⁷⁷ Taylor, *Antioch*, p.100.

⁴⁷⁸ "Such a Gentile, though a special sort of Jew (that is, a proselyte), would already 'count' as a Jew." (Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.545)

⁴⁷⁹ See Dunn, *Relationship*, p.469; Oepke, *Galater*, p.79; Burton, *Galatians*, p.89-91.

⁴⁸⁰ "We should not underestimate how astonishing a decision was here made: that Jews, leaders of a movement focused on Messiah Jesus, should agree in considered and formal terms that circumcision need no longer be required of Gentiles wishing to be counted full members of what was still a sect of second-Temple Judaism." (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.104)

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p.106.

Since Jerusalem, thus, at the Jerusalem Council agreed with Paul's concept of the Gentiles and disagreed with the Judaizers' concept, but vice versa at the Antioch Incident, we will have a closer look at Jewish concepts of the Gentiles.

In the Judaism of Paul's time there were basically four different categories of Gentiles which defined Gentiles in their relationship to the people of God.⁴⁸²

- a) the idolater,
- b) the convert, the proselyte, the Jew,
- c) the pagan resident, the 'alien-resident' living in Palestine,
- d) the 'God-fearer'⁴⁸³, the adherent to the synagogue in the Diaspora.

All four concepts have an eschatological as well as a day to day, quotidian aspect.⁴⁸⁴

There is a) the "fornicating idolater."⁴⁸⁵ This Gentile has no positive relation to the Jews at all. "By definition a Gentile was an idolater."⁴⁸⁶ The Gentiles are ἄνομοι because their life is not regulated by the Torah, and thus they are ἁμαρτωλοί.⁴⁸⁷ Hence for an observant Jew social intercourse with such Gentiles was impossible.⁴⁸⁸

Concerning the eschatological kingdom of God the role of such Gentiles was depicted either "in negative terms: judgement by Yahweh and servitude to Israel"⁴⁸⁹ or in positive terms: they will "worship and eat together with Israel"⁴⁹⁰ and thus "participate in Israel's redemption."⁴⁹¹ However, it will be a moral conversion from the idols to Israel's God and not a halakhic conversion from Gentile to Jew. They will be saved as Gentiles, and that means not converted.⁴⁹²

⁴⁸² For these following see Frederiksen, *Judaism*, esp. p.534f and p.540ff; and Dunn, *Incident*, p.143ff; Dunn, *Galatians*, p.119f. But also Sanders, *PPJ*, p.206-212; Sanders, *JJ*, p. 212-221; Segal, *Convert*, p.187-218. Using these four categories is not to assume "that all... [Jewish] jurisdictions would necessarily have reached identical conclusions in every case." (Cohen, *Boundary*, p.14) With Cohen "I freely admit that the paucity of evidence, and the frequent obscurity of the meager evidence that does exist, give a tentative character to my analysis; my... categories are chiefly of heuristic value." (Ibid.) See also Sanders, *Association*, p.170-188, who shows that "the real-life situation was more diverse." (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.119)

⁴⁸³ I take the definition of "God-fearers as accepting whatever parts of Judaism they like without giving up paganism." (Sanders, *Association*, p.188 n.31)

⁴⁸⁴ See Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.534 and p.544. See also Sanders, *JJ*, p.216 and p.216 n.28.

⁴⁸⁵ Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.540.

⁴⁸⁶ Dunn, *Incident*, p.142. See also Strack/Billerbeck, *Synagoge*, p.354.

⁴⁸⁷ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.168; Rengstorff, ἁμαρτωλός, p.325f. See also Gal 2:15 and Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.534.

⁴⁸⁸ See Strack/Billerbeck, *Synagoge*, p.374-378; Dunn, *Incident*, p.142.

⁴⁸⁹ Donaldson, *Curse*, p.99. See also Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.544f.

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid., p.548. See also Sanders, *JJ*, p.217.

⁴⁹¹ Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.544f.

⁴⁹² See ibid., p.547, saying that this point so far as she can see "has been universally missed."

The other extreme is b) the proselyte. This Gentile was “no longer a Gentile, but a Jew.”⁴⁹³ He “had certain disabilities,”⁴⁹⁴ but “came within the same limits of table-fellowship that applied to the native born Jew.”⁴⁹⁵

As a converted Gentile he entered the kingdom of God like any other Jew. He already is a full member of the community of the people of God. “The covenantal soteriology... covers both native-born Israelites and proselytes.”⁴⁹⁶

Somewhere in between we find the two other categories of Gentiles. These Gentiles are concerning the quotidian situation neither fully integrated nor fully excluded, and from the eschatological aspect their status reflects what seems to have been “the common Jewish view: in the last days the Gentiles can be admitted to the kingdom on some condition or other.”⁴⁹⁷

On the one hand there are c) the ‘alien-residents’. In the Rabbinic discussion about the question “whether or not... it is possible for Gentiles who do not become proselytes to be righteous”⁴⁹⁸ arises “discussion of the Noachian commandments.”⁴⁹⁹ To keep at least these Noachide commandments when living among Israel is “what was expected of Gentiles.”⁵⁰⁰ When Gentiles keep these commandments they are righteous and “will share in the world to come.”⁵⁰¹ Table-fellowship with such Gentiles, who thus have a halakhic status, seems to have been possible for the observant Jew.

⁴⁹³ Ibid., p.537.

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid., p.537.

⁴⁹⁵ Dunn, *Incident*, p.143.

⁴⁹⁶ Sanders, *PPJ*, p.206. “The proselyte probably had an ambiguous status in the Jewish community.” (Cohen, *Boundary*, p.29) “A gentile who converted to Judaism became not a Jew but a proselyte, that is, a Jew of a peculiar sort.” (Ibid., p.30)

⁴⁹⁷ Sanders, *JJ*, p.221.

⁴⁹⁸ Ibid., p.216.

⁴⁹⁹ Ibid., p.216. See also Dunn, *Incident*, p.143f and p.168 n.72. They are derived from the Noah story in combination with the laws for the ‘alien-resident’ in Israel in Lev 17-26. (See Segal, *Convert*, p.195) That they date from an earlier date than the Rabbinic sources “is clear from the Jubilee reference.” (ibid., p.197) See Jub 7:20-21.

⁵⁰⁰ Sanders, *PPJ*, p.211. See also Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.535.

⁵⁰¹ Sanders, *JJ*, p.215. See, however, also Sanders’ careful statement that “there seems to be no clear early statement to the effect that Gentiles who obey the Noachide commandments will be saved.” “The Rabbis did not actually have a general and comprehensive soteriology.” (Sanders, *PPJ*, p.210f)

On the other hand there are d) the 'God-fearers'.⁵⁰²

In distinction from the typical 'alien-resident' who lives in Israel under Jewish legislation the 'God-fearer' is to be found mainly in the Jewish Diaspora.⁵⁰³ "These Gentiles were free to observe as much or little of Jewish custom as they choose."⁵⁰⁴ "Halakhically, they are literally anomalous."⁵⁰⁵

Surely we should not over categorise. There is a wide range of opinions about both the 'God-fearers' and the 'alien-residents'.⁵⁰⁶ However, it seems to me that "the attitude of the Palestine Jew was stricter than that of the Diaspora Jew on the question of how far a Gentile had to go to be acceptable."⁵⁰⁷ Hence 'God-fearer-status' presumably is a typical status for Gentiles living in Jewish Diaspora, whereas the 'alien-resident-status' is mainly applied to the non-Jews living in Israel.⁵⁰⁸

In the light of these four categories I understand Gal 2:11ff thus that certain people from Judea came to Antioch saying that the Gentiles must become Jews to enter the kingdom of God. This occasioned the Jerusalem Council. And thus the Jerusalem Council was concerned with the status of the Gentiles in respect to their eschatological salvation. Jerusalem agreed with the Antioch church and Paul that the Gentiles will be saved as Gentiles. They do not have to become Jews to enter the eschatological people of God.

At the Jerusalem Council, therefore, the issues were Judaizing, the Gentiles and eschatology.

⁵⁰² I mainly follow Frederiksen, *Judaism*, in her point concerning the 'God-fearers'.

⁵⁰³ See Dunn, *Incident*, p.145, and Callan, *Decree*, p.293: "In the diaspora, where the Jews themselves were the resident aliens, the resident alien with respect to Israel would be the Gentile who was drawn to Judaism, but not strongly enough to convert completely. Such Gentile adherents of the synagogue are often called God-fearers."

⁵⁰⁴ Frederiksen, *Judaism*, p.548. Also Callan, *Decree*, p.294: These 'God-fearers' "may have differed considerably in the extent to which they kept the Jewish law and to which they entered into the life of the Jewish people."

⁵⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p.542.

⁵⁰⁶ See Dunn, *Incident*. p.147.

⁵⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p.147.

⁵⁰⁸ See e.g. Josephus, *War*, 2.463, who refers to Gentiles in Antioch who were 'mixed up' with Jews (καὶ μεμιγμένον ὡς βεβαίως ἀλλόφυλον ἐφοβεῖτο), "where the verb elsewhere denotes social intercourse including guest friendship." (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.121)

4.4. Disagreement in Antioch: Day to day Situation

At the Antioch Incident the other aspect of the question had to be clarified: ‘Gentilizing’, Jews, the day to day situation.⁵⁰⁹

“Paul did not startle the Jewish Christian community by saying that circumcision was unnecessary for gentile salvation.”⁵¹⁰ This was agreed upon at the Jerusalem Council. “His claim that the saved Jews and gentiles could form a single new community and freely interact was more innovative.”⁵¹¹ “The issue is not circumcision but purity.”⁵¹² “The lack of specifically Jewish customs was appropriate for a group of gentile Christians living alone, but it became a problem for the unified group of faith, made up of both Jews and Gentiles.”⁵¹³

Antioch was the biggest city in Syria⁵¹⁴ and the “third largest city in the Empire.”⁵¹⁵ Quite a lot of Jews were living there.⁵¹⁶ “They grew in numbers... and

⁵⁰⁹ See Hill, *Hellenists*, p.109: “The issue in Antioch, unlike that at the Jerusalem conference, was not Gentile but *Jewish* obedience.” (Emphasis by Hill) “The latter [the Jerusalem Council] had to do with gentile entrance, while the former [the Antioch Incident] was concerned with Jewish obedience.” “The risk [in Antioch] was that of ‘Gentilizing’.” (ibid., p.116) This is one of Hill’s main points concerning Gal 2:1-10 and 2:11-14a, and I think it is a good one. The issues of Gentile entrance versus Jewish obedience at the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident “are often confused, but they are very different issues.” (ibid., p.116) It is Paul’s distinct argument that “by attempting to preserve the integrity of the Jewish Christians as Jews, Cephas destroys the integrity of the Gentile Christians as believers in Christ.” (Betz, *Galatians*, p.112) See also Segal, *Convert*, p.194; Mußner, *Galater*, p.134; Dunn, *Incident*, p.155.

⁵¹⁰ Segal, *Convert*, p.194.

⁵¹¹ Ibid., p.194.

⁵¹² Betz, *Galatians*, p.104. At issue between Peter, Paul, and James was “the general question of association between Jews and Gentiles.” (Sanders, *Association*, p.172)

⁵¹³ Segal, *Convert*, p.201. At this point I will refer to the ψευδαδελφοί (Gal 2:4). Paul inserted into his account of the Jerusalem Council Gal 2:1-3 and 2:6-10 a reference to ψευδαδελφοί, and it is not clear whether they are the ones that caused the dissent in Antioch or whether they were brought in at the Jerusalem Council. (See e.g. Watson, *Paul*, p.50ff; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.15f; Mußner, *Galater*, p.107ff) Striking, now, is the fact that in Gal 2:4f as well as in Gal 2:14 ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου was at stake: Peter’s obedience to the law was against the ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. In Gal 2:4 Paul says that it was against the ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου that the false brethren spied upon the freedom ἡμῶν. Since Paul refers to the Galatians with ὑμᾶς (2:6), ἡμῶν can only refer to Paul and Barnabas. (Contrast Dunn, *Galatians*, p.101) Hence the false brethren tried to bring them - as Jews - under the law. Thus the issue in Gal 2:4-5 was the same as the one in Gal 2:11-14a: Jewish observance. And the fact that it is inserted into a context which revolves around a different issue explains sufficiently the awkwardness of the whole sentence. And we must remember also that the issue of Jewish observance was not the official issue at the Jerusalem Council. Only because at the Jerusalem Council nothing was decided in that matter the Antioch Incident could have happened. Hence it can hardly be the case that “Gal. 2:4-5 refers to controversies in the church at Antioch prior to the Jerusalem conference.” (Watson, *Paul*, p.51) This would have anticipated the Antioch Incident, which, then, hardly could have happened.

⁵¹⁴ See Josephus, *Ant.*, 16.148: Ἀντιοχεῦσι δὲ τοῖς ἐν Συρίᾳ μεγίστην πόλιν οἰκοῦσιν,... See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.79.

⁵¹⁵ Dunn, *Incident*, p.135.

were constantly attracting to their religious ceremonies multitudes of the Greeks, and these they had in some measure incorporated with themselves.”⁵¹⁷ Hence we can reckon with “a broad range of social intercourse between faithful Jew and God-fearing Gentile.”⁵¹⁸ And since “in the violence which marked relations between Jews and non-Jews in Syria in AD 66, Antioch was one of only three cities which spared their Jewish inhabitants,”⁵¹⁹ we may assume that the broad majority of the Jews living in Antioch did not very strongly hold to their national identity so that the Greek community did not perceive them as a threat. Hence I think that there was a considerable freedom concerning the Jewish law among the Jews⁵²⁰ in Antioch, and also for the Gentiles, who adhered to the synagogue.

Since, however, “reflection tended to follow experience”⁵²¹ the Antioch Incident happened at a stage when the Gentiles’ acceptance of the Messiah had already been experienced to a high degree, whereas reflection on what this new experience meant for the ‘old’ customs of Judaism had not yet started. Eschatological expectation conflicted with day to day situation.

Against this background we can describe the situation in Antioch thus that the Jewish Christians including Peter and the Gentile Christians who observed the Jewish customs in all sorts of varying degrees ate together in Antioch (2:12). The people from James, however, could not accept this behaviour and demanded instead the separation of the Jews from the Gentiles within the community. In Jerusalem they were used to a well defined degree of law-observance of the Gentiles which allowed the Jews to have social intercourse with them. For the people from James “the Jerusalem agreement required a Jewish believer to continue practising as a Jew.”⁵²² But this attitude Paul could not accept. The unity of Jews and Gentiles, the unity of the people of God, was at stake. For Paul the integrity of Jewish Christians as observant Jews was opposed to the integrity of Gentile Christians as believers in Christ within a mixed community.⁵²³ He wanted to include the ‘God-fearers’ in the community as full members. For him the ‘God-fearers’ had the same status as the Gentiles living like the ‘alien-residents’.

⁵¹⁶ See Josephus, *War*, 7.43: Τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαίων... ἐξαιρέτως ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἦν πολὺ. See also Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, col.149; Dunn, *Incident*, p.135 and p.165 n.34.

⁵¹⁷ Dunn, *Incident*, p.146. See Josephus, *War*, 7.45: the Jews of Antioch εἰς τε πλῆθος ἐπέδωκαν... αἰεὶ τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκείαις πολὺ πλῆθος Ἑλλήνων, κάκεῖνους τρόπῳ τινὶ μοῖραν αὐτῶν πεποιήντο.

⁵¹⁸ Dunn, *Incident*, p.147, and Callan, *Decree*, p.294.

⁵¹⁹ Dunn, *Incident*, p.169 n.83.

⁵²⁰ Κατασκοπήσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν, Gal 2:4.

⁵²¹ Hill, *Hellenists*, p.138.

⁵²² Dunn, *Galatians*, p.125.

⁵²³ See Hill, *Hellenists*, p.142.

Jerusalem, however, could accept social intercourse and thus inclusion only under the precondition of something like the Noachian commandments.

To summarise: concerning the eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles it was agreed that they would be saved as believing Gentiles without circumcision. This applied to Gentiles living as 'alien-residents' in Israel as well as to Gentiles living as 'God-fearers' in the Jewish Diaspora.

Concerning the day to day situation in a mixed congregation, however, Jerusalem expected 'alien-resident-status' of the Gentiles,⁵²⁴ whereas Paul accepted 'God-fearer-status' as a sufficient precondition for social intercourse between Jews and Gentiles.⁵²⁵ "Where Paul saw the agreement safeguarding the rights of Gentile believers, James may have seen it equally as safeguarding the rights of Jewish believers to continue living as Jews."⁵²⁶ There were "a number of misunderstandings among the parties to the agreement, or differences in interpretation."⁵²⁷

⁵²⁴ See Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.38.

⁵²⁵ Paul "was breaking down a ritual boundary in Christianity, not a boundary between saved and unsaved." (Segal, *Convert*, p.202) See also Berger, *Almosen*, p.203, saying that for Paul the Gentile Christians had "ohne jeden Zweifel volle Mitgliedschaft."

⁵²⁶ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.122.

⁵²⁷ Ibid.. Hence, I do not think that the collection arrangement was a 'unavoidable compromise' for Paul "if agreement on his primary objective was to be achieved." (Ibid., p.113)

4.5. Gal 2:10

Since at the Jerusalem Council Paul and the Jerusalem leaders seem to have had different understandings of the status of the Gentiles within Jewish Christianity,⁵²⁸ for our investigation we have to take into consideration that they could have had a different understanding also of the collection agreement (Gal 2:10).

When Paul wrote the letter to the Galatians he had already broken with Jerusalem, Antioch and Barnabas, with whom he had agreed upon the collection. Hence we cannot take it for granted that Paul's understanding of the collection has not developed since that time. However, on the third missionary trip Paul was concerned with the collection as indicated in 2 Cor 8 and 2 Cor 9.⁵²⁹ Gal 2:10, therefore, is more than just a reference to an agreement between Antioch and Jerusalem. But also a reference to Paul's collection among his churches.⁵³⁰ Hence being aware of the fact that the connections between the collection mentioned in Gal 2:10 and the collection mentioned in the other Pauline letters are probably "as tenuous as Paul's past links with the church of Antioch during the period subsequent to the Antioch incident"⁵³¹ we have "to consider the obligation to remember the πτωχοί in its own right."⁵³²

In Gal 2:9b-10a Paul reports the outcome of the Jerusalem Council: the Jerusalem leaders gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas (δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ κοινωνίας, Gal 2:9). Since Paul argues two different points in Gal 1-2 - that he is independent from but recognised by Jerusalem - it is not clear whether δεξιὰς διδόναι κοινωνίας implies superiority of Jerusalem or equality of Jerusalem and Antioch.⁵³³ This ambiguity⁵³⁴ probably reflects Paul's relationship to Jerusalem at the time when writing the letter to the Galatians. The insertion in Gal 2:6b: ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει· πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει shows that Paul at the time of the Jerusalem Council acknowledged the authority of James, Cephas and John more than

⁵²⁸ See §4.3. and §4.4..

⁵²⁹ See Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.39.

⁵³⁰ If the Galatians were already instructed about the collection - when dating 1 Cor 16:1-4 before the letter to the Galatians - they would have read Gal 2:10 in this wider context as well. See §4.5.1..

⁵³¹ Taylor, *Antioch*, p.116.

⁵³² Ibid., p.116. One presupposition is, however, evident and shared by most scholars: Gal 2:10 refers to a collection of money. This is not explicitly stated in Gal 2:10. But the writing of the letter near in time to 2 Cor 8 and 2 Cor 9 and, thus, also in the context of Rm 15 suggests that the 'poor' in Gal 2:10 and the 'poor among the saints' in Rm 15:26 are the same group of people. See Ibid., p.117; Hurtado, *Collection*, p.50.

⁵³³ That it is a "Zeichen der Unterwerfung" of Jerusalem can be excluded. (See Schlier, *Galater*, p.45)

⁵³⁴ See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.22, referring to Dunn, *Relationship*, and Dunn, *Incident*.

he does when writing the letter to the Galatians.⁵³⁵ Only at the Antioch Incident, then, did Paul change his attitude towards Jerusalem's authority - and they probably changed their attitude towards Paul. However, the Antioch Incident shows that a recognition of the Jerusalem authorities at the time of the Jerusalem Council does not necessarily mean that Paul was subject to their decision. The agreement (δεξιαι κοινωνίας) was one between churches and not individuals.⁵³⁶

Δεξίας δίδοναι is "Zeichen eines friedlichen Vertrages."⁵³⁷ However, it is not clear whether ἵνα in Gal 9b introduces the content of the agreement⁵³⁸ or perhaps simply the result of the Jerusalem Council,⁵³⁹ whether both Gal 2:9b and Gal 2:10a are the content of the agreement or only verse 9b, and whether the text is a literal rendering of the contract,⁵⁴⁰ a summary including key words,⁵⁴¹ or Paul's own free formulation⁵⁴².

The issue at the Jerusalem Council was the theological - 'theoretical' - question whether Gentile Christians who have experienced God's spirit need also to be circumcised⁵⁴³ and the 'practical' question whether Antioch can continue with its practice of admitting uncircumcised Gentile Christians to their community. Since Jerusalem recognised Antioch's 'Gentile-gospel,' the division of the mission into ἔθνη and περιτομή has to be regarded as a direct outcome of this recognition and, therefore, as part of the agreement. What was already practised was officially agreed upon:⁵⁴⁴ the work for the same gospel, on the one hand, and the division into εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας and εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς, on the other hand.

It is, therefore, likely that Antioch acknowledged a special status of Jerusalem as the authority in matters of circumcision, which is the reason for sending a delegation to Jerusalem. But at the time of the Jerusalem Council Jerusalem did not exercise its au-

⁵³⁵ See the change from past tense: ποτε ἦσαν to present tense: διαφέρει. See also Dunn, *Relationship*, p.470 and p.477 n.48; Dunn, *Theology*, p.126.

⁵³⁶ See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.88 and p.109; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.21; Mußner, *Galater*, p.121.

⁵³⁷ Schlier, *Galater*, p.45. See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.110.

⁵³⁸ "ἵνα epexegeticum." (Mußner, *Galater*, p.122)

⁵³⁹ "ἵνα finale." (Ibid., p.122)

⁵⁴⁰ "Wortlaut des Vertrages." (Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.21)

⁵⁴¹ "Wiedergabe seines wesentlichen Inhalts." (Ibid., p.21)

⁵⁴² "Aktualisierende Anspielung." (Ibid., p.21)

⁵⁴³ See Act 15:5.8f.

⁵⁴⁴ See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.110. There is, however, no indication that Jerusalem already before the Jerusalem Council acted as the authority which issued instructions to Antioch. Against Taylor, *Antioch*, p.109, saying that "the conference reaffirmed the κοινωνία between two churches." The κοινωνία was established at the Jerusalem Council.

thority. This would happen later at the Antioch Incident, where Jerusalem's authority concerned the conduct of Jews. But this was not in view at the Jerusalem Council. The κοινωνία was a mutual agreement "ohne den Nebengedanken der Überlegenheit dessen, der die Hand reicht."⁵⁴⁵ Jerusalem and Antioch were partners.

But what does the division of the mission into ἔθνη and περιτομή mean? Is it a ethnic, or a geographic division? Or does it reflect attitudes towards the law?⁵⁴⁶

I think to pose the question as an either-or of these three aspects is misleading.⁵⁴⁷ From a Jewish point of view all three aspects are closely connected. Going to the Gentiles (ethnic) means to go into Gentile territory (geographical) and to preach their inclusion apart from the works of the law (attitude towards the law).⁵⁴⁸ Since the issue at the Jerusalem Council was circumcision of the Gentiles, and not circumcision of Jews and Gentiles, being sent to the Gentiles means to go to the people whom the law-free gospel in the first instance concerns.⁵⁴⁹ Only at the Antioch Incident did Jerusalem realise that this eschatological idealistic view has to be adjusted to the day to day situation of mixed congregations.

With this division into two idealistically distinct areas Jerusalem did not exercise its authority, but merely recognised the gospel for the Gentiles as true gospel and set the seal on this fellowship in Christ by giving the right hand of fellowship.⁵⁵⁰

This means that it is unlikely that Gal 2:10, μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, should be seen as an obligation imposed upon Antioch.⁵⁵¹

Hence already at this stage of the investigation we can exclude the possibility of understanding the collection in terms of the Temple tax. Nickle⁵⁵² enumerates eight

⁵⁴⁵ Schlier, *Galater*, p.45.

⁵⁴⁶ For the following see Dunn, *Galatians*, p.110ff; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.115; Berger, *Almosen*, p.197 n.71 and p.198 n.73; Mußner, *Galater*, p.123; Munck, *Salvation*, p.119; Schlier, *Galater*, p.46; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.21f.

⁵⁴⁷ Against e.g. Berger, *Almosen*, p.197 n.71 and p.198 n.73; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.115.

⁵⁴⁸ See Burton, *Galatians*, p.97ff. Burton, however, rejects that Paul could have accepted a gospel for the circumcision (p.91f), and concludes that it is mainly a geographical division (p.98). See also Munck, *Salvation*, p.119.

⁵⁴⁹ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.110, speaks of a "division of responsibility" in contrast to a division of missionary responsibility. However, although this understanding makes good sense of James' role in the Antioch Incident, I think that the main point is the division of mission. In Jerusalem the eschatological status of the Gentiles was debated. And this issue concerns primarily the missionary praxis.

⁵⁵⁰ "Die Gemeinschaft (κοινωνία) könnte nach Art eines Freundschaftsverhältnisses gedacht sein." (Berger, *Almosen*, p.198)

⁵⁵¹ See also Dunn, *Relationship*, p.470.

⁵⁵² Nickle, *Collection*, p.74-93, esp. p.87-93.

points in support of this view.⁵⁵³ He also enumerates six points where Paul's concept differed from the Temple tax:⁵⁵⁴ the collection is not for sacrifices at the Temple, but for the poor in the church; Paul does not explicitly refer to the institution of the Temple tax, but has different explanations; the collection did not follow the highly organised procedure of the Temple tax collection; the Temple tax was annual; Paul accepted any amount of money; the tax was compulsory and not voluntary.⁵⁵⁵

I think that these 'variations' on the Temple tax mean that it can hardly be called a Temple tax anymore.⁵⁵⁶ Moreover, the Temple tax is not the only matter to which one can relate Nickle's parallels to the Temple tax. Unity⁵⁵⁷ is established by the institution of almsgiving as well; the men appointed to accompany the fund⁵⁵⁸ fit into the concept of the offering of the Gentiles in the context of the pilgrimage of the Gentiles as well; "central reception areas"⁵⁵⁹ are merely the easiest way of collecting money (if Paul had such points at all); Jerusalem was not just the centre and recipient of the Temple tax,⁵⁶⁰ but also the recipient and centre of almsgiving and the pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Zion.⁵⁶¹

Hence the collection is not a Temple tax, nor an obligation.

μόνον (Gal 2:10) refers back to οὐδέν προσανέειντο (Gal 2:6). The Jerusalem leaders only asked that the poor should be remembered.⁵⁶² They initiated the idea of the collection and Paul accepted it. And since it was not imposed it seems to be

553 "The parallels between the half-shekel Temple tax and the collection gathered by Paul for the Jerusalem community are too numerous to have been coincidental." (Ibid., p.87)

554 See Ibid., p.90-93.

555 Additionally to these six points point two of his supporting arguments should be subsumed under this category. "Paul should have chosen the Feast of the Tabernacles as the date of the delivery of his collection" instead of Pentecost (see Act 20:16) (Ibid., p.87f). And that Paul used "the protection provided under special concessions granted to Judaism by the Roman Government" is a mere hypothesis.

556 Thus also Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.26.

557 See Nickle, *Collection*, p.89.

558 See Ibid., p.88.

559 Ibid., p.88.

560 See Ibid., p.87.

561 See also Oepke, *Galater*, p.85; Munck, *Salvation*, p.287ff; Schlier, *Galater*, p.46; Mußner, *Galater*, p.126 and p.126 n.129. The fact that all had to pay the Temple tax and thus not just the Gentile Christians (see Ibid., p.126 n.129) is, however, not an argument against an understanding of the collection as Temple tax because it is nowhere said that the Jewish Christians did not pay any money; Keck, *Poor 1*, p.123f; Berger, *Almosen*, p.181, p.181 n.6 and p.199; Betz, *Galatians*, p.103. Against Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.29f; Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.62. Against Betz I do not, however, think that the collection "was felt to be a new venture without analogies." (Betz, *Galatians*, p.103) See Berger, *Exegese*, p.237: "Sollte man nicht häufiger mit *Anlehnung* an bestehende Institutionen und Modelle rechnen?" (Emphasis by Berger)

562 "Das an der Spitze stehende *μόνον* schränkt nicht nachträglich das οὐδέν προσανέειντο V 6 wieder ein." (Mußner, *Galater*, p.124) Against Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.13.

“supplementary rather than integral to the agreement.”⁵⁶³ However, Keck⁵⁶⁴ is probably right in saying that in any case decisive “is the fact that Paul does not in any way regard it as undermining the statement in v.6.” Paul himself did not regard it as an obligation.⁵⁶⁵ And the Jerusalem leaders did not seem to have regarded it as an obligation, a condition without which the contract is invalid, either.⁵⁶⁶

Hence Gal 2:9b gives the content of the agreement with 2:10a as a supplementary - though official - arrangement.

The formulation in Gal 2:9b-10a probably uses key words of this agreement and arrangement.⁵⁶⁷ Because of ἡμεῖς and αὐτοί (2:9) and μνημονεύωμεν (2:10) it can hardly be a quotation.⁵⁶⁸ Also the fact that the formulation is “kurz und unpräzise”⁵⁶⁹ is an argument against a full quotation. The fact that a verb is missing is also an argument for the fact that Paul did not freely formulate this phrase. If so he could have used a verb in the first person plural, saying that ‘we,’ ‘Jerusalem and I’ mutually agreed upon the collection. But instead he adds that he was eager to collect the money.

Hence Paul seems to be free enough not to have to quote exactly, but sufficiently bound to some key words or phrases to have been prevented from formulating totally new phrases. These key words probably include ἔθνη (ἀκροβυστία) / περιτομή, οἱ πτωχοί and maybe μνημονεύειν.

⁵⁶³ Taylor, *Antioch*, p.116. See also Betz, *Galatians*, p.101.

⁵⁶⁴ Keck, *The Poor 1*, p.123f.

⁵⁶⁵ See Dunn, *Galatians*, p.113.

⁵⁶⁶ See §4.5.3..

⁵⁶⁷ See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.21, who, however, takes Gal 2:10a as part of the “Abkommen” as well.

⁵⁶⁸ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.123 n.120.

⁵⁶⁹ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.21.

4.5.1. Gal 2:10 and 1 Cor 16:1-4

Before we finally ask for the historical, institutional and theological background of ‘remembering the poor,’ we shall ask how the Galatians perceived this passage. For this purpose we have to consider the chronological order of 1 Cor 16:1 and Gal 2:10.

Since the instruction of the Galatians (1 Cor 16:1) has probably happened during a visit we have to put the elements visit/instruction, 1 Cor 16:1 and Gal 2:10 into a chronological order. And since the visit must have taken place before 1 Cor 16:1 was written there are three possibilities to arrange these elements: a) Gal - visit/instruction - 1 Cor 16, implying that in 1 Cor 16 Paul does not refer to problems in Galatia because the problems had been solved in the meantime;⁵⁷⁰ b) visit/instruction - 1 Cor 16 - Gal, implying that the problems had not yet arisen;⁵⁷¹ c) visit/instruction - Gal - 1 Cor 16, indicating that Paul never speaks about troubles with other churches.⁵⁷²

Decisive is the question whether we have in Gal 2:10 an explicit reference to a present collection or not.⁵⁷³ The vague formulation of Gal 2:10, then, shows either that the Galatians could not yet have been instructed, or that the Galatians knew precisely about the collection so that an allusion to it was sufficient.⁵⁷⁴ Hence it can be argued both ways: the letter to the Galatians was written before or after instructions were given and 1 Cor was written. Nevertheless model b) sounds more plausible to me: Gal 2:10 is an allusion to the collection. The Galatians were already informed about it. Paul, then, avoids the possible charge that the collection shows his dependence on Jerusalem⁵⁷⁵ by adding that he was eager to collect the money. However, he “does not seem too concerned to deny such impressions.”⁵⁷⁶

⁵⁷⁰ See Watson, *Paul*, p.56ff and p.174 : Gal was written in Corinth (Act 18:1), the visit is that from Act 18:23, and 1 Cor was written in Ephesus; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.30ff and p.37 n.119: Gal was written in Ephesus, then instructions were given; Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.30 and p.37.

⁵⁷¹ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.9ff and p.124f n.125: the instructions are given through letters or delegates, 1Cor is written in Ephesus and Gal probably in Macedonia; Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3073-3080: the visit is that of Act 18:23 and Gal 5:7, 1 Cor is written in Ephesus as is Gal; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.149: the instructions are given from Ephesus.

⁵⁷² See Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.146 n.21.

⁵⁷³ See *ibid.*, p.30; Watson, *Paul*, p.59 and p.174f; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.30 and p.32f; Mußner, *Galater*, p.124f n.125; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.114f.

⁵⁷⁴ Hurtado, *Collection*, p.52, even speaks of a “carefully-worded reference to the Jerusalem collection in Gal 2:10.”

⁵⁷⁵ See Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.30.

⁵⁷⁶ Dunn, *Relationship*, p.470.

Since Paul probably did not give first instructions about the collection through delegates or letters⁵⁷⁷ the most plausible date for the instruction of the Galatians is Paul's second visit to Galatia (Act 18:23).⁵⁷⁸ Subsequently to this visit Paul went to Ephesus where he wrote 1 Cor 16:1. In 1 Cor 16:1 no problems with the Galatians are reflected because at that time Paul did not know of any troubles in Galatia.⁵⁷⁹

The letter to the Galatians is, then, written in Ephesus,⁵⁸⁰ or already in Macedonia⁵⁸¹. Thus the collection might have been "in vollem Gange"⁵⁸² until, one year after Paul's visit,⁵⁸³ the opponents came to Galatia. Paul could, then, have heard of their agitation one and a half years after his arrival in Ephesus.⁵⁸⁴ That the opponents changed the Galatians' opinion within only one year is, then, reflected in οὐτως ταχέως (Gal 1:6).⁵⁸⁵ Probably the collection was an issue in Galatia between Paul and the Galatians, without, however, being a major one.⁵⁸⁶

⁵⁷⁷ Against Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.149, and indirectly also Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.32, saying that the instruction was after the second - and last - visit to Galatia. This does not apply to 1 Cor 16:1-4, for it "enthält keine Bitte an die Korinther um Beteiligung am Kollektenwerk, sondern setzt die Beteiligung der Korinther bereits voraus." (Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.114 n.134) See also Nickle, *Collection*, p.15 and p.15 n.10 and Betz, *Corinthians*, p.142.

⁵⁷⁸ See Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3073, p.3077f; Watson, *Paul*, p.57.

⁵⁷⁹ Maybe there were some troubles during his second visit which caused him to warn the Galatians (Gal 1:9). These troubles, however, did not prevent Paul from instructing the Galatians.

⁵⁸⁰ Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3080f.

⁵⁸¹ Mußner, *Galater*, p.9f. The argument that "the fact that Paul is content to portray the episode at Antioch as unresolved, and to give impression of continuing hostility between himself and Peter must favour an early date," (Taylor, *Antioch*, p.46) and that Galatians is, therefore, written "not very long after the Antioch incident and prior to Paul's return to Antioch (Act 18:22)" (ibid., p.46) is a strong argument for dating the letter already at Paul's stay in Corinth (Act 18:1-4). (See Watson, *Paul*, p.58; Dunn, *Incident*, p.161, Dunn, *Galatians*, p.17ff) The similarities, however, between the issue in Galatia and that at the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident - circumcision of the Gentiles and Paul's recognition as an apostle - serve as explanation for Paul's portrayal of the Antioch Incident as well. How much Paul sees the two issues as identical is clear from the fact that the speech to Peter at the Antioch Incident in Gal 2:14ff marks the transition to the argumentation in the letter. If Paul wrote the letter to the Galatians already in Corinth it is surprising that the themes righteousness and justification are no central issues in Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians. However, most important for us is the fact that Gal 2:10 is an obvious allusion to the collection.

⁵⁸² Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.115.

⁵⁸³ Suhl, *Galaterbrief*, p.3078.

⁵⁸⁴ Ibid., p.3080.

⁵⁸⁵ This phrase does not, however, necessarily have a chronological meaning. See ibid., p.3078; Mußner, *Galater*, p.9 and p.53f.

⁵⁸⁶ Since it can be argued both ways: Galatians could be written before or after 1 Cor in Corinth, Ephesus or Macedonia the chronological reconstruction should not be the key argument for any particular understanding of the collection.

4.5.2. Key Words

Let us now finally turn to Gal 2:10 itself by looking at the key-words οἱ πτωχοί, μνημονεύειν and σπουδάζειν.

4.5.2.1. Οἱ πτωχοί

Since Karl Holl's essay *Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde* ⁵⁸⁷ it has been debated whether οἱ πτωχοί denotes "einen Teil der jerusalemischen Gemeinde," ⁵⁸⁸ or whether οἱ πτωχοί like οἱ ἅγιοι was a "feststehender, geläufiger Name" ⁵⁸⁹ for "die Christengemeinde in Jerusalem." ⁵⁹⁰ Applied to Rm 15:26: is οἱ πτωχοί τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ a genitivus partitivus (the poor among the saints), or a genitivus epexegeticus (the poor, that is the saints)?

For Holl οἱ ἅγιοι in 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8:4, 9:1.12; Rm 15:25.31 is a fixed title denoting the Christians in Jerusalem "als im Besitz eines Vorzugs, der sie dauernd auszeichnet." ⁵⁹¹ Rm 15:26 itself suggests a genitivus partitivus. However, since in Rm 15:27 Paul explains the collection as a duty towards the whole "Urgemeinde" ⁵⁹² Rm 15:26 is an epexegetic genitive, as well. It is "eine verhüllende Redeweise," ⁵⁹³ though. This Holl relates to οἱ πτωχοί in Gal 2:10. "Der absolute Gebrauch des Begriffs und die Tatsache, daß er keiner Erklärung bedarf" indicate to Holl "daß es sich hier um einen bekannten Titel der jerusalemischen Christen handelt." ⁵⁹⁴ Inasmuch as Paul is referring only to the poor he is, therefore, "downplaying any sense of it being a tax upon" ⁵⁹⁵ his churches. Hence the "Kirchenbegriff, von dem die Urgemeinde ausging" saw the Christian church as "eine einzige große Gemeinde" ⁵⁹⁶ with Jerusalem as the continuing centre.

⁵⁸⁷ Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, esp. p.58-63.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid., p.58.

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid., p.60. (Emphasis by Holl)

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid., p.59.

⁵⁹¹ Ibid., p.59.

⁵⁹² See ibid., p.59.

⁵⁹³ Ibid., p.59. I think, however, it is rather difficult to see in Rm 15:26 a "verhüllende Redeweise." How can it be a "verhüllende Redeweise" if οἱ πτωχοί and οἱ ἅγιοι are fixed and well known titles of the Jerusalem church? If the addition of οἱ πτωχοί is veiling the meaning of ἅγιοι it cannot have had a strong connotation of a title.

⁵⁹⁴ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.23. Georgi follows Holl concerning Gal 2:10. He disagrees, however, with Holl in respect to an epexegetic understanding of Rm 15:26. "Der zeitliche Abstand gegenüber dem in Gal 2.10 Berichteten hat sich hier auch sachlich bekundet." (Ibid., p.23 n.51)

⁵⁹⁵ Hurtado, *Collection*, p.52. See Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.60.

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid., p.61. (Emphasis by Holl)

And this is the reason for the fact that “diese Gemeinde ist befugt und verpflichtet, ein Aufsichts- und selbst ein gewisses *Besteuerungsrecht* über die ganze Kirche auszuüben.”⁵⁹⁷

Holl is taken up mainly in four different ways:

- a) οἱ πτωχοί is a self-designation in Rm 15:26, as well as in Gal 2:10;⁵⁹⁸
- b) οἱ πτωχοί has this meaning just in Gal 2:10;⁵⁹⁹
- c) οἱ πτωχοί as a title is the understanding just of the Jerusalem leaders;⁶⁰⁰
- d) οἱ πτωχοί is not a title at all.⁶⁰¹

In 2 Cor 8:4, 9:1.2 Paul talks about economic poverty in Jerusalem among the ἅγιοι.⁶⁰² As part of the Corinthian correspondence this applies also to 1 Cor 16:1. Hence even if οἱ ἅγιοι in 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8:4, 9:1.12; Rm 15:25.31 is a title of the Jerusalem Christians,⁶⁰³ this does not mean that the collection in 1 Cor 16; 2 Cor 8; 2 Cor 9 and Rm 15 is for the Jerusalem church as a whole.⁶⁰⁴ Paul can say that the collection is for the Jerusalem church as a whole. “However, that adds nothing to the case for seeing ‘the poor’ and ‘the saints’ as synonymous (v 26), since Paul would naturally regard a gift for the benefit of the poor members of the Jerusalem church as a gift to the church,”⁶⁰⁵ because it means helping them to support their poor members. That on average the Jerusalem church is “nicht die bedürftigste”⁶⁰⁶ is not very probable, either. Paul, then, could hardly have used the term διακονῶν (Rm 15:25) since it has the connotation of being a charitable act.⁶⁰⁷ Hence I disagree with Schlier, Lietzmann, Nickle and Holl.⁶⁰⁸ The most natural reading of Rm 15:26 is that of an genitivus partitivus.⁶⁰⁹

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid., p.62. (Emphasis by Holl)

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid.; esp. p.58-63; Schlier, *Galater*, p.46; Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.13; Nickle, *Collection*, p.138f and p.138f n.290.

⁵⁹⁹ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.23 n.51, p.40, p.40 n.136, p.81f and p.81f n.315; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.386; Hurtado, *Collection*, p.52.

⁶⁰⁰ Wilkens, *Römer 12-16*, p.126; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.875f; Bruce, *Galatians*, p.126; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.117ff.

⁶⁰¹ Keck, *Poor 1*, p.100-129, and Keck, *Poor 2*, p.54-78; Oepke, *Galater*, p.85; Mußner, *Galater*, p.125 n.126; Berger, *Almosen*, p.181 and p.196; Munck, *Salvation*, p.287ff; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.256ff; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, esp. p.107f; Bammel, *πτωχός*, p.909.

⁶⁰² See 2 Cor 8:14a, ὑστέρημα and περισσεύμα. See also Munck, *Salvation*, p.288.

⁶⁰³ Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.58f; Keck, *Poor 1*, p.118 and p.118 n.62. But see Bammel, *πτωχός*, p.909; Munck, *Salvation*, p.288.

⁶⁰⁴ This is, however, Holl’s argument. Rm 15:26 has to be interpreted in the light of the passages where οἱ ἅγιοι is used absolutely rather than vice versa.

⁶⁰⁵ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.876. See also Berger, *Almosen*, p.196.

⁶⁰⁶ Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.59.

⁶⁰⁷ See e.g. 2 Cor 8:4.19,9:12. Also Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, c.368f; Keck, *Poor 1*, p.118 n.63.

⁶⁰⁸ Schlier, *Galater*, p.46; Lietzmann, *Galater*, p.13; Nickle, *Collection*, p.138f and p.138f n.290; Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.58-63.

I also do not think that οἱ πτωχοί at least in Gal 2:10 is a self-designation of the Jerusalem church. If οἱ πτωχοί is a title it is an honorary title.⁶¹⁰ Together with οἱ δοκοῦντες in Gal 2:6 it would denote Jerusalem's priority and superiority. In Gal 2:6b, however, Paul plays this aspect down concerning οἱ δοκοῦντες. And there seems to be no need for him to play down any connotation of superiority of οἱ πτωχοί. It does not seem to have provoked an impression of Paul's subordination to Jerusalem. Maybe Paul just does not want to stress the fact that Jerusalem is the recipient of the collection. Thus he just says 'the poor' and not 'the poor among the saints.'⁶¹¹ I think that neither Paul nor the Galatians read οἱ πτωχοί in Gal 2:10 as such a title. Hence it does not seem to have been a well known title of the Jerusalem Christians, neither at the time of the letter to the Galatians, nor at the time of the Jerusalem Council.

Even the fact that it denotes merely the self-understanding of the Jerusalem Christians is hard to imagine. I do not think that the Jerusalem church "erhob mitten in der heiligen Stadt der Juden Anspruch, das eschatologische Gottesvolk zu sein."⁶¹² This would show that they had "ein recht aggressives Selbstbewußtsein."⁶¹³ But they had to be careful not to provoke the zeal of their fellow Jews. And the fact that the people in Qumran called themselves 'the poor'⁶¹⁴ - if they did at all⁶¹⁵ - cannot be taken as proof for the fact that Jewish Christians claimed the same exclusiveness within the Holy City, since they did not live distinct from their fellow Jews as did the people in Qumran, who separated themselves from the other Jews.⁶¹⁶

"'Die Armen' ist... als feststehendes Würdeprädikat der Gemeinde nicht zu erweisen."⁶¹⁷

⁶⁰⁹ See Wilkens, *Römer 12-16*, p.126; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.875; Keck, *Poor 1*, p.119; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.386f. See also Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.81 n.315.

⁶¹⁰ Schlier, *Galater*, p.46: πτωχοὶ τῶν ἀγίων is "der messianische Ehrenname;" Käsemann, *Römer*, p.386: "Ehrentitel;" Munck, *Salvation.*, p.287: "honourable epithet."

⁶¹¹ Against Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.60.

⁶¹² Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.24.

⁶¹³ Ibid., p.24 n.61.

⁶¹⁴ See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.875f; Wilkens, *Römer 12-16*, p.125.

⁶¹⁵ See Keck, *Poor 2*, p.54-78, esp. p.66ff and p.76f.

⁶¹⁶ See also Kuhn, *Qumrantexte*, esp. p.193f: "der Befund in den Qumrantexten kann zwar dafür sprechen, daß sich auch die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde von der gleichen atl.-frühjüdischen Tradition her so bezeichnet hat, aber Sicherheit ist nicht zu gewinnen."

⁶¹⁷ Berger, *Almosen*, p.196. See also Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.108. Also the fact that a later Jewish-Christian sect called itself 'Ebionites' does not show that it was a self-designation of the Christians earlier on. "Every church calls itself apostolic in some sense." (Keck, *Poor 2*, p.55) And this is what the Ebionites do when "referring to the communal tradition reported in Acts." (Ibid., p.55) Against Nickle, *Collection*, p.138f n.290; Holl, *Kirchenbegriff*, p.60 and p.60 n.2; Schlier, *Galater*, p.46.

4.5.2.2. Μνημονεύωμεν and σπουδάζειν

Μνημονεύωμεν appears 21 times in the New Testament⁶¹⁸, three of which are in Paul's writings⁶¹⁹. It means 'to recall,'⁶²⁰ to keep or to have something past in mind,⁶²¹ consider it⁶²² and to be aware of its impact.⁶²³ It causes a certain action.⁶²⁴ The remembrance influences one's behaviour and is followed by a reaction (to consider, recognise, imitate, repent). Μνημονεύειν itself does not denote this reaction.⁶²⁵ Hence in Gal 2:10 μνημονεύωμεν does not denote a "tätige Unterstützung"⁶²⁶ or mean "fürsorgend gedenken."⁶²⁷ Only in the context of remembering 'the poor' does it take on this connotation. And since mere remembrance cannot be imposed, the Jerusalem leaders merely intended a moral obligation.⁶²⁸

"If this financial support was to be directed exclusively to beneficiaries in Jerusalem... then qualities other than material poverty... were criteria of receiving this aid."⁶²⁹ I do not, however, think that this criterion was the "obligation towards those from whom the faith had been received."⁶³⁰ This is Paul's later interpretation to his churches (Rm 15:27). It is hard to imagine the Jerusalem church saying: 'we gave you the gospel and you now give us some money instead.' The issue at the Jerusalem Council was the relation of the Gentiles to the people of God. And the additional arrangement has most likely something to do with this issue. Hence the collection has something to do with the inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of God.

⁶¹⁸ Mt 16:9; Mk 8:18; Lk 17:32; Joh 15:20, 16:4.21; Act 20:31.35; Gal 2:10; Eph 2:11; Col 4:18; 1 Thess 1:3, 2:9; 2 Thess 2:5.8; Heb 11:15.22, 13:7; Rev 2:5, 3:3, 18:5.

⁶¹⁹ 1 Thess 1:3, 2:9; Gal 2:10.

⁶²⁰ Joh 16:4.21; 2 Thess 2:5; Heb 11:22.

⁶²¹ Act 20:31; 1 Thess 2:9; Rev 18:5.

⁶²² Lk 17:32; Joh 15:20; 2 Thess 2:8.

⁶²³ 1 Thess 1:3. (Col 4:18) It can also mean to remember in prayer: Mt 16:9; Mk 8:18; Eph 2:11.

⁶²⁴ Act 20:35; Heb 13:7; Rev 2:5, 3:3.

⁶²⁵ The fact that some kind of reaction is demanded when remembering something is also seen by the fact that μνημονεύειν quite often appears as an imperative (Lk 17:32; John 15:20; Act 20:31; Eph 2:11; Col 4:18; 1 Thess 2:9; 2 Thess 2:8; Heb 13:7; Rev 2:5, 3:3).

⁶²⁶ Berger, *Almosen*, p.196.

⁶²⁷ Ibid., p.196 n.69.

⁶²⁸ See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.116ff. With his concept of the κοινωνία as denoting Jerusalem's superiority he does not, however, give enough weight to the fact that it is a moral obligation. See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.113.

⁶²⁹ Taylor, *Antioch*, p.119.

⁶³⁰ Ibid., p.117

Some scholars conclude from the fact that *μνημονεύωμεν* is present subjunctive that the Jerusalem church asked them to continue remembering the poor.⁶³¹ This could imply that they had already at least once received money from Antioch before (see Act 11:30) or at the Jerusalem Council. However, Act 11:26ff would have been a “Blitzbesuch,”⁶³² or Luke is wrong in talking of two events in Act 11 and Act 15 which were actually the one event in Gal 2:1-10.⁶³³ More probable, therefore, is the meaning of a practice in the future.⁶³⁴ That this is implied is made clear by Gal 2:10b. “Durch ὃ καί [Gal 2:10b] versteht sich der Aorist ἐσπούδασα klar als *nachfolgende* Ausführung des Exhortativs.”⁶³⁵ In other words ἐσπούδασα is not a pluperfect, but a past tense in relation to the time of the writing of the letter to the Galatians.⁶³⁶

Because of the change from the first person plural to the first person singular the action described by ἐσπούδασα is in contrast to the subject of *μνημονεύωμεν*⁶³⁷ “a reference to Paul’s subsequent diligence in fulfilling the stipulation then made.”⁶³⁸ It means “‘to make diligent effort’ to do a thing.”⁶³⁹ “Apparently, therefore, it can not refer simply to the apostle’s state of mind, but either to a previous or subsequent activity on his part.”⁶⁴⁰ Since there is no evidence that Paul brought money to Jerusalem between the Jerusalem Council and the time when he wrote the letter to the Galatians the aorist cannot denote a completed previous action: ‘which effort I finished eagerly’ (egressive), but only the beginning of an subsequent action (ingressive). And since the ingressive meaning excludes the egressive meaning the aorist does not indicate that Paul had stopped long ago with this eagerness. The aorist suggests some discontinuity,⁶⁴¹ but it does not mean that Paul has not taken the collection up again.⁶⁴² To relate the discontinuity with Paul’s break with Antioch, then, is very plausible.⁶⁴³

⁶³¹ See Bruce, *Galatians*, p.126; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.27ff; Hurtado, *Collection*, p.52; Fung, *Galatians*, p.102; Burton, *Galatians*, p.99.

⁶³² Mußner, *Galater*, p.124 n.124

⁶³³ See also Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.13 n.3 and p.30f and Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.105-110.

⁶³⁴ Thus Betz, *Galatians*, p.102 n.420; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.29; Mußner, *Galater*, p.124 n.124; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.105-110. See also Burton, *Galatians*, p.99f. Against Keck, *Poor 1*, p.123.

⁶³⁵ Mußner, *Galater*, p.124 n.124. (Emphasis by Mußner) See also Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.106f.

⁶³⁶ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.124 n.124; Watson, *Paul*, p.230 n.53. Against Bruce, *Galatians*, p.126; Oepke, *Galater*, p.83.

⁶³⁷ See Mußner, *Galater*, p.124 n.124.

⁶³⁸ Burton, *Galatians*, p.100. It cannot mean “an effort on behalf of the poor at the very time in progress..... This would have required an imperfect tense, and in all probability... the plural number.” (Ibid., p.100)

⁶³⁹ Ibid., p.99.

⁶⁴⁰ Ibid., p.99f. Against Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.109.

⁶⁴¹ Against Lüdemann, p.110, who holds that Gal 2:10 and “sämtliche in den Paulusbriefen enthaltene Kollekttenotizen a) auf die Regelung in Jerusalem zurückgehen und b) auf ein- und dieselbe

Aktion zu beziehen sind." If so Paul would have used the imperfect since this would have shown even more his commitment to this agreement.

⁶⁴² Against Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.32f, who stresses too much that Paul's eagerness to fulfil the agreement lay so long in the past that even at the time when writing to the Galatians Paul had not taken up the collection again; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.198.

⁶⁴³ Thus *ibid.*, e.g. p.198 n.1; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.33. Against Betz, *Galatians*, p.102.

4.5.3. The Collection as Almsgiving

Now we will try to answer the question which concept or idea was lying behind the collection arrangement. How does it fit into the context of the issues at the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident?

As I have argued above an understanding of the collection as a *Temple tax* can be excluded.

The motif of the *pilgrimage* of the Gentiles to Zion, together with “the widely held Jewish expectation that the wealth of the nations would flow into Jerusalem in the end time,”⁶⁴⁴ is probably in Paul’s mind in Romans (esp. Rm 15:25ff). However, in Jewish expectation it follows the restoration of Israel.⁶⁴⁵ Hence it can hardly have been Jerusalem’s understanding at the time of the Jerusalem Council. In Rm 9-11 Paul turned this eschatological expectation upside down. He wanted to make the Jews jealous instead.⁶⁴⁶ But he hardly has “diese ‘heilsgeschichtlich-eschatologische’ Deutung seiner Mission schon den drei ‘Säulen’ in Jerusalem vorgetragen.”⁶⁴⁷ Hence it does not serve as a concept at the time of the Jerusalem Council.

To Georgi mounting problems in Paul’s congregations precede the resumption of the collection. It is “*pädagogisches Mittel für verwirrte Gemüter.*”⁶⁴⁸ However, this concept is too much based on a discontinuity of the collection even up to the letter to the Galatians, which I do not agree with. Hence it does not serve as an idea behind the collection.

Watson⁶⁴⁹, on the basis of his chronological decision that “the crisis in Galatia preceded the institution of the collection there,”⁶⁵⁰ argues that the collection enterprise was meant “to secure *Jerusalem’s recognition* of their [Paul’s congregations] legiti-

⁶⁴⁴ Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, p.874. See also Hill, *Hellenists*, p.173-178. esp. p.176f; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.30 and p.84ff; Munck, *Salvation*, p.303-305.

⁶⁴⁵ See Hengel, *Mission*, p.20: “die Hinwendung der Völker zu dem Gott Israels [is] erst eine Konsequenz des vollen Anbruchs der Heilszeit.”

⁶⁴⁶ See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.84ff.

⁶⁴⁷ Hengel, *Mission*, p.21. Moreover “vermutlich hat er diese Schau erst im Vollzug seiner unabhängigen ‘Weltmission’ von der sog. 2. Missionsreise an entwickelt.” (Ibid., p.21)

⁶⁴⁸ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.37. (My emphasis)

⁶⁴⁹ Watson, *Paul*, p.174ff.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid., p.175.

macy”⁶⁵¹ “so that they would stop trying to undermine them.”⁶⁵² To Watson this is the only possible reason for instituting the collection in Galatia, so shortly after the Galatian crisis.

Watson does not, however, give any reason for the fact that Paul in the first instance accepted the “request of the ‘pillars’ in Jerusalem.”⁶⁵³ And his concept reckons with “infiltration by the emissaries of Jerusalem.”⁶⁵⁴ With this, however, Watson shows that he does not distinguish between the issue at the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident. According to the agreement at the Jerusalem Council James and the Jerusalem leaders had no interest at all in undermining Paul’s law-free gospel to the Gentiles. What they were opposed to was Jewish disobedience only. If they demanded law observance they did it not for the salvation of the Gentiles, but for the observance of the Jews.⁶⁵⁵ Hence recognition on the part of Jerusalem does not seem to have been the point of the collection.

More likely a reason for the agreement in Gal 2:10 and Paul’s acceptance of it is *recognition on Antioch’s and the Gentiles’ part of the church in Jerusalem as the mother-church of the renewed Israel.*⁶⁵⁶ “Paul’s recognition of Jerusalem was essentially an acknowledgement that there was one gospel and that this gospel originated in Jerusalem and still was, in a sense, a Jerusalem gospel. Thus he acknowledged... that to be valid, his own preaching must be one with theirs.”⁶⁵⁷ This is one of the reasons for the fact that Paul in Gal 1-2 refers to the collection at all: he shows his independence, but he also shows that he recognised Jerusalem.

Hand in hand with this motif goes the recognition of *unity* between Jews and Gentiles. Since the agreement divided the mission into two - idealistically - distinct areas the collection served as a symbol of recognition of the Jerusalem church. “Paul agreed to help... to present a token of the unity of the whole church.”⁶⁵⁸ Maybe the

⁶⁵¹ Ibid., p.175. (My emphasis)

⁶⁵² Ibid., p.175.

⁶⁵³ Ibid., p.174.

⁶⁵⁴ Ibid., p.175.

⁶⁵⁵ “I do not think that the circumcision-free gospel of Paul was at stake, at least on the part of James and what appears to be the mainstream of Jerusalem Christian opinion.” (Hill, *Hellenists*, p.176) That Paul feared the *ψευδαδελφοί* as his opponents is not “the most likely possibility... since acceptance by James would probably have been the significant indicator of the success of the collection to Paul (compare Gal. 2:4-6, in which it is the acceptance of the ‘pillars,’ James included, which was decisive).” (Ibid.)

⁶⁵⁶ See Fung, *Galatians*, p.102f; Oepke, *Galater*, p.85; Schlier, *Galater*, p.47; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.29; Mußner, *Galater*, p.126.

⁶⁵⁷ Hill, *Hellenists*, p.174. For Paul “the continuity of covenant and salvation-history which Jerusalem symbolized remained fundamental.” (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.114)

⁶⁵⁸ Keck, *Poor 1*, p.126. See also Mußner, *Galater*, p.126.

collection was “die einzig sichtbare Klammer zwischen Juden- und Heidenchristen,” ⁶⁵⁹ showing the “unity of purpose with the church in Jerusalem.” ⁶⁶⁰

Hence the *theological motives* of the collection are these motives of *recognition* of and *unity* with Jerusalem.

The *practical motif* then would be the fact that the collection was an act of *charity* for the economically poor members of the Jerusalem church. The Jerusalem congregations seem to have been more than “other Hellenistic cities of Greece and Asia Minor” ⁶⁶¹ “in real economic distress,” ⁶⁶² and “Verfolgungen mußten die wirtschaftliche Notlage verschärfen.” ⁶⁶³ These economic difficulties might have increased in the Sabbath year in 47/48 CE, ⁶⁶⁴ the date of the Jerusalem Council. Hence a request of the pillars for support from the Gentile churches outside Israel is even more plausible. That Paul was eager to fulfil this part of the agreement might suggest a certain urgency of the financial support as well.

Hence the collection had the *practical* cause of real and maybe increasing poverty in the Jerusalem church. The *theological* motives of the collection could be described as *recognising* Jerusalem as the origin of the gospel and being a symbol for the *unity* of Jews and Gentiles. ⁶⁶⁵

These motives, now, are an integral part of the *institution of almsgiving*. ⁶⁶⁶

In Paul’s time Gentiles were - by some Jews - thought to be righteous “nicht nur durch Zugehörigkeit zur Gruppe sondern auch durch ‘sympathisierendes’ Verhalten zu ihr.” ⁶⁶⁷ Conversion to the God of Israel and not circumcision - as the entrance requirement for the Gentiles to belong to Israel - made a righteous Gentile. Almsgiving,

⁶⁵⁹ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.22.

⁶⁶⁰ Hill, *Hellenists*, p.174. See also Nickle, *Collection*, p.111-129; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.257.

⁶⁶¹ Betz, *Galatians*, p.102. See, however, 2 Cor 8:2f.

⁶⁶² Martin, *Corinthians*, p.256. See also Dunn, *Galatians*, p.112.

⁶⁶³ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.24. See Martin, *Corinthians*, p.256. But see also Betz, *Galatians*, p.102.

⁶⁶⁴ See Hyldahl, *Chronologie*, p.113f. See, however, Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.109 n.119.

⁶⁶⁵ Charity as a motif can be understood in theological terms as well. See Nickle, *Collection*, p.100-111; Keck, *Poor 1*, p.125; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.256.

⁶⁶⁶ We should “häufiger mit *Anlehnung* an bestehende Institutionen und Modelle rechnen.” (Berger, *Exegese*, p.237, emphasis by Berger) And almsgiving can serve as this model for the collection.

⁶⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p.194.

now, is “Ausweis der Gerechtigkeit ganz allgemein und Ausdruck der Ernsthaftigkeit, mit der die Bekehrung aufgefaßt wurde.” ⁶⁶⁸ It is “das Kennzeichen für Bekehrung.” ⁶⁶⁹

Being an expression of the conversion to the God of Israel the institution of almsgiving expresses the “Beziehung des Außenstehenden, des Sympathisanten oder des Neubekehrten zum jüdischen Volk.” ⁶⁷⁰ It is the “Kriterium des Gemeinschaftswillens sowohl für ‘Gottesfürchtige’ als auch für Proselyten.” ⁶⁷¹ Hence Paul’s acceptance of the request of the ‘pillars’ showed “daß Paulus sehr an der Einheit mit Jerusalem lag:” ⁶⁷² the collection of money regulates “das Verhältnis der paulinischen Gemeinden zur Jerusalemer Gemeinde im Sinne einer Gemeinschaft.” ⁶⁷³

When understood in this light the collection is an answer to the question of the Jerusalem Council: how can the Gentiles be saved, how can they be righteous? In Jerusalem was debated whether Gentiles Christians needed to be circumcised, whether they had to become Jews, to be counted among the people of God. And it was agreed that they belong to the eschatological people of God without becoming Jews. ⁶⁷⁴ But although almsgiving “was widely understood within Judaism as a central and crucial expression of covenant righteousness,” ⁶⁷⁵ nevertheless, I do not think that the Jerusalem leaders thought of it as being almost a substitute for circumcision. The Gentiles belong to the children of Abraham through faith in Jesus Christ. And only then, as a “Kennzeichen” ⁶⁷⁶ and “Ausdruck der Ernsthaftigkeit” ⁶⁷⁷ of their conversion to the God of Israel, were they expected to give alms. ⁶⁷⁸

⁶⁶⁸ Ibid., p.190.

⁶⁶⁹ Ibid., p.194f n.60.

⁶⁷⁰ Ibid., p.192.

⁶⁷¹ Ibid., p.190.

⁶⁷² Ibid., p.196.

⁶⁷³ Ibid., p.197.

⁶⁷⁴ Gentile believers, Paul and the Jerusalem leaders understood that “by conversion and baptism they [the Gentile Christians] had entered into the blessings of the promise to Abraham.” (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.129, who attribute this opinion to Gentile believers only) See also Cohen, *Boundary*, p.27, who says that “as far as is known no (non-Christians) Jewish community in antiquity accepted male proselytes who were not circumcised. Perhaps the god of the Jews would be pleased with gentiles who venerate him and practiced some of his laws, and perhaps in the day of the eschaton gentiles would not need to be circumcised to be part of god’s holy people: but if those gentiles wanted to join the Jewish community in the here and now, they had to accept circumcision.”

⁶⁷⁵ Dunn, *Galatians*, p.112.

⁶⁷⁶ Berger, *Alsmosen*, p.194f n.60.

⁶⁷⁷ Ibid., p.194f n.60.

⁶⁷⁸ Hence, I do not think that with the collection the Jerusalem leaders “sought to win what they regarded as an important concession from Paul and Barnabas.” (Dunn, *Galatians*, p.113) If they decided on “an obligation characteristically understood as a primary expression of Jewish covenant piety” (ibid.) and, thus, on the day to day life of Gentile Christians it is surprising that “the issue of the food laws had not been raised explicitly and was not explicitly part of the agreement.” (Ibid., p.122)

Hence with the supplementary arrangement of almsgiving to the agreement upon a circumcision-free and law-free gospel to the Gentiles Paul's churches had "den traditionellen Status der 'Gottesfürchtigen'." ⁶⁷⁹ And this means "Anerkennung der Unabhängigkeit wie Anerkennung von Gemeinschaft." ⁶⁸⁰ "Die in Gal. ii 10 vorgeschlagene Lösung bedeutet daher die Legitimierung der Existenz unbeschnittener Gemeinden und ihrer Verbindung mit Jerusalem mit Hilfe traditioneller jüdisch-theologischer Kategorien." ⁶⁸¹

As we have argued above Paul and the Jerusalem leaders had different concepts of the status of the Gentiles in a mixed congregation. These different concepts can be described in Jerusalem's terms as concentric circles: "Den inneren Kreis bildeten die beschnittenen Judenchristen [born Jews and proselytes], den dann folgenden Heiden, die nach dem Aposteldekret mit diesen zusammenleben konnten [Gentiles living according to the alien-resident-status]." ⁶⁸² "Den äußersten Kreis bilden die christlichen gottesfürchtigen Heiden des paulinischen Typs [the 'God-fearers' who constitute distinct communities without social intercourse with the Jewish Christian communities]." ⁶⁸³ Nevertheless, since almsgiving was an institution valid for proselytes, 'alien-residents' and 'God-fearers', Paul and Jerusalem could agree upon the collection on the basis of this institution although they had actually different views of the Gentiles. "Nun besteht freilich diese 'Zuordnung' [of Paul's Gentile churches to the Jewish Christian community] für die Jerusalemer unter dem Gesichtspunkt der (abgestuften) Toraerfüllung, während sie für Paulus unter dem der Erwählung besteht." ⁶⁸⁴ Thus according to the Jerusalem concept Paul's churches were Christians "zweiten Ranges." ⁶⁸⁵ But for Paul they had "ohne jeden Zweifel volle Mitgliedschaft." ⁶⁸⁶

For both parties almsgiving was a means of *unity* and *recognition* of the fact that the Gentiles had converted to the God of Israel. That the collection was based upon a different understanding of the Gentiles' status in the day to day situation, then, became clear at the Antioch Incident. Suddenly the Gentiles who did not observe at least

⁶⁷⁹ Berger, *Almosen*, p.200.

⁶⁸⁰ Ibid., p.198.

⁶⁸¹ Ibid., p.199.

⁶⁸² Ibid., p.200.

⁶⁸³ Ibid., p.200.

⁶⁸⁴ Ibid., p.202.

⁶⁸⁵ Ibid., p.203.

⁶⁸⁶ Ibid., p.203.

something like the Noachian commandments⁶⁸⁷ were ‘unsociable’ for the Jewish Christians and, thus, in Paul’s view marked as Christians of secondary status.⁶⁸⁸ After the break with Antioch and Jerusalem Paul stopped the collection for a while because the issue at the heart of both the Antioch Incident and the collection was the status of the Gentiles within the people of God.

⁶⁸⁷ This does not mean that the people from James demanded a well defined degree of law-observance from the Gentiles. They were worried about “too much association” (Sanders, *Association*, p.186) of Jews with Gentiles, “since close association might lead to contact with idolatry or transgression of one of the biblical food laws.” (Ibid.) However, the most versions of the Noachian commandments “include the prohibition of idolatry.” (Cohen, *Boundary*, p.22))

⁶⁸⁸ See also Bammel, *ΠΤΩΧΟΣ*, p.909; Mußner, *Galater*, p.126; Wedderburn, *Purpose*, p.200f; Dunn, *Relationship*, p.477 n.52; Dunn, *Incident*, p.171 n.109; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.873f.

4.6. Other Collection-Texts

4.6.1. Chronology of Paul's letters

Before we look at Paul's other references to his collection we will briefly set out the chronology of 1 Cor, 2 Cor, 2 Cor 8, 2 Cor 9 and Rm.

1 Cor was probably written from Ephesus.⁶⁸⁹ Since Timothy is in 1 Cor 1:1 not named as co-author he still was on his journey to Corinth (1 Cor 4:17) and Philippi (Phil 2:19f).⁶⁹⁰

The literary unity of 2 Cor is strongly disputed. We cannot go into the details of the literary criticism of 2 Cor.⁶⁹¹ However, I think that all (the Pauline) parts of 2 Cor can be dated "subsequent to 1 Corinthians,"⁶⁹² between Timothy's arrival in Ephesus and Paul's final arrival in Corinth.

With ἀπὸ ἐφρουσι (2 Cor 8:10) Paul refers back to the time near to 1 Cor 16:1-4. Since 2 Cor 8 reflects positive relations with Corinth, it is, thus, written after the resolution of the crisis in Corinth.⁶⁹³ It is also written shortly after 2 Cor 7:5-16.⁶⁹⁴ Maybe it is a letter of recommendation for Titus who went to Corinth to complete the collection.⁶⁹⁵ For Dautzenberg 2 Cor 9 is "das früheste Stück der im 2 Kor gesammelten Korrespondenz...: ein Empfehlungsschreiben... [geschrieben] noch vor dem 'Zwischenfall'." ⁶⁹⁶ However, 2 Cor 9:3ff is too vague about the 'brothers' to be an independent letter of recommendation. It was therefore probably written shortly after 2 Cor 8:16ff.⁶⁹⁷

⁶⁸⁹ See §4.5.1..

⁶⁹⁰ See 1 Cor 16:10: ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος.

⁶⁹¹ For an overview of the literary-criticism see e.g. Betz, *Corinthians*, p.3-36; Dautzenberg, *Briefsammlung*, p.3046-3052; Hyldahl, *Chronologie*, p.88-102; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.11-25; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.xiii-xxxvi; Windisch, *Korinther*, p.11-23.

⁶⁹² Taylor, *Antioch*, p.47.

⁶⁹³ See Betz, *Corinthians*, p.65.

⁶⁹⁴ Compare 2 Cor 8:1f with 2 Cor 7:5ff.

⁶⁹⁵ See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.58; Nickle, *Collection*, p.20.

⁶⁹⁶ Dautzenberg, *Briefsammlung*, p.3050.

⁶⁹⁷ When could Paul have praised to the Macedonians the zeal of the Corinthians (9:2) if 2 Cor 9 was written from Ephesus? And how could Paul have anticipated that he will come with a delegation

Hence both letters are written from Macedonia. Maybe 2 Cor 8 is sent to Corinth and 2 Cor 9 to Achaia. ⁶⁹⁸

The letter to the Romans is written after the correspondence with the Corinthians, probably from Corinth itself. ⁶⁹⁹ In 2 Cor 8 and 2 Cor 9 the collection is still unfinished whereas Rm 15:25ff indicates that the collection is finished and Paul is about to deliver it. ⁷⁰⁰

To sum up: "At the beginning of the collection activity in Corinth stood... Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians." ⁷⁰¹ It was followed by Gal. ⁷⁰² Then "the crisis interrupted the progress of the collection." ⁷⁰³ Only after it was resolved and after the Macedonians were so keen on taking part in the collection-enterprise did Paul venture to ask the Corinthians to resume the collection. Thus Titus was - with 2 Cor 8 as a letter of recommendation - sent to complete what he had begun a year before. Probably shortly after he and the two brothers had left Macedonia Paul had another opportunity to send a letter to Corinth. ⁷⁰⁴ This letter - 2 Cor 9 - might have been sent in the first instance to Achaia. Finally, in Rm 15, we hear about the latest stage of the collection.

from Macedonia to Corinth (9:4)? Also ἀπὸ πέρυσιν in 2 Cor 8:10 and 9:2 indicates that 2 Cor 9 is written near in time to 2 Cor 8.

⁶⁹⁸ See 2 Cor 9:2 and Lang, *Korinther*, p.12ff; Betz, *Corinthians*, p.139f; Taylor, *Antioch*, p.58; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.249f; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.57f; Windisch, *Korintherbrief*, p.288.

⁶⁹⁹ Thus most scholars. See Taylor, *Antioch*, p.48; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p.xliv; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.384.

⁷⁰⁰ See Betz, *Corinthians*, p.141.

⁷⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p.142.

⁷⁰² See §4.5.1..

⁷⁰³ *Ibid.*, p.142.

⁷⁰⁴ See also Windisch, *Korinther*, p.286ff.

4.6.2. 1 Cor 16:1-4

1 Cor 16:1 (περὶ δέ) should be taken in the same sense as 7:1 (περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε), 7:25, 8:1, 12:1 and also 16:12: Paul answers questions the Corinthians had asked him.⁷⁰⁵ Hence the Corinthians were already instructed about the collection before they received Paul's letter (1 Cor). Hence again οἱ ἅγιοι is not a title of the Jerusalem church, but it is obvious whom Paul is talking about.⁷⁰⁶

Only in 1 Cor 16:1-4 does Paul use the term λογεία for the collection. If it was a tax⁷⁰⁷ the plural λογεῖται in connection with the verb γίνονται in 16:2 would be incomprehensible. Hence it means a collection.⁷⁰⁸ Organising the collection of the money Paul uses official language (λογεία).⁷⁰⁹ Maybe he takes up the wording of the letter he had received from the Corinthians. The opponents' interpretation of the collection in official terms as a financial liability on behalf of Paul⁷¹⁰ could well have fuelled the charges against Paul.

However, "Paulus [gebraucht] als Synonyma für λογεία nicht steuertechnische, sondern erbauliche Wörter."⁷¹¹ Χάρις first of all denotes the act of charity. It is "das von der göttlichen Gnade gezeugte, christliche Gnaden- oder Liebeswerk."⁷¹² Paul had talked about the χαρίσματα in 1 Cor 12 (and 13-14), 1 Cor 7:7 and 1 Cor 1:7. Hence a reference to God's grace in 1 Cor 16:3 cannot have been missed by the Corinthians.⁷¹³ The term χάρις could furthermore indicate that Paul has the institution of almsgiving in mind.⁷¹⁴ His order to nominate delegates (οὓς ἐὰν δοκιμάσητε, 16:3) who would deliver the collection to Jerusalem would then mean that he wanted Gentiles to deliver

⁷⁰⁵ See Lang, *Korinther*, p.245, Wolff, *Korinther*, p.217f; Nickle, *Collection*, p.15; Lüdemann, *Heidenapostel*, p.111f. Against Conzelmann, *Korinther*, p.353.

⁷⁰⁶ Against Lang, *Korinther*, p.245; Conzelmann, *Korinther*, p.353; Wolff, *Korinther*, p.218f; Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.122f. See §4.5.2.1..

⁷⁰⁷ For this meaning see Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.40; Conzelmann, *Korinther*, p.353.

⁷⁰⁸ See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.40; Conzelmann, *Korinther*, p.353; Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, c.965.

⁷⁰⁹ Thus Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinthians*, p.76.

⁷¹⁰ See 2 Cor 12:16-18 and 1 Cor 9:16-18.

⁷¹¹ Conzelmann, *Korinther*, p.354. Paul refers to the Corinthians' letter with the singular λογεία. In the next verse he uses the plural λογεῖται, shifting the meaning from 'tax' to 'collection'. In the third verse he then uses χάρις.

⁷¹² Windisch, *Korinther*, p.243. See also Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.40.

⁷¹³ Thus also Martin, *Corinthians*, p.254, concerning 2 Cor 8:4 and 8:1.

⁷¹⁴ Compare §4.5.3..

the money. Additionally it might have been a “Vorsichtsmaßnahme” ⁷¹⁵ preventing charges of misusing the money. Presumably Paul also wants to emphasize “die selbstständige Verantwortung der Gemeinde.” ⁷¹⁶ This does not, however, mean that he used the collection in the first instance as a “pädagogisches Mittel.” ⁷¹⁷

Paul himself had not yet decided whether he would accompany the delegation or not. He wants to send the delegation on its way with letters of recommendation (16:3). ⁷¹⁸ This could indicate that after his break with Antioch and Jerusalem Paul had interest in showing that it was he and his Gentile-churches who collected the money as agreed upon at the Jerusalem Council. ⁷¹⁹ That these letters are important for the purpose of the collection is furthermore underlined by the fact that if it is ἀξιόν for Paul to travel to Jerusalem as well they shall accompany him (16:4). The emphasis lies upon the fact that they shall travel with him and not upon the question whether it is ἀξιόν or not. ⁷²⁰ His letters of recommendation are a substitute for his presence.

Ἀξιόν might refer to the amount of money given. ⁷²¹ It is more probable, however, that Paul has in mind the “inneren Einsatz der Gemeinde.” ⁷²² Maybe Paul would feel obliged to accompany the delegation if the Corinthians are very much involved in the collection.

Hence important for Paul was the delegation of the church of Corinth travelling to Jerusalem. His presence was only important under certain circumstances. Nevertheless he would have explained the collection through letters of recommendation, ⁷²³ and it would have been clear to Jerusalem that the money comes from his Gentile-churches.

⁷¹⁵ Conzelmann, *Korinther*, p.355. See also Lang, *Korinther*, p.246.

⁷¹⁶ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.41.

⁷¹⁷ Ibid., p.37. Against Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.37f.

⁷¹⁸ Δι' ἐπιστολῶν does not refer to δοκιμάσητε but to πέμψω. Thus rightly ibid., p.41; Wolff, *Korinther*, p.220; Lang, *Korinther*, p.246 and also the punctuation mark in Nestle-Aland, p.470. Against Nickle, *Collection*, p.15 and p.15f n.12.

⁷¹⁹ Thus also Wolff, *Korinther*, p.220.

⁷²⁰ Most commentators embark on a discussion about the fact that Paul has the amount of money in mind. This is not, however, Paul's main concern here.

⁷²¹ Thus ibid., p.220.

⁷²² Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.41.

⁷²³ See ibid., p.41 n.145.

4.6.3. 2 Cor 8

2 Cor 8 is divided into the “advisory section” ⁷²⁴ (8:1-15) which consists of a “commendation of the Macedonians” ⁷²⁵ (8:1-6) and “the appeal to the Corinthians” ⁷²⁶ (8:7-15) and the “legal section” ⁷²⁷ (8:16-24). ⁷²⁸

Χάρις “is a key term.” ⁷²⁹ “It embraces a whole range of meanings,” ⁷³⁰ and it almost seems as if Paul plays with all these different meanings. ⁷³¹

God’s grace given to the Macedonians in all their afflictions (see 7:5 ⁷³²) provided the basis for their joy and the riches of their generosity, ⁷³³ namely the collection (8:4). The Macedonians gave money *παρὰ δύναμιν* (8:2f). ⁷³⁴ They in fact gave themselves first ⁷³⁵ to the Lord and also to Paul and his co-workers ⁷³⁶ (8:5). Saying this Paul indicates that the “innere(n) Beteiligung der Mazedonier” ⁷³⁷ is “first in importance.” ⁷³⁸

That it is a “Selbsthingabe” ⁷³⁹ to God refers back to the χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ (8:1). “Having received the gift of divine grace... they had given themselves to God in return as a living sacrifice.” ⁷⁴⁰

The collection is called ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τῆς τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους (8:4) and again in 8:6 ἡ χάρις ταύτη.

⁷²⁴ Betz, *Corinthians*, p.41.

⁷²⁵ Martin, *Corinthians*, p.248.

⁷²⁶ Ibid., p.259.

⁷²⁷ Betz, *Corinthians*, p.70.

⁷²⁸ Ibid., p.82, separates 8:24 as the peroration.

⁷²⁹ Martin, *Corinthians*, p.252. See also Windisch, *Korinther*, p.243; Lang, *Korinther*, p.318.

⁷³⁰ Betz, *Corinthians*, p.42. See Windisch, *Korinther*, p.243; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.218.

⁷³¹ See Betz, *Corinthians*, p.42.

⁷³² Windisch, *Korinther*, p.244; Betz, *Corinthians*, p.43.

⁷³³ “Der erste ὅτι - Satz (V.2) ist also Erläuterung zu τὴν χάριν und damit zugleich Objekt zu γνωρίζομεν.” (Windisch, *Korinther*, p.244)

⁷³⁴ 8:3f is an anakoluthon. (Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.59, Windisch, *Korinther*, p.245). The verb ‘to give’ is taken from 8:5. See Martin, *Corinthians*, p.255; Lang, *Korinther*, p.318; Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.221.

⁷³⁵ πρῶτον goes with θεός and not with ἔδοκαν. See Windisch, *Korinther*, p.247; Lang, *Korinther*, p.317f. Against Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.236.

⁷³⁶ To Windisch, *Korinther*, p.247, ἡμῶν is “pluralis humilitatis für ἐμοί.”

⁷³⁷ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.59.

⁷³⁸ Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.236. See also Murphy-O’Connor, *Corinthians*, p.80.

⁷³⁹ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.247.

⁷⁴⁰ Betz, *Corinthians*, p.47. Similar Murphy-O’Connor, *Corinthians*, p.79. I would not, however, speak of a ‘sacrifice.’

Χάρις in 8:4 has to be taken as “a human privilege, a gracious act.”⁷⁴¹ In 8:6 it is used absolutely and is thus almost a technical term for the collection. It has, however, “a theological underpinning”⁷⁴² and is thus closely related to 1 Cor 16:3.⁷⁴³ Χάρις and κοινωνία in 8:4 should not be taken as synonyms.⁷⁴⁴ Since Paul before the writing of 2 Cor 8 boasted about the willingness of the Corinthians for the collection⁷⁴⁵, which resulted in the enthusiasm of the Macedonians it is likely that κοινωνία here means the “fellowship in a work.”⁷⁴⁶ This, then, is a new aspect of the collection: additionally to the destination εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους it became a means of κοινωνία between the Gentile-churches.⁷⁴⁷

Taking χάρις and κοινωνία as such ἡ διακονία ἣ εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους (8:4) has to be taken “als technischer Ausdruck.”⁷⁴⁸ Διακονία has primarily the meaning of being a “Dienstleistung”⁷⁴⁹ and seems to be “one of Paul’s distinctive words for the collection.”⁷⁵⁰

With 8:7ff Paul appeals to the Corinthians to take up the collection again. He begins with a *captatio benevolentiae*,⁷⁵¹ which seems, however, to be a real compliment⁷⁵² since Paul is relieved (7:9) that the crisis in Corinth is over. Paul’s reference to the richness of the Corinthians in spiritual gifts reminds us of 1 Cor 1:5⁷⁵³ and 1 Cor 12-14. Here χάρις has again primarily the connotation of God’s grace and gift.⁷⁵⁴

⁷⁴¹ Martin, *Corinthians*, p.254. See also Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.220.

⁷⁴² Martin, *Corinthians*, p.254. I think Betz, *Corinthians*, p.46, is totally mistaken in taking χάρις “in the secular sense, as is common in administrative documents.”

⁷⁴³ See §4.6.2..

⁷⁴⁴ See Martin, *Corinthians*, p.254. Against Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.133.

⁷⁴⁵ 2 Cor 9:2.

⁷⁴⁶ Martin, *Corinthians*, p.254. See Windisch, *Korinther*, p.246.

⁷⁴⁷ Against Taylor, *Antioch*, p.197ff. In 2 Cor 8:24 Paul talks about the collection as ἐνδειξις τῆς ἀγάπης... εἰς πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. And also in 2 Cor 9:13 he talks of a κοινωνία with the Jerusalem Christians and with πάντας. As with the term χάρις I do not think that κοινωνία has a strong connotation of administrative language.

⁷⁴⁸ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.246.

⁷⁴⁹ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.60.

⁷⁵⁰ Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.220. Against Nickle, *Collection*, p.106ff, esp. p.108 n.84.

⁷⁵¹ See Murphy-O’Connor, *Corinthians*, p.81.

⁷⁵² Against *ibid.*, p.81.

⁷⁵³ See Lang, *Korinther*, p.319; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.238; Betz, *Corinthians*, p.56.

⁷⁵⁴ See Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.222; Windisch, *Korinther*, p.250. Against Martin, *Corinthians*, p.262.

Paul emphasises that the collection is a voluntary gift and not an obligation (οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν). As in 1 Cor 16:1-4 he stresses the independence of the Corinthians in matters of the collection.⁷⁵⁵ The symbolic value is important for Paul.

However, Paul uses some sort of moral imperative.⁷⁵⁶ He talks about God's grace (8:1), the example of the Macedonians (8:5), and now he uses Christ's grace as an example (8:9): he emphasises "the contrast 'rich/poor'," ⁷⁵⁷ and that Christ as well gave something for the sake of others. The reminder that the Corinthians themselves had already shown their willingness to collect money (8:10)⁷⁵⁸ fulfils the function of another moral imperative.⁷⁵⁹ Now they shall do what they had promised to do. But they shall do it ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν (8:11) and καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχη εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει (8:12). As it was in Macedonia Paul wants the collection to be a voluntary gift. Verse 12 is introduced with γάρ: 8:11 is explained by 8:12ff.⁷⁶⁰ "The idea is not that the Corinthians and the poor saints in Jerusalem shall change places" ⁷⁶¹ as indeed would be the case if the Corinthians followed Christ's example, but ἰσότης, "the Greek virtue," ⁷⁶² is the "regulierende(s) Prinzip für die gegenseitige Hilfe." ⁷⁶³ Although the following quotation from Ex 16:18 tells of an equality in gathering Paul applies it to a situation where there ought to be equality of supply. ⁷⁶⁴ As with the example of Christ this 'illustration' ⁷⁶⁵ is not directly applicable to the present situation. "Was Paulus hervorhebt, ist allein die Analogie zwischen dem damals eingetretenen und dem jetzt erstrebten Zustand." ⁷⁶⁶ The collection is thus a divine means (χάρις) of adding the περίσσευμα of the Corinthians to the ὑστέρημα of the Jerusalem Christians (8:14).

This principle ἰσότης will work vice versa as well. However, "Paul does not here develop the argument of Rom. xv. 27." ⁷⁶⁷ He does not have the giving of the spiritual gifts of the Jerusalem Christians in mind, nor does he refer to an eschatological

⁷⁵⁵ See Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.222.

⁷⁵⁶ See Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinthians*, p.82.

⁷⁵⁷ Martin, *Corinthians*, p.263.

⁷⁵⁸ Thus also Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.224f.

⁷⁵⁹ He is not commanding, but just giving his advice (γνώμην, 8:10).

⁷⁶⁰ Thus *ibid.*, p.226; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.266; Windisch, *Korinther*, p.257. Against Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.62ff, who seems to take 8:13 totally separated from 8:12.

⁷⁶¹ Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.226.

⁷⁶² Betz, *Corinthians*, p.67f. Against Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.63f

⁷⁶³ Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.135.

⁷⁶⁴ Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.227; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.267.

⁷⁶⁵ Thus Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.227; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.267; Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinthians*, p.85; Koch, *Schrift*, p.258ff.

⁷⁶⁶ Koch, *Schrift*, p.258.

⁷⁶⁷ Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.226. Thus also Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.135; Windisch, *Korinther*, p.261f.

event.⁷⁶⁸ Important is the fact that ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ the Corinthians have περίσσευμα compared to the Jerusalem Christians.

In 2 Cor 8:16-24 Paul commends Titus and the two brothers he sent to Corinth. He only names Titus. In contrast to 1 Cor 16:3 here even other churches have appointed men to see that everything goes καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων (8:21). The first one is elected⁷⁶⁹ by the churches for the χάρις ταύτη ἣ διακονουμένη ὑφ' ἡμῶν (8:19). Hence he might be “der offizielle Begleiter des Pls auf der Kollektenreise.”⁷⁷⁰ The second brother (8:22) is chosen by Paul.

We can only speculate about the churches which elected the first one and where the brothers came from.⁷⁷¹ Since Paul in 2 Cor 9:4 says that he himself will come from Macedonia with delegates different from the brothers (9:3) they are “from other churches than those in Macedonia and Achaia.”⁷⁷² Important is that they are sent in matters of the collection to Corinth. Hence their job is different from that of the delegation mentioned in 1 Cor 16:3.

In 8:19 the collection is again called χάρις. Also the term διακονία appears. This time, however, as a verb διακονεῖν, denoting that the collection is Paul’s service for the glory of God. “It was Paul who took final responsibility for the delegation”⁷⁷³ and thus for the collection. Referring to the glory of God (πρὸς τὴν [αὐτοῦ] τοῦ κυρίου δόξαν, 8:19) Paul shows that the collection meant more to him than a mere relief fund. His collection-enterprise serves and promotes the glory of God.⁷⁷⁴

To sum up:

The interpretation of the collection shifted in relation to the institution of alms-giving from:

⁷⁶⁸ Against Martin, *Corinthians*, p.267. I do not see how Martin can argue with Rm 9-11 that Israel’s reconciliation “will presage the final homecoming of the nations (Rom 11:25,26,30-32).” In Romans Paul argues exactly the other way round: πῶρως ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρι οὗ τοῦ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται. See e.g. Hengel, *Mission*, p.19ff.

⁷⁶⁹ On χειροτονηθεῖς see Martin, *Corinthians*, p.275; Betz, *Corinthians*, p.74f; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.249.

⁷⁷⁰ Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.137.

⁷⁷¹ See the discussion by Windisch, *Korinther*, p.263f; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.249f; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.274f; Munck, *Salvation*, p.296f; Nickle, *Collection*, p.18ff.

⁷⁷² Munck, *Salvation*, p.297.

⁷⁷³ Betz, *Corinthians*, p.78.

⁷⁷⁴ Thus Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.248f.

a) expressing the willingness of the Gentiles to belong to the community of God's people to showing that one is already a true member. The Corinthians already have all the other *χαρίσματα*. Now they shall also strive for the *χάρις* of the collection.

b) being one sided in principle: the Gentiles Christians give and the Jerusalem Christians receive, to mutual in principle: in introducing the principle of *ἰσότης* Paul says that in the future the Corinthians might benefit and become recipients as well.

c) establishing fellowship between Jerusalem and Paul's churches to establishing fellowship between Paul's churches themselves.

It is, however, still an act of charity for actual poor people with a highly theological meaning, showing God's grace and promoting God's glory.

Concerning himself Paul made clear that he is the initiator of the collection. It is his work. Nevertheless it serves God's glory. Hence its symbolic character is valuable rather than the amount of money given.

4.6.4. 2 Cor 9

Δέ in 9:3 refers back to μέν in 9:1.⁷⁷⁵ Paul does not in the first instance want to talk about the collection, but rather about the delegation he has sent to Corinth. This delegation (9:3) consists of the brothers from 8:16ff.⁷⁷⁶

2 Cor 8 was written after the reconciliation when Paul was in an euphoric state of mind.⁷⁷⁷ He was happy that the Macedonians had started a collection and that the Corinthians were on his side again. Thus he had ventured to ask them to take up the collection again. Now the delegation was on its way and Paul seems to have had a second thought about the collection. He seem to have feared that he had boasted too much.⁷⁷⁸

Compared to 2 Cor 8, 2 Cor 9 shows that Paul had extended the authority of Titus and the brothers.⁷⁷⁹ He empowers them to collect the money and to have it ready when he himself comes.⁷⁸⁰

From 1 Cor 16:3 we know that Paul had planned to come to Corinth before the money was sent to Jerusalem. Now we hear that he is going to come with a delegation from Macedonia. This could indicate that the Macedonians were very much involved in the collection⁷⁸¹. Maybe they decided to send their own delegates only after Titus and the brothers had left for Corinth. This would explain why it was that only after writing 2 Cor 8 Paul started to be afraid that he might be in an awkward situation vis-à-vis the Macedonians. Προέλθωσιν and προκαταρτίσωσιν in 9:5 indicate that the first delegation has now become a mere advance guard in contrast to 8:6, preparing everything for the delegation which is going to come with Paul.

Since Paul does not indicate that he organised the delegation - he could have said that he is going to take a delegation with him -, the Macedonians themselves seem to have decided on it. Maybe this was the point when it became appropriate (ἄξιον, 1 Cor 16:4) for Paul to travel to Jerusalem as well.

⁷⁷⁵ Thus also Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.253; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.283. Windisch, *Korinther*, p.271 and Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.233, say that it is a limitation of 9:1 because 9:3ff contains information about the collection. The information about the collection, however, begins only in 9:6 as an explication of 9:5. In 9:3-5a Paul talks about the delegation.

⁷⁷⁶ See Windisch, *Korinther*, p.271; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.234; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.284; Lang, *Korinther*, p.323; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.254.

⁷⁷⁷ See Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinthians*, p.88.

⁷⁷⁸ Thus Windisch, *Korinther*, p.272; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.253f.

⁷⁷⁹ See Windisch, *Korinther*, p.271.

⁷⁸⁰ This is a parallel to 1 Cor 16:2. See *ibid.*, p.273.

⁷⁸¹ See *ibid.*, p.272.

Using εὐλογία for the collection Paul might have had a word play with λογία in mind.⁷⁸² Εὐλογία is, however, taken up in a different context in 9:6, and in 9:7 (Prov 22:8) Paul even deliberately substitutes εὐλογεῖ with ἀγαπᾷ.⁷⁸³ Εὐλογία denotes the collection as a “gift of blessing.”⁷⁸⁴ In contrast to διακονία (9:1, 8:4) “bezeichnet εὐλογ. die Wirkung auf den Empfänger.”⁷⁸⁵ It, therefore, stresses the fact that the collection is a means of fellowship between donor and beneficiary.⁷⁸⁶ Since a “gift of blessing is given in response to blessings received”⁷⁸⁷ from God Paul combines λογεία and χάρις in εὐλογία.⁷⁸⁸ Hence in contrast to 2 Cor 8 Paul again focuses on the beneficiary. However, εὐλογία has also the connotation of being a generous gift. This is made clear by the contrast εὐλογία / πλεονεξία (9:5). Πλεονεξία means a grudging gift, stinginess.⁷⁸⁹ In 9:5 Paul refers to “two attitudes of giving.”⁷⁹⁰

In 2 Cor 8 Paul had explained why there should be a collection of money. Χάρις was a key word. Here he enumerates “Motive für die Aufbringung einer reichen Beisteuer.”⁷⁹¹ The key word is εὐλογία. This quest for a rich collection Paul elaborates in 9:6-10 with agrarian motifs. Taking up the contrast εὐλογία / πλεονεξία from verse 5 Paul uses a “Bauernregel”⁷⁹² to show that generosity will pay. However, although Paul uses the image of sowing and reaping in an eschatological sense in Gal 6:7ff, there is no connotation of “Vergeltung”⁷⁹³ or “Lohn”⁷⁹⁴ in Paul’s mind here.⁷⁹⁵ The emphasis is totally on the second part of the proverb, which can be paraphrased “the more blessings you give, the more you will receive.”⁷⁹⁶ “The attitude of the giver is all-

⁷⁸² Ibid., p.274; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.67.

⁷⁸³ Thus ibid., p.68. We cannot, however, tell whether Paul substituted εὐλογεῖ because he did not want to play with the different meanings of the word (thus ibid., p.68) or whether he wanted to introduce “einen neuen schönen Gedanken” with ἀγαπᾷ (thus Windisch, *Korinther*, p.277). According to Koch, *Schrift*, p.140, Paul hardly ever used εὐλογεῖν for an action of God, whereas ἀγαπᾷν did have this meaning. This would indicate that Paul did not want to play with the word. He did not want to relate εὐλογεῖν to humans as well as to God as he had done with χάρις.

⁷⁸⁴ Betz, *Corinthians*, p.96. See also Windisch, *Korinther*, p.274; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.67f; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.285; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.255f; Lang, *Korinther*, p.323f.

⁷⁸⁵ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.274. See also Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.255f.

⁷⁸⁶ Thus Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.68.

⁷⁸⁷ Betz, *Corinthians*, p.97. Also Lang, *Korinther*, p.324.

⁷⁸⁸ Thus Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.68.

⁷⁸⁹ See Windisch, *Korinther*, p.275; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.285f; Betz, *Corinthians*, p.96; Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.137f; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.256; Lang, *Korinther*, p.324.

⁷⁹⁰ Martin, *Corinthians*, p.286.

⁷⁹¹ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.275.

⁷⁹² Ibid., p.276. See also Martin, *Corinthians*, p.289; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.68f.

⁷⁹³ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.277.

⁷⁹⁴ Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.138.

⁷⁹⁵ Against Windisch, *Korinther*, p.176. See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.68f.

⁷⁹⁶ Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinthians*, p.90.

important," ⁷⁹⁷ because God loves a cheerful giver. ⁷⁹⁸ In 2 Cor 8 Paul has said that nobody shall give above his or her means. Here he says everyone shall only give as much as he or she wants. Thus the motif of giving voluntarily "wird in 2. Kor 9. noch gesteigert." ⁷⁹⁹

With verse 8 another dimension comes in. Appealing to the reason of the Corinthians ⁸⁰⁰ Paul introduces with δέ another argument in favour of generosity. ⁸⁰¹ The Corinthians shall consider the fact that "God will always make it possible for them to give." ⁸⁰² Paul, therefore, "moves on from 8:12 which limits the amount to what a person has to this level where it is God who inspires and provides the ability to give." ⁸⁰³ Paul uses χάρις to illustrate that "aus dem Reichtum Gottes fließt der Strom des Lebens." ⁸⁰⁴

The quotation from verse 9 is an explanation of the ἔργον ἀγαθόν verse 8. ⁸⁰⁵ The subject of the quotation is the one who gives alms. ⁸⁰⁶ The quotation is from Ps 111:9 LXX. There it denotes the works of a just man. Paul exhorts the Corinthians to give a generous gift so that it can be said of them what is said of the just man. Σκοπίζω is thus parallel to σπείρω in verse 6.

It is, however, "possible to carry on ὁ Θεός from v. 8 as the subject of the quotation." ⁸⁰⁷ Paul must have been aware of this ambiguity - even more so since the subject of verse 10 is God, as well. Probably Paul wanted to evoke "den Gedanken an Gott als den eigentlichen Autor der menschlichen Barmherzigkeit." ⁸⁰⁸ This would underline what he has said in 9:8.

Lietzmann ⁸⁰⁹ and Windisch ⁸¹⁰ hold that δικαιοσύνη (9:9b) merely means almsgiving and "kaum die paulinische 'Gerechtigkeit vor Gott'." ⁸¹¹ But presumably it

⁷⁹⁷ Ibid., p.90.

⁷⁹⁸ On this quotation from Prov 22:8 LXX see Martin, *Corinthians*, p.290; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.236; Betz, *Corinthians*, p.105f; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.69f.

⁷⁹⁹ Ibid., p.69.

⁸⁰⁰ See *ibid.*, p.69ff.

⁸⁰¹ Against Windisch, *Korinther*, p.277.

⁸⁰² Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.237. See also Windisch, *Korinther*, p.278; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.71.

⁸⁰³ Martin, *Corinthians*, p.290.

⁸⁰⁴ Lang, *Korinther*, p.324f.

⁸⁰⁵ See Martin, *Corinthians*, p.291. Against Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinthians*, p.92.

⁸⁰⁶ See Martin, *Corinthians*, p.291; Lang, *Korinther*, p.325; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.238; Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.138; Windisch, *Korinther*, p.278; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.261; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.71f. Against Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinthians*, p.92; Betz, *Corinthians*, p.111.

⁸⁰⁷ Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.261. See also Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.71.

⁸⁰⁸ Ibid., p.71f.

⁸⁰⁹ Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.138.

refers to the fact that almsgiving is a means of showing one's righteousness.⁸¹² Paul, therefore, refers to what was the underlying motif of the institution of almsgiving of Gentile-converts.⁸¹³ The collection in 2 Cor 9 is thus a means of establishing the unity of Jews and Gentiles.

Before talking about the effect of the collection in verse 10 Paul mentions a quotation from Isa 55:10 and an allusion to Hos 10:12 LXX. With these citations Paul refers back to verse 8.⁸¹⁴ As in 9:8 Paul says in 9:10 that God will give seed so that they can give to the poor⁸¹⁵ (χορηγέω) and that he will multiply (πληθύνω) it. Since he speaks of πᾶσα χάρις (9:8) and ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι (9:11) Paul also seems to have "die göttliche Belohnung mit neuem Segen"⁸¹⁶ in mind.

Understanding 9:10 in the context of Isa 55:10 and Hos 10:12 Georgi⁸¹⁷ holds that Paul understood the collection "als Zeichen der Endzeit."⁸¹⁸ The context is "das Wunder der Heimkehr Israels"⁸¹⁹ and that "Israel wird auch die Völker rufen, und diese werden kommen"⁸²⁰ Thus the collection demonstrates to the Jews that "nicht die Juden zogen den Heiden voraus, wie es Deuterojesaja verheißen hatte, sondern die Heiden den Juden."⁸²¹ However, nowhere in 2 Cor 9 is this imagery is made explicit.⁸²² More probable is that Paul used Isa 55:10 because of a "Stichwortassoziation"⁸²³ of agrarian motives. Hence Paul does not speak at all about the unbelief of Israel⁸²⁴ and the reversal of the eschatological events.

⁸¹⁰ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.278f.

⁸¹¹ Ibid., p.279.

⁸¹² See Martin, *Corinthians*, p.291; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.237f.

⁸¹³ See Berger, *Almosen*, p.190.

⁸¹⁴ The ambiguity of the subject of the sentence from verse 9 is also seen in verse 10: ἐπιχορηγέω / χορηγέω as well as σπóρον / σπείρω can be taken as a parallel to σκορπίζω and δίδομι in 9:9. Only σπείρω, however, refers to humans. The other words refer to God.

⁸¹⁵ "Σπόρος is here used of the gifts." (Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.263) See also Windisch, *Korinther*, p.280.

⁸¹⁶ Ibid., p.280.

⁸¹⁷ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.72ff.

⁸¹⁸ Ibid., p.72

⁸¹⁹ Ibid., p.72.

⁸²⁰ Ibid., p.72.

⁸²¹ Ibid., p.72.

⁸²² See Berger, *Almosen*, p.200.

⁸²³ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.72, but against Georgi.

⁸²⁴ He is not saying that the Gentile-Christians received "was die Juden von sich gewiesen hatten," and that the promises "galt jetzt ihnen [the Gentiles] - nicht den Juden." (Thus *ibid.*, p.72f)

In verse 11 the “Dankbarkeit und Liebe der Beschenkten” ⁸²⁵ comes in. The generosity of the Corinthians will yield thanksgiving on the part of the poor in Jerusalem ⁸²⁶ to God. This will happen through Paul (δι’ ἡμῶν) because he organises the collection. In contrast to 8:19f Paul not only organises the collection, but himself will deliver it and thus evoke thanksgiving.

“Die Verse 12-15 begründen V. 11b.” ⁸²⁷ Διὰ κοινῆς in verse 12 means execution ⁸²⁸ rather than ministration. ⁸²⁹ It includes the collecting of the money and its delivery. This execution will provide for the needs of the saints (see 8:14) on the one hand. But it will also overflow διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ. “Πολλῶν may be ‘of many people,’ but ‘many thanksgivings’ is simpler.” ⁸³⁰ A “bei Gott entstehender Überfluß” ⁸³¹ will thus be achieved through the collection. Λειτουργία is the public service. ⁸³² But it has also religious and sacral overtones. ⁸³³ Paul evokes the image of a “weltweiten Gottesdienst.” ⁸³⁴

Thus also “the Christians at Jerusalem” ⁸³⁵ will glorify God because of the evidence ⁸³⁶ of the execution of the collection. They will glorify God for the “Bekehrung der Heiden zum Evang..” ⁸³⁷ The collection will be a sign of the Gentiles’ conversion to Christ and of their will to belong to the people of God. It means fellowship with Jerusalem and with all Christians (καὶ εἰς πάντας). ⁸³⁸ Since the basis of the collection is God’s gift and the effect is the praise of God it is a “von Gott in Gang gesetzter und

⁸²⁵ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.280.

⁸²⁶ Thus Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.138; Murphy-O’Connor, *Corinthians*, p.94; Windisch, *Korinther*, p.280; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.264; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.239; Lang, *Korinther*, 325; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.74.

⁸²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.74.

⁸²⁸ Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.239; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.74.

⁸²⁹ Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.264; Murphy-O’Connor, *Corinthians*, p.94.

⁸³⁰ Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.265. Thus also Windisch, *Korinther*, p.282; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.74. Against Lang, *Korinther*, p.324; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.293. The construction of the sentence is not quite clear. See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.74.

⁸³¹ *Ibid.*, p.75.

⁸³² Windisch, *Korinther*, p.281f; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.75f n.298; Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.265; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.239; Lang, *Korinther*, p.325.

⁸³³ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.281f; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.240; Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.139; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.293.

⁸³⁴ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.75.

⁸³⁵ Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.266.

⁸³⁶ See Betz, *Corinthians*, p.120.

⁸³⁷ Windisch, *Korinther*, p.284. See also Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.139.

⁸³⁸ As in 8:4 it is not entirely clear whether κοινωνία means the collection or the fellowship. “Die Verbindung mit ἀπόττης spricht sehr für die konkrete Fassung.” (Windisch, *Korinther*, p.284f) But because of καὶ εἰς πάντας I prefer the meaning of fellowship. Thus also *ibid.*, p.285; Martin, *Corinthians*, p.293; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.77; Barrett, *Corinthians*, p.241; Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p.139.

ständig zu ihm zurückkehrender Prozeß.”⁸³⁹ But it will also have an effect on the Jerusalem Christians which goes directly back to the Gentiles: they will pray and long for them.

“It is a glorious picture which he [Paul] has before his eyes.”⁸⁴⁰ The collection will establish unity between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians. Maybe Paul also hopes in the light of the break with Jerusalem that the collection will convince Jerusalem “of the divine legitimacy of the mission to the gentiles.”⁸⁴¹

To sum up.

With 2 Cor 9 Paul goes beyond what he has said about the collection - the amount of money given and its effect - in 2 Cor 8.

Now he is going to come with a delegation from Macedonia. This delegation probably has the same function as the one organised in 1 Cor 16:3. In contrast to 1 Cor 16, however, the Macedonian delegation is going to accompany him on his way to Jerusalem.

In 2 Cor 8 Paul has pledged a new start for the collection in Corinth. In 2 Cor 9, however, he asks the Corinthians for a generous gift, presumably in spite of the collection in Macedonia.

In both chapters the gift is voluntary. However, in the one chapter the limit is that the gift shall not be beyond the means of the Corinthians (2 Cor 8) and in the other chapter the limit is determined by their will and God’s χάρις (2 Cor 9).

Also concerning the recipients Paul introduces a new argument for a generous gift. In 2 Cor 8 he has said that if there should be a ὑστέρημα one day in Corinth Jerusalem would help them. In 2 Cor 9 he says that Jerusalem will react immediately. They will praise God, increase the δόξα θεοῦ, and pray for the Corinthian Christians.

The collection is more than just meeting the needs of the poor in Jerusalem. It is a liturgical service, causing thanksgiving and praise to God and prayer for the fellow-Christians. Through the collection-enterprise Jerusalem will recognise and praise God for the belief of the Gentiles. Unity will be established.

⁸³⁹ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.75.

⁸⁴⁰ Plummer, *Corinthians*, p.267.

⁸⁴¹ Murphy-O’Connor, *Corinthians*, p.82.

4.6.5. Rm 15:14-33

Paul's travel plans to Spain and his request to the Romans to pray for him on his way to Jerusalem in Rm 15:14-33 is judged by many to be one of his reasons for writing the letter to the Romans.⁸⁴²

Paul introduces verse 14 with a *captatio benevolentiae*.⁸⁴³ "Der ganze Vers ist ein pädagogisch höfliches Zurücklenken von der Ermahnung."⁸⁴⁴ Paul wrote to remind them. The authority for his rather bold⁸⁴⁵ letter⁸⁴⁶ is the grace given to him by God. Since χάρις is "hier der Heidenapostolat"⁸⁴⁷ Paul wrote to the Romans on the basis of his mission to the Gentiles. This mission he describes as a priestly service⁸⁴⁸ so that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Spirit. Since Paul uses the image of a cultic offering it might be appropriate to translate ἡγιασμένη with "set apart."⁸⁴⁹

Since "προσφορά can denote either the act of offering or the thing offered"⁸⁵⁰ it is debated whether the Gentiles are the offering or whether they perform it.⁸⁵¹ It is too far-fetched, however, to connect 15:16 with the collection and its delegation by saying that Paul presents "Vertreter der Heidenvölker als Opfergabe."⁸⁵² Also Aus⁸⁵³ holds

⁸⁴² Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, p.856, 880f and p.884; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.211; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.376, 383; Zeller, *Römer*, p.15. See also Wedderburn, *Purpose*, p.137-141.

⁸⁴³ Käsemann, *Römer*, p.376f. Compare Rm 1:8 and *ibid.*, p.15.

⁸⁴⁴ Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.120.

⁸⁴⁵ See e.g. Dunn, *Romans*, p.858f; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.753; Barrett, *Romans*, p.275; Wilckens, *Römer* 12-16, p.116; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.377.

⁸⁴⁶ Ἐὰν μέρους probably refers to the exhortation of the letter. Thus Wilckens, *Römer* 12-16, p.117, relating it to 14:1-15:13; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.753; Zeller, *Römer*, p.237, referring to 12:1-15:13. But see also Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, p.858f, who argues that since 15:14ff refers back to 1:8-15 "it may be better to take the ἄπο μέρους as a polite self-deprecatory reference to the whole of the letter." Probably "stretching the syntax too far" (*ibid.*, p.859) is to take ἄπο μέρους as relating to τολμηρότερον. Against Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.209. The addition of ἀδελφοί in \mathfrak{P}^{46} , \mathfrak{S}^2 , D, F, G Ψ , \mathfrak{W} , lat and sy (see Nestle-Aland on Rm 15:15) might indicate that these texts related ἄπο μέρους neither to τολμηρότερον, nor to ἔγραψα, but to ὡς ἐπαναμνησέσκων. Ἐὰν μέρους ὡς ἐπαναμνησέσκων ὑμᾶς would then be an insertion into the statement that Paul wrote rather boldly because of the grace given to him by God.

⁸⁴⁷ Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.120. See 1:5 and also 12:3 and Gal 1:15.

⁸⁴⁸ Thus most commentators. See e.g. *ibid.*, p.120; Barrett, *Romans*, p.275; Zeller, *Römer*, p.238; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.378; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.209f; Hengel, *Mission*, p.20; Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, p.859. For criticism on Cranfield's assumption that Paul has the ministry of the Levites in mind (Cranfield, *Romans*, p.755f) see especially Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, p.859.

⁸⁴⁹ Thus Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, p.860f. Against Wilckens, *Römer* 12-16, p.118.

⁸⁵⁰ Cranfield, *Romans*, p.756 n.3. See also Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, p.860.

⁸⁵¹ Most scholars prefer the former. See Cranfield, *Romans*, p.756; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.210; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.379; Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.120; Zeller, *Römer*, p.238; Barrett, *Romans*, p.275; Wilckens, *Römer* 12-16, p.118; Hengel, *Mission*, p.20; Aus, *Spain*, p.236.

⁸⁵² Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.85.

that “Paul is thinking here in terms of OT eschatology.”⁸⁵⁴ And since Paul reads Isa 66 “through Christian eyes”⁸⁵⁵ he modifies the motif in such a way that he primarily sees himself as bringing Gentile Christians from his congregations in all the nations as an offering to Jerusalem. But Paul hasn’t said anything about the collection up to this point, and only with Rm 15:25 does he introduce this second concern of his to the Romans.⁸⁵⁶ With most scholars, therefore, I think that the Gentiles are the object of the offering, but that they are not represented in the delegation.⁸⁵⁷

“Damit es nicht als Selbstruhm des Apostels klingt”⁸⁵⁸ Paul says that his boasting in respect to his work is grounded in Christ Jesus. He would not dare talk about anything which is not brought about for the obedience of the Gentiles. Using the phrase ὑπακοὴ ἐθνῶν Paul refers back to 1:5. He is an apostle for the gospel (1:1), ministering in the service of the gospel (15:16).

Since Christ is the moving spirit behind Paul’s work Paul has completed the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum.⁸⁵⁹ This reference to Jerusalem and Illyricum is probably to be taken in an exclusive sense rather than in an inclusive sense.⁸⁶⁰ As apostle to the Gentiles his missionary field is the Gentile territory.⁸⁶¹ And “a preaching in Jerusalem would not naturally be thought of as forming part of the Gentile mission.”⁸⁶² Since Paul continued depicting Jerusalem as the starting point of the gospel and the centre of salvation history he here thinks in terms of salvation history. This is made clear by the fact that he has completed (πεπληρωκένοι) the gospel in this area. He could not have done this on his own, nor even with the help of his fellow workers.⁸⁶³ Πεπληρωκένοι, therefore, seems to tie in with the fullness of the Gentiles in

853 Aus, *Spain*.

854 Ibid., p.236f.

855 Ibid., p.237.

856 See Hengel, *Mission*, p.20 n.21.

857 For criticism on Aus see Zeller, *Römer*, p.238. Hengel, *Mission*, p.20, denies any connection of Rm 15:16 with the collection.

858 Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.118. See also Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.120.

859 “ὍΣΤΕ v.19b refers back to the explanation of v.17 in v.18 and 19a. See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.863; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.760; Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.120. I do not, however, follow Wilckens in saying that “das logische Subjekt in V19b eigentlich das Evangelium selbst ist,” (ibid., p.120) and that Paul’s “Völkermission” therefore belongs “eben doch zur Gesamtbewegung des Evangeliums hinzu.” (ibid., p.120) The moving spirit was Christ.

860 Thus Käsemann, *Römer*, p.380; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.760.

861 See §3.6.1.4..

862 Ibid., p.760.

863 Thus Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.864.

Rm 11:25,⁸⁶⁴ which anticipates Israel's salvation. Paul has done "pioneer preaching"⁸⁶⁵ in a "representative way."⁸⁶⁶ But also his fellow workers have laid foundation (ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον, v.20). Hence it is exaggerated to say that Paul thinks of his own mission to be the only one to bring God's plan of salvation to an end.⁸⁶⁷ What Paul is saying is that he has - in respect to his strategy not to preach where Christ has already been proclaimed - no room left in the eastern part of the world. Paul, therefore, prepares his visit to Rome in "a sweeping vision of missionary strategy."⁸⁶⁸ All this work has so far hindered him from coming to Rome.⁸⁶⁹ Now he wants to see the Romans and needs their help on his way to Spain.

"The reason why Paul was so set on reaching Spain is regrettably much less clear than we might have hoped."⁸⁷⁰ It was certainly much more likely for Paul to reach out for Spain rather than more northern regions.⁸⁷¹ And probably also the fact that Spain was depicted in Jewish tradition to be the end of the world playing an important part in the work of the Servant of the Lord in Isa 66 could have inspired Paul to aim for missionary work in Spain.⁸⁷² However, Paul does not say that his trip to Spain is part of God's plan of salvation. His mission in the eastern part of the world is fulfilled. And why not go to Spain, then?

In Rm 15:25-33, then, Paul comes to speak about his collection enterprise. For the last time his visit to Rome will be delayed because he is on his way to Jerusalem serving (διακονῶν) the saints. The use of διακ- refers to 15:31; 2 Cor 8:4, 19-20; 9:1, 12-13. It is "most frequently used with reference to the collection."⁸⁷³ The present tense of the

⁸⁶⁴ Thus also *ibid.*, p.864; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.210; Muck, *Salvation*, p.48. See also Barrett, *Romans*, p.276; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.380f. Zeller denies any "heilsgeschichtliche Hintergedanken." (Zeller, *Römer*, p.239)

⁸⁶⁵ Cranfield, *Romans*, p.762.

⁸⁶⁶ Barrett, *Romans*, p.276.

⁸⁶⁷ Thus the thesis of Aus, *Spain*, p.234. See also Munck, *Salvation*, e.g. p.43, 55.

⁸⁶⁸ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.869.

⁸⁶⁹ Διὸ refers to v.19b and not to v.20f. See *ibid.*, p.871; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.765f; Wilckens, *Römer*, p.123f; Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.121; Zeller, *Römer*, p.239. Against Käsemann, *Römer*, p.382.

⁸⁷⁰ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.872.

⁸⁷¹ See *ibid.*, p.872.

⁸⁷² Thus Aus, *Spain*.

⁸⁷³ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.873. See also Barrett, *Romans*, p.278.

participle διακονῶν is usually taken as expressing purpose.⁸⁷⁴ And the present tense of the verb πορεύομαι probably indicates that Paul is about to leave for Jerusalem.⁸⁷⁵

Since the Romans have not heard anything about the collection from Paul he has to explain this ministry in v.26ff: the Macedonians and Achaians have decided to make a collection. Εὐδόκησαν indicates that it was their free will gift.⁸⁷⁶ Since Paul does not explain the ‘fellowship’ it must have been clear that the term κοινωνία τις εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἀγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ denotes a financial aid.

In verse 27 Paul adds to the fact that they deliberately organised the collection that they are the debtors to Jerusalem. In 2 Cor 8 Paul has argued with the principle of ἰσότης. The reciprocity will come to effect in the future. In 2 Cor 9 Paul said that the collection will immediately cause thanksgiving to God and prayer for the Corinthians. “Jetzt [in Rm 15:27] dreht Paulus den Stamm κοινων- anders herum.”⁸⁷⁷ The collection is a means of fellowship in “material things”⁸⁷⁸ in return for the fellowship in spiritual blessings already received from the Jerusalem Christians.

The πνευματικά probably is “all which believers have received from the Spirit,”⁸⁷⁹ in the first instance the gospel as such,⁸⁸⁰ which first came to Israel and only later to the Gentiles, but also the “geistgewirkten himmlischen Gaben.”⁸⁸¹ Since, however, in the whole letter Paul does not explicitly refer to any tradition received from Jerusalem I do not think that it also refers to traditions received.⁸⁸²

The giving of the collection Paul describes in terms of λειτουργεῖν. This refers back to 15:16. Through Paul’s service the gospel has reached the Macedonians and Achaians, and they share in the πνευματικά of the Jerusalem Christians (v.27). And the Gentiles’ collection is in return their service to the Jerusalem Christians. That the Gentiles can minister at all shows that “both cultic and ethnic boundaries have been

⁸⁷⁴ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.873; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.384; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.770f; Wilckens, *Römer*, p.124 n.601; O’Rourke, *Participle*, p.116-118.

⁸⁷⁵ Thus Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.873; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.770.

⁸⁷⁶ Compare 1 Cor 16:2; 2 Cor 8:4, 9:7. See Käsemann, *Römer*, p.384; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.771; Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.127; Zeller, *Römer*, p.240; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.875.

⁸⁷⁷ Zeller, *Römer*, p.240.

⁸⁷⁸ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.876. Also Barrett, *Romans*, p.279, Cranfield, *Romans*, p.773f, Käsemann, *Römer*, p.385.

⁸⁷⁹ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.876. See Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.127; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.214.

⁸⁸⁰ Thus Zeller, *Römer*, p.240.

⁸⁸¹ Käsemann, *Römer*, p.385.

⁸⁸² Against Barrett, *Romans*, p.279. See also Cranfield, *Romans*, p.773.

removed and completely transformed.”⁸⁸³ And since the collection is this service it is a means of this unity.

In verse 28 Paul calls the collection⁸⁸⁴ τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον. This takes up 2 Cor 9:8ff. The collection is a “irdische Frucht der empfangenen geistlichen Güter.”⁸⁸⁵ Since Paul with the collection ministers to the saints (15:25) the fruit is a sign for the fact “daß das von ihnen [the Jerusalem Christians] begonnene Werk der Evangeliumsverkündigung in der Heidenwelt Frucht getragen hat.”⁸⁸⁶ It does not in the first instance refer to the “Fruchtbarkeit der paulinischen Mission.”⁸⁸⁷ The fruit is an outcome of the gospel and returns thus to Jerusalem, where the gospel started.⁸⁸⁸

Σφραγίζομαι would usually denote the handing over of the gift to Paul by his churches.⁸⁸⁹ However, since Paul only seals the fruit when he has delivered it to Jerusalem,⁸⁹⁰ most commentators relate αὐτοῖς to the Jerusalem church and translate the verb ‘sealing over to.’⁸⁹¹ This view is supported by the fact that αὐτοῖς in v. 27 refers to the Jerusalem church⁸⁹² and that Paul in v. 25 talks about his service for the Jerusalem saints. However, in v. 26f the Gentiles are the subject.⁸⁹³ It is, therefore, most likely that αὐτοῖς refers to them.⁸⁹⁴ Since the collection only achieves its purpose of helping the poor in Jerusalem and establishing unity among Gentiles and Jews when it is delivered to and accepted in Jerusalem σφραγισάμενος means the sealing of the fruit to the Gentile churches by the successful handing over of the collection. Paul’s role is that of an ‘advocate’ of his churches.

⁸⁸³ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.883.

⁸⁸⁴ Against Bartsch, *Frucht*, p.96, p.107.

⁸⁸⁵ Käsemann, *Römer*, p.387.

⁸⁸⁶ Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.86. See also Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.128; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.775.

⁸⁸⁷ Zeller, *Römer*, p.241.

⁸⁸⁸ See Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.214f.

⁸⁸⁹ See e.g. Bartsch, *Frucht*, p.95.

⁸⁹⁰ The καὶ in v.28 is explicative. See Käsemann, *Römer*, p.387.

⁸⁹¹ Thus Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.86; Wilckens, *Römer*, p.128; Lietzmann, *Römer*, p.123; Bartsch, *Frucht*, p.96; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.774 n.3; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.214; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.387; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.876f.

⁸⁹² See Cranfield, *Romans*, p.774 n.3.

⁸⁹³ Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.127.

⁸⁹⁴ I think the understanding of the sealing over as a pars pro toto for sealing and delivering (thus Radermacher, *σφραγίζεσθαι*, p.87f; Barrett, *Romans*, p.279; Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, c.1589) is difficult. Αὐτοῖς would, then, refer to the collectors (sealing) as well as to the recipients (delivering).

When he has completed this task he will go to Spain by way of Rome.⁸⁹⁵ And after he has delivered the collection, after he has himself been delivered from the disobedient in Judea and after his service has been accepted by the saints Paul will be freed “innerlich und äußerlich von einer offensichtlich drückenden Last.”⁸⁹⁶

In Rm 15:31 Paul expresses his fear concerning his journey to Jerusalem. We have to distinguish between the fear in respect to the Jewish Christians concerning the collection (ἵνα... ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἁγίοις γένηται) and the fear for his life in respect to the Jews in Judea (ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ). Paul did not fear that he as a person and as an apostle could be rejected by the Jerusalem Christians. He nowhere indicates that the Jerusalem Christians have rescinded their acceptance of him as a missionary among the Gentiles (Gal 2:1-10) and that they were hostile towards him since the Antioch Incident. On the other hand the fear of the Jews he relates only to himself and not to the acceptance of the collection or the appearance of the delegation. The two issues “were no doubt as closely linked in Paul’s mind as his syntax makes them.”⁸⁹⁷ However, that they are two distinct aspects is supported by Acts. According to Act 21:17ff Paul was well received by the Jerusalem church. The reason for Paul being accused by the Jews was his gospel and his attitude towards the law and the temple (Act 21:28f, 24:5f, 24:21, 25:19). It is striking that according to Acts “die Gemeinde im ganzen Prozeßbericht keine Rolle spielt.”⁸⁹⁸ “Dies gilt ebenso für die paulinischen Gemeinden, deren Vertreter Paulus auf seiner Jerusalemreise begleitet hatten.”⁸⁹⁹ Not the collection and the delegation were provocative to the Jews, but Paul’s presence.⁹⁰⁰ Hence I do not think that the collection was meant to be “eine Provokation gegen die Judaisten.”⁹⁰¹

⁸⁹⁵ See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.877; Cranfield, *Romans*, p.774.

⁸⁹⁶ Käsemann, *Römer*, p.387. Also Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.877.

⁸⁹⁷ Ibid., p.883.

⁸⁹⁸ Stolle, *Zeuge*, p.274.

⁸⁹⁹ Ibid., p.274f.

⁹⁰⁰ It is of course in Luke’s interest to show that Paul is “primär Zeuge ‘des sich durch seine Boten selbst verkündigenden Christus’.” (ibid., p.275, quoting from Käsemann, *Fragen*, p.30) Maybe Luke’s concentration on this one aspect in the portrayal of Paul’s trial is another reason for his silence about the collection. One reason could be the “failure of the collection” (Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.24) because of the Jews’ zeal against Paul. The other reason would, then, be the fact that he did not want to stress the point that there were any troubles in Jerusalem regarding the Gentile Christians, the collection and the delegation, but only regarding Paul.

⁹⁰¹ Wilckens, *Römer 12-16*, p.130. Against Aus, *Spain*, p.256, who connects 11:13f with 15:16 and 15:25ff; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.84f.

We now turn to the delegation and its function asking who took part in the collection and the delegation.⁹⁰²

In 1 Cor 16:1 we heard that Paul had instructed the Galatians about the collection. And from 2 Cor 8 and 9 we know that the Macedonians and Achaians took part in it. Presumably also Corinth was included. In Rm 15 Paul might only mention “the regions in closest proximity to Rome,”⁹⁰³ which additionally were most of all engaged in the collection. But nevertheless the only thing we can be sure of is that Paul is on his way to Jerusalem with a collection from Macedonia and Achaia. Only by way of conjecture and in comparison with the list in Act 20:4 can we say more about the partaking churches.

Moreover we have to be clear about the fact that Paul does not mention any delegation at all in Rm 15. He merely says that the Macedonians and Achaians organised a collection and that he is going to deliver it to Jerusalem. It seems to have been of no importance for Paul to explain the delegation to the Romans. Its significance should, therefore, not be stressed too much. From Paul’s own references to the collection we can hardly say that “the Apostle to the Gentiles made it his practice to gather representatives or delegates from each of the areas he missionized for the task of bringing the collected gifts to Jerusalem.”⁹⁰⁴

There is, however, no need to assume that Paul changed his plans to take a delegation with him. In 1 Cor 16:1-4 he organised a Corinthian delegation, and in 2 Cor 9 we heard of a delegation from Macedonian Christians following him to Corinth, from where he started to Rome.

For a reconstruction of this delegation we have to refer to Act 20:4. The list includes Sopater of Beroea (Σώπατρος Πύρρου Βεροιαῖος), Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica (Θεσσαλονικέων δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Σεκοῦνδος) and Tychicus and Trophimus from Asia (Ἀσιανοὶ δὲ Τύχικος καὶ Τρόφιμος). In Act 21:29 Trophimus is described as being from Ephesus. Hence we have three men from Macedonia and two from Asia. “That means a numerically strong representation of the Macedonian churches.”⁹⁰⁵ About the participation of the Ephesian church we do not hear anything from Paul, not even in 2 Cor 9, which was written after he had departed from Ephesus

⁹⁰² See especially the discussion in Munck, *Salvation*, p.292ff; Nickle, *Collection*, p.68f; Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.87.

⁹⁰³ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.875.

⁹⁰⁴ Aus, *Spain*, p.257. His thesis depends entirely on this assumption and is based on Munck’s, Georgi’s and Nickle’s discussion of the participating churches. (See *ibid.*, p.235 n.12)

⁹⁰⁵ Munck, *Salvation*, p.294.

for Corinth.⁹⁰⁶ We might find a reference to them in 2 Cor 8:18-24.⁹⁰⁷ But if so it remains unresolved why Paul does not mention Ephesus to stir up the Corinthians' zeal for the collection.

Puzzling is the reference to Gaius and Timothy in Act 20:4: Γάϊος Δερβαῖος καὶ Τιμόθεος. It would conform with Act 19:29 if Gaius was from Thessalonica as are Aristarchus and Sekundus.⁹⁰⁸ Derbe would then refer to Timothy, which would conform with Act 16:1.⁹⁰⁹ But then the καὶ between Δερβαῖος and Τιμόθεος does not fit. Hence the most natural reading is that Gaius comes from Derbe in south Galatia.⁹¹⁰ Timothy, then, might be from Galatia as well, but not from Derbe.⁹¹¹ This could indicate that Galatia took part in the collection.

Acts does not say anything about representatives from Troas, Philippi, Tyre, Ptolemais, Caesarea⁹¹² and Cyprus. To say, therefore, that "additional representatives were picked up along the trip"⁹¹³ and that "apparently the list is not complete"⁹¹⁴ is based on the presupposition that "the collection was Paul's all-consuming interest from the Jerusalem conference onwards."⁹¹⁵ But we just know of delegates from Asia and Macedonia. And we can only presume that there were delegates from Corinth, Achaia⁹¹⁶ and Galatia as well. Any reconstruction of a complete list of delegates from all Pauline churches or from all areas around the eastern part of the Mediterranean sea "goes beyond the evidence of the text itself."⁹¹⁷ So does the assumption that Paul was accompanied by a "large body of church representatives."⁹¹⁸

We cannot say that the delegation represented all Pauline churches. Paul nowhere assigns to the collection the function of bringing in the full number of the

⁹⁰⁶ See §4.6.1.. See also *ibid.*, p.295f.

⁹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p.296f.

⁹⁰⁸ See *ibid.*, p.294.

⁹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p.294

⁹¹⁰ For the variant reading Δουβ(ε)ριος see Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.87 n.333; Nickle, *Collection*, p.68 n.79.

⁹¹¹ Maybe from Lystra. See Act 16:1 and *ibid.*, p.68 and p.68 n.80.

⁹¹² But see Act 21:16.

⁹¹³ *Ibid.*, p.69.

⁹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.68. See Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.87.

⁹¹⁵ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.875, rejecting the opinion quoted.

⁹¹⁶ See, however, Wedderburn, *Reason*, p.42f.

⁹¹⁷ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.874.

⁹¹⁸ Munck, *Salvation*, p.302. See also Georgi, *Kollekte*, p.87f. Wedderburn, *Reasons*, p.23, speaks of "a small party."

Gentiles (Rm 11:25). ⁹¹⁹ He could hardly have thought that the Messiah would come “primarily through his own efforts” ⁹²⁰ of the collection. And we also cannot combine Rm 11:13f, Rm 11:25f, Rm 15:16 and Rm 15:25ff. The *τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν* (Rm 11:14) is not identical with *πᾶς Ἰσραήλ* (Rm 11:26), ⁹²¹ the *πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν* (Rm 11:25) is not represented in the delegation, and the collection is presumably not the offering of the Gentiles (Rm 15:16).

To sum up:

In Rm 15:14-33 Paul stresses that the collection is a free-will gift. If there is any obligation it is merely moral. It is a charitable sign of fellowship and intended to establish unity. Paul himself is the advocate of his churches guaranteeing that the collection is well received and is serving this purpose. Since the collection was made for Jewish Christians it was not intended to make the Jews jealous. Also “der Gedanke an eine repräsentative Vorwegnahme der prophetisch angekündigten Völkerwallfahrt nach Zion... entfällt in unserem Text völlig.” ⁹²² Paul’s “Mission ist von der apokalyptischen Hoffnung getragen, einer der missionarischen Wegbereiter der Erlösung für Heiden und Juden sein zu dürfen.” ⁹²³ But with the collection he did not want to achieve anything more - nor anything less - than establishing unity and fellowship between his Gentile Christian congregations and the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem.

⁹¹⁹ Against Aus, *Spain*, p.234.

⁹²⁰ Ibid., p.261.

⁹²¹ See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p.874.

⁹²² Käsemann, *Römer*, p.385. Against Cranfield, *Romans*, p.770.

⁹²³ Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, p.212.

5. CONCLUSION

In my dissertation I have attempted to find an answer to the question whether Paul is in the first instance a systematic thinker or a pragmatic churchman. In doing so I have looked at Paul's concepts of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles, his apostleship to the Gentiles and the collection of money for Jerusalem. We have seen that in the history of research these issues have always been closely related to each other. Scholars' views on how Paul conceived of Gentile - Jewish relations have shaped their views on his apostleship and collection. Thus I have looked at Paul's references to his revelation experience and collection mainly in Gal 1-2, but also in Paul's other letters, developing his view on Gentile - Jewish relations, his apostleship and his collection and how these issues are connected in Paul's thought.

Concerning Gal 1:15-16a we saw that it is Paul's basic conviction that the people of God is a unity of Jews and Gentiles with the Jews in a position of prime importance. Paul saw himself commissioned to proclaim the final inclusion of the Gentiles into the eschatological people of God. Relating his commission to the commission of the Servant of the Lord he conceived of his own role as playing an important part in God's plan of salvation. However, we also saw that Paul in Gal 1:15-16a does not really argue for his Gentile mission on grounds of his 'people-of-God-ecclesiology.' He argues on a textual (rhetorical), historical and theological (based on models of revelation experiences found in the Old Testament) level, but not ecclesiologically.

With this it has already been shown that Paul is no 'perfect systematic thinker.' His 'people-of-God-ecclesiology' is the underlying concept of his apostleship. But, nevertheless, there seems to be no need for Paul to argue on the basis of this basic conviction. He is not interested in arguing for the fact that his apostleship is part of his Jewishness. He mainly stresses his commission to the Gentiles. Thus he is not compelled by one theological system to argue for a certain point in one particular way.

However, Gal 1:15-16a is a highly stylised and systematised block of text. And Paul's allusions to Old Testament redemptive history quite obviously suggest that Paul's ecclesiology is one of a unity of Jews and Gentiles, and that he is interested in maintaining relationship with Israel. Thus I will now summarise the findings of the chapter on Paul's collection because they support my thesis - and bring the point even more strongly across - that Paul is no 'perfect systematic thinker.'

I have argued that the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident were concerned with quite different issues. At the Jerusalem Council the apostles agreed with Paul on the eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of God without being circumcised. Only at the Antioch Incident was there a debate about the day to day situation in mixed congregations. Here Jerusalem insisted on the necessity of Jewish obedience to the law, whereas Paul defended the rights of the Gentiles as Gentiles. For him Jews and Gentiles were to form a single community without any divisions concerning social intercourse. However, for both parties it was unquestioned that the Gentiles were to be included into the people of God. Paul's ecclesiology was one of the people of God being a unity of Jews and Gentiles.

In this light, then, we made good sense of the collection agreement at the Jerusalem Council. Almsgiving from Gentiles to the Jews was to show the Gentiles' will to convert to the God of Israel and the Jews' recognition of this will. Thus it was a means of unity between Jews and Gentiles with the Jews in the place of prime importance. With the collection agreement it was thus recognised that the Gentiles were already part of the people of God. However, later on, when after the break with Antioch Paul took up the collection again, he did not argue on the grounds of this concept of Jewish - Gentile relations. He rather used a variety of images and arguments for taking up the collection and for a rich collection. It is a sign of fellowship and intended to establish unity between Jerusalem and Paul's churches, and the institution of almsgiving might be in the background of Paul's concept all the time. But the fact that Jerusalem is the centre of Jewish Christianity and thus of Israel is not the main point of Paul's argument. Hence, although the eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of God is the main issue of the collection Paul does not systematically elaborate this thought when talking about the collection.

Concerning his own role Paul conceived of himself merely as the advocate of the Gentiles. In 1 Cor 16 he did not plan to deliver the collection at all. And according to 2 Cor 8 and 2 Cor 9 it seems that it was the commitment of his churches which forced him to accompany their delegates to Jerusalem.

Therefore, concerning the collection we have made the same observation as we made concerning Paul's apostleship. Both issues are related to the relationship between Jews and Gentiles. But Paul does not systematically integrate his apostleship to the Gentiles and the collection among his Gentile churches for Jerusalem into this 'people-of-God-ecclesiology.'

And he does not even transfer his special role as apostle to the Gentiles to his role in the collection from the Gentiles to Jerusalem. He does not develop one system of his role as an apostle which he then applies to all aspects of his work among his Gentile Christian churches. Hence, concerning Paul's apostleship I argued in one direction with the highly eschatological and theological interpretations of the works mentioned in §3.3. and with some of the works mentioned in §3.2.. But concerning his role in the collection enterprise I do not agree with these interpretations, which regard Paul as the one by whose collection the fullness of the Gentiles will come in and the one by whose collection the Gentiles will make the prophesied pilgrimage to Zion.

Hence, I think that the issues of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles, of Paul's apostleship and of his collection are interrelated issues. Both Paul's apostleship and his collection are based on his 'people-of-God-ecclesiology.' But arguing for the one or the other Paul does not systematically elaborate his concept of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles. And although both issues are related issues on the basis of the unity of Jews and Gentiles Paul does not transfer his role as an apostle to his role as the bearer of the collection. Contrary to the way many scholars deal with Paul I think that he is no 'perfect systematic thinker.' He has basic convictions, but he is a pragmatic churchman and not a systematic thinker. He does not elaborate on the grounds of some basic convictions a complete and coherent systematic theology, which he then applies to the problems and situations in his congregations he is dealing with in his letters. As a pragmatic churchman he rather works the other way round. First there are the problems and situations to deal with. Only then does Paul develop his arguments for his point.

Therefore, the most basic result of my thesis is a methodological one. Dealing with Paul we should not assume that he was taught systematic theology as we are. For Paul what is given is the method of biblical argumentation, but not the results of this exegesis. Paul does not apply a theological system to the situation; the argumentation is determined by the situation. Hence, we should be much more concerned with the situation in Paul's congregations and with the point he wants to make before we refer to related issues in other Pauline letters or even within the same letter.

This methodological reservation against systematising the pragmatic churchman Paul is the lesson which we might learn from the fact that *Paul's apostleship and collection* are - musically speaking - neither a counterpoint to, nor an homophonic accompaniment of, but rather a polyphonic variation on *the unity of Jews and Gentiles*.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

6.1. Texts

- DIE BIBEL, Nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers, Bibeltext in der revidierten Fassung von 1984, Stuttgart 1985
- THE HOLY BIBLE, containing the Old and New Testament with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, New Revised Standard Version, New York/Oxford 1989
- DIO, Cassius, *Roman History*, vol.VII, with an English translation by Earnest Cary, on the basis of the version of Herbert Baldwin Foster, in: Warmington, E. H. (ed.), The Loeb classical library, vol. 175, Cambridge (Massachusetts)/London 1966
- ELLIGER, Karl/RUDOLPH, Wilhelm (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS)*, editio funditus renovata, Dritte verbesserte und verkleinerte Ausgabe, Stuttgart 1987 = Stuttgart 1967/77
- JOSEPHUS, Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities*, books XV - XVII, with an English translation by Ralph Marcus, completed and edited by Allen Wikgren, in: The Loeb classical library, vol. VIII, London/Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1963 (*Ant.*)
- JOSEPHUS, Flavius, *The Jewish War*, books I-III and IV - VII, with an English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray, in: The Loeb classical library, London/Cambridge (Massachusetts), vol. II 1956, vol. III 1957
- KAUTZSCH, Emil, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, 2 Volumes, Tübingen 1900
- NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE (*Nestle-Aland*), post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle, ed. Kurt Aland et Barbara Aland, 26. neu bearbeitete Auflage, 9. Druck, Stuttgart 1987
- OROSIUS, Paulus, *Historiarum adversum paganos, libri VII*, accedit eiusdem liber apologeticus, recensit et commentario critico instruit Carlus Zangemeister, in: *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. V, Vindobonae 1882
- RAHLFS, Alfred (ed.), *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, verkleinerte Ausgabe in einem Band, Stuttgart 1979 = Stuttgart 1935

6.2. Dictionaries and Concordances

- BAUER, Walter, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, 6.völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage, herausgegeben von Kurt Aland/Barbara Aland, Berlin/New York 1988

- DENIS, Albert-Marie, *Concordance Greque des Pseudepigraphes d'Ancien Testament*. Concordance. Corpus des textes. Indices, Louvain-la-Neuve 1987
- EVEN-SHOSHAN, Abraham, *A New Concordance of the Bible*, Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible, Hebrew and Aramaic, Roots, Words, Proper Names, Phrases and Synonyms, Jerusalem 1990
- GESENIUS, Wilhelm, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, bearbeitet von F. Buhl, unveränderter Neudruck der 1915 erschienenen 17. Auflage, Berlin u.a. 1962
- GROSSWÖRTERBUCH ENGLISCH, Englisch-Deutsch, Deutsch-Englisch, Duden-Oxford, Dudenredaktion und Oxford University Press (ed.), Mannheim/Wien/Zürich 1990
- HATCH, Edwin/REDPATH, Henry A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books) in three Volumes*, fifth reprint, Grand Rapids/USA 1991 = first reprint = Oxford 1897 (Vol.1 and 2), 1906 (Vol.3)
- REHKOPF, Friedrich, *Septuaginta-Vokabular*, Göttingen 1989
- RENGSTORF, Karl Heinrich (ed.), *A complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, 4 Volumes, Leiden 1973-1983
- VOLLSTÄNDIGE KONKORDANZ ZUM GRIECHISCHEN NEUEN TESTAMENT. Unter Zugrundelegung aller modernen kritischen Textausgaben und des textus receptus in Verbindung mit H. Riesenfeld u.a. neu zusammengestellt unter der Leitung von Kurt Aland, 2 Volumes (Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 4,1), Berlin/New York 1983

6.3. Commentaries

- BARRETT, Charles Kingsley, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Black's New Testament Commentaries, London 1962
- BARRETT, Charles Kingsley, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, Black's New Testament Commentaries, London 1973
- BETZ, Hans Dieter, *Galatians*, A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia, Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Philadelphia/USA 1979
- BETZ, Hans Dieter, *Corinthians 8 and 9*, A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul, Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Philadelphia/USA 1985
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, A Commentary on the Greek Text, The New International Greek Testament Commentary 2, Exeter/U.K. 1982
- BURTON, Ernest de Witt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Galatians*, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh 1921

- CONZELMANN, Hans, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 5, eleventh edition, first revised edition, Göttingen 1969
- CRANFIELD, Charles Ernest Burland, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to The Romans*, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh 1979, Volume II, Commentary on Romans IX-XVI and Essays
- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, *Romans*, Word Biblical Commentary 38A, *Romans 1-8* and 38B, *Romans 9-16*, David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker (ed.), Dallas/Texas 1988
- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, Black's New Testament Commentaries, London 1993
- FUNG, Ronald Y.K., *The Epistle to the Galatians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, I. Title. II. Series, Grand Rapids/USA 1988
- GUELICH, Robert A., *Mark 1:1-8:26*, Word Biblical Commentary 34A, Dallas/Texas 1989
- HAENCHEN, Ernst, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3, tenth edition, first new edition Göttingen 1956
- HOLTZ, Traugott, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament XIII, 2nd edition, Zürich/Braunschweig/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990
- KÄSEMANN, Ernst, *An die Römer*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 8a, 4th edition Tübingen 1980
- LANG, Friedrich, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, Das Neue Testament Deutsch 7, 16th edition, first revised edition, Göttingen 1986
- LIETZMANN, Hans, *An die Römer*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 8, fourth edition Tübingen 1933
- LIETZMANN, Hans, *An die Korinther I · II*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9, fifth edition, completed by W.G. Kümmel, Tübingen 1969
- LIETZMANN, Hans, *An die Galater*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 10, Tübingen 3rd edition 1932
- LIGHTFOOT, Joseph Barber, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, a Revised Text with Instruction, Notes, and Dissertations, The Epistles of St Paul, II. The Third Apostolic Journey, 3. Epistle to the Galatians, ninth edition London and New York 1887
- LONGENECKER, Richard N., *Galatians*, Word Biblical Commentary 41, Ralph P. Martin (ed.), Dallas/Texas 1990
- MARTIN, Ralph Philip, *2 Corinthians*, Word Biblical Commentary 40, Dallas/Texas 1986

- MUßNER, Franz, *Der Galaterbrief, Auslegung von Franz Mußner, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament IX, 2.*, Wikenhauser, Alfred/Vögtle, Anton/Schnackenburg, Rudolph (ed.) 2nd edition Freiburg 1974
- NOLLAND, John, *Luke 1-9:20*, Word Biblical Commentary 35A, Dallas/Texas 1989
- OEPKE, Albrecht, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, revised by Joachim Rohde, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament IX, Erich Fascher, Joachim Rohde, Christian Wolff (ed.), Berlin 5th edition 1984
- PLUMMER, Alfred, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh 1915
- SCHILLE, Gottfried, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 5, 3rd ed. Berlin 1989
- SCHLIER, Heinrich, *Der Brief an die Galater*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7, Göttingen 11th edition 1951
- SCHRAGE, Wolfgang, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament VII/1, 1 Kor 1,1-6,11, Zürich/Braunschweig/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991
- STUHLMACHER, Peter, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Das Neue Testament Deutsch 6, 14th edition, first revised edition, Göttingen 1989
- WINDISCH, Hans, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6, ninth edition Göttingen 1924
- WILKENS, Ulrich, *Der Brief an die Römer (Röm 12-16)*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament VI/3, Zürich/Einsiedeln/Köln/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982 (*Römer 12-16*)
- WOLFF, Christian, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8 - 16*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament VII/2, Berlin 1982
- ZELLER, Dieter, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Übersetzt und erklärt von Dieter Zeller, Regensburger Neues Testament, Regensburg 1985

6.4. Monographs and Articles

- AUS, Roger David, *Paul's Travel Plans to Spain and "the Full Number of the Gentiles" of Rom XI 25*, Novum Testamentum XXI (1979), p.232-262
- BAMMEL, Ernst, *πτωχός, πτωχεία, πτωχεύω*, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VI, Πε - P, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.885-915, esp. p.908-910
- BARTSCH, Hans-Werner, *...wenn ich ihnen diese Frucht versiegelt habe. Röm 1528*, Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der paulinischen Mission, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 63 (1972), p.95-107

- BAUR, Ferdinand Christian, Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums, Eduard Zeller (ed.), Leipzig vol. 1 ²1866 (*Paulus I*), vol. 2 ²1867 (*Paulus II*)
- BERGER, Klaus, *Abraham* in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen, Münchener Theologische Zeitschriften 17 (1966), Michael Schmaus, Wilhem Keilbach (ed.), München 1966, p.47-89
- BERGER, Klaus, *Almosen* für Israel. Zum historischen Kontext der paulinischen Kollekte, New Testament Studies 23 (1977), p.180-204
- BERGER, Klaus, *Exegese* des Neuen Testaments, Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung, 2nd edition Heidelberg 1984
- BERGER, Klaus, *Theologiegeschichte* des Urchristentums, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen/Basel 1994
- BERTRAM, Georg, ἔθνος, ἑθνικῶς, A (in the LXX), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament II, Δ - H, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.364-369
- BETZ, Otto, Die *Vision* des Paulus im Tempel von Jerusalem, Apg 22,17-21 als Beitrag zur Deutung des Damaskuserlebnisses, Verborum Veritas, Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag, Otto Böcher and Klaus Haacker (ed.), Wuppertal 1970, p.113-123
- BLANK, Josef, *Paulus* und Jesus, Eine theologische Grundlegung, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testamentvol. XVIII, München 1968
- BULTMANN, Rudolf, *Theologie* des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen 1958
- CALLAN, Terrance, The Background of the Apostolic *Decree* (Acts 15:20,29; 21:25), Catholic Biblical Quarterly 55 (1993), p.284-297
- COHEN, Shaye J. D., Crossing the *Boundary* and becoming a Jew, Harvard Theological Review 82 (1989), p.13-33
- DAUTZENBERG, Gerhard, Der Zweite Korintherbrief als *Briefsammlung*, Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt 25.4, Wolfgang Haase (ed.), Berlin/New York 1987, p.3045-3066, esp. p.3046-3052
- DIETZFELBINGER, Christian, Die Berufung des Paulus als *Ursprung* seiner Theologie, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 58, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985
- DONALDSON, Terence L., The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3.13-14, New Testament Studies 32 (1986), p.94-112
- DONALDSON, Terence L., *Zealot* and Convert: The Origin of Paul's Christ-Torah Antithesis, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Vol.51 (1989), p.655-682
- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, Once More - Gal 118: ἱστορῆσαι κεφᾶν, In *Reply* to Otfried Hofius, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 76 (1985), p.138-139

- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, *The Incident at Antioch* (Gal. 2.11-18), Jesus, Paul and the law, London 1990
- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, *The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem according to Galatians 1 and 2*, *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982), p.461-478
- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, J.D.G. Dunn (general editor) *New Testament Theology*, Cambridge 1993
- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament, An Inquiry into the Character of the Earliest Christianity*, 2nd edition Trowbridge 1991
- DUNN, James Douglas Grant, What was the *Issue* between Paul and "Those of the Circumcision"? in: *Paulus und das Antike Judentum/Tübingen-Durham-Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters (†19. Mai 1938)*, Martin Hengel, Ulrich Heckel (ed.), Tübingen 1991, p.295-317
- FREDERIKSEN, Paula, *Judaism, the Circumcision of the Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 42.2 (1991), p.533-564
- FRIEDRICH, Gerhard, *εὐαγγελίζομαι, εὐαγγέλιον*, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* II, Δ - H, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.707-737, esp. *εὐαγγελίζομαι* p.707-721 and *εὐαγγέλιον* p.721-736
- GAGER, John G., *Some Notes on Paul's Conversion*, *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981), p.697-704
- GEORGI, Dieter, *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem*, *Theologische Forschung, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Kirchlich - Evangelischen Lehre* vol.38, Hamburg - Bergstedt 1965
- HAACKER, Klaus, *Die Berufung des Verfolgers und die Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen, Erwägungen zum Zusammenhang zwischen Biographie und Theologie des Apostels Paulus*, *Theologische Beiträge* 6 (1975), p.1-19
- HENGEL, Martin, *Der vorchristliche Paulus*, in: *Martin Hengel/Ulrich Heckel (ed.), Paulus und das antike Judentum, Tübingen-Durham-Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters († 19. Mai 1938)*, WUNT 58, Tübingen 1991, p.177-291
- HENGEL, Martin, *Die Synagogeninschrift von Stobi, Prof. E. Käsemann zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 57 (1966), p.145-183
- HENGEL, Martin, *Die Ursprünge der urchristlichen Mission*, *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971), p.15-38
- HENGEL, Martin, *The Zealots, Investigation into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.*, Edinburgh 1989
- HILL, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews, Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*, Minneapolis 1992

- HOFIUS, Otfried, Gal 1 18: ἱστορῆσαι Κεφᾶν, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 75 (1984), p.73-85
- HOLL, Karl, Der *Kirchenbegriff* des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde, in, Holl, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. II, Der Osten, Darmstadt 1964, p.44-67
- HOLMBERG, Bengt, *Paul and Power*, The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles, Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series II, Lund 1978
- HOLTZ, Traugott, Die Bedeutung des *Apostelkonzils* für Paulus, Novum Testamentum 16 (1974), p.110-148
- HOLTZ, Traugott, Zum Selbstverständnis des Apostels *Paulus*, Theologische Literaturzeitung 91, Mai 1966, column 321-330
- HURTADO, Larry W., The Jerusalem *Collection* and the Book of Galatians, Journal for the Study of the New Testament 5 (1979), p.46-62
- HYLDAHL, Niels, Die paulinische *Chronologie*, Acta Theologica Danica vol.XIX, Leiden 1986
- JEREMIAS, Joachim, *Chiasmus* in den Paulusbriefen, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 (1958), p.145-156
- JEWETT, Robert, *Dating Paul's Life*, London 1979
- KÄSEMANN, Ernst, Neutestamentliche *Fragen* von heute, in: *ibid.*, Exegetische Versuch und Besinnungen vol.2, Göttingen 1964, p.11-31
- KECK, Leander E., The Poor among the Saints in the New Testament, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 56 (1965), p.100-129 (*Poor 1*)
- KECK, Leander, E., The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 57 (1966), p.54-78 (*Poor 2*)
- KIM, Seyoon, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, United States of America 1982 (German edition Tübingen 1981)
- KNOX, John, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, London 1954
- KNOX, John, Romans 15 14-33 and Paul's *Conception* of his apostolic Mission, Journal of Biblical Literature 83 (1964), p.1-11
- KOCH, Dieter-Alex, Die *Schrift* als Zeuge des Evangeliums, Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie vol. 69, Johannes Wallmann (ed.), Tübingen 1986

- KUHN, Heinz-Wolfgang, Die Bedeutung der *Qumrantexte* für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes, Aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament, in: George J. Brooke/Florentino García Martínez (ed.), *New Qumran Texts and Studies, Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Paris 1992, F.G. Martínez/A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* vol. VX, Leiden/New York/Köln 1994
- LUCK, Ulrich, Die Bekehrung des Paulus und das Paulinische *Evangelium*, Zur Frage der Evidenz in Botschaft und Theologie des Apostels, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 76 (1985), p.187-208
- LÜDEMANN, Gerd, Paulus, der *Heidenapostel*, Band 1, Studien zur Chronologie, Forschung zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Ernst Käsemann/Ernst Würthwein (ed.), 123. Heft der ganzen Reihe, Göttingen 1980
- MICHAELIS, Wilhelm, ὁράω, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* V, Ξ - Πα, Gerhard Friedrich (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.315-382, esp. p.315-367
- MUNCK, Johannes, Paul and the *Salvation* of Mankind, London 1959
- MURPY-O'CONNOR, Jerome, Paul and *Gallio*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993), p.315-317
- MURPY-O'CONNOR, Jerome, St. Paul's *Corinth*, Texts and Archaeology, Robert J. Karris (ed.), *Good News Studies* vol. 6, Wilmington/Delaware 1983
- MURPHY-O'CONNOR, Jerome, The Theology of the Second Letter to the *Corinthians*, J.D.G. Dunn (ed.), *New Testament Theology*, Cambridge 1991
- NICKLE, Keith F., The *Collection*, A Study in Paul's Strategy, *Studies in Biblical Theology* 48, London 1966
- NIEBUHR, Karl-Wilhelm, *Heidenapostel* aus Israel: die jüdische Identität des Paulus nach ihrer Darstellung in seinen Briefen, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 62, Tübingen 1992
- OEPKE, Albrecht, ἐν, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* II, Δ - H, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.537-544
- OEPKE, Albrecht, ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* III, Θ - K, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1984, p.556-592
- O'ROURKE, John J., The *Participle* in Rom 15,25, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967), p.116-118
- QIMRON, Elisha/STRUGNELL, John, An Unpublished *Letter* from Qumran, *Biblical Archaeology Today, Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, 1984*, Janet Amitai (ed.), Jerusalem 1985
- QIMRON, Elisha, The *Hebrew* of the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Harvard Semitic Studies* 29, Design and Typesetting Jerusalem, printed in the USA 1986

- RÄISÄNEN, Heikki, Paul's Conversion and the *Development* of His View of the Law, *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987), p.404-419
- RADERMACHER, Ludwig, σφραγίζεσθαι: Rm 1528, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1933), p.87-89
- RENGSTORF, Karl Heinrich, ἁμαρτωλός, ἀναμάρτετος, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* I, A - Γ, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.317-335
- RENGSTORF, Karl Heinrich, ἀποστέλλω, ἀπόστολος, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* I, A - Γ, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.398-447, esp. ἀπόστολος p.407-445
- SANDERS, Ed Parish, *Jesus and Judaism*, third edition London 1985 (JJ)
- SANDERS, Ed Parish, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism, A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, third edition London 1989 (PPJ)
- SANDERS, Ed Parish, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, London 1985 (PLJP)
- SANDERS, Ed Parish, *Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11-14*, in: Robert T. Fortna/Beverly R. Gaventa (ed.), *The Conversation Continues, Studies in Paul & John, In Honour of J. Louis Martyn*, Abingdon (Nashville) 1990, p.170-188
- SANDNES, Karl Olav, *Paul -One of the Prophets?*, A Contribution to the Apostle's Self-Understanding, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2.Reihe 43, Martin Hengel/Otfried Hofius (ed.), Tübingen 1991
- SCHMIDT, Karl Ludwig, ἔθνος, ἐθνικῶς, B (New Testament), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* II, Δ - H, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, ἔθνος p.369-372, ἐθνικῶς p.372
- SCHMIDT, Karl Ludwig, καλέω, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* III, Θ - K, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Amsterdam 1965, p.487-536 (esp. p.501-536)
- SCHWEIZER, Eduard, υἱός, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* VIII, T - Ψ, chapter D. New Testament, Gerhard Friedrich (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1983, p.363-392
- SEGAL, Alan F., *Paul the Convert : The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*, Binghampton, New York 1990, esp. chapter one, Paul and Luke, p.3-33
- SELLIN, Gerhard, *Hauptprobleme des Ersten Korintherbriefes, Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 25.4, Wolfgang Haase (ed.), Berlin/New York 1987, p.2940- 3044
- STENDAHL, Krister, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and other essays*, Norwich 1976 (First British Edition London 1977), esp. chapter 2, Call Rather Than Conversion, p.7-23

- STOLLE, Volker, *Der Zeuge als Angeklagter, Untersuchungen zum Paulus-Bild des Luks*, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, sechste Folge, Heft 102, Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz 1973
- STRACK, Hermann Leberecht/BILLERBECK, Paul, *Die Stellung der Synagoge zur nichtjüdischen Welt, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. 4, Exkurse zu den einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testaments, 4th unchanged ed., München 1965, p.353-414
- STUHLMACHER, Peter, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament²⁸, Das Evangelium und die Evangelien, Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982, P. Stuhlmacher (ed.), Tübingen 1983, p.157-182
- STUHLMACHER, Peter, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, I. Vorgeschichte, E. Käsemann/ E. Würthwein (ed.), Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 95, Göttingen 1968
- SUHL, Alfred, *Der Galaterbrief - Situation und Argumentation, Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 25.4, Wolfgang Haase (ed.), Berlin/New York 1987, p.3067-3134
- TAYLOR, Justin, *The Ethnarch of King Aretas at Damascus: A Note on 2 Cor 11:32-33*, *Revue biblique* 99 (1992), p.719-728
- TAYLOR, Nicholas, Paul, *Antioch and Jerusalem, A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Supplement Series 66, Sheffield 1992
- THEIßEN, Gerd, *Judentum und Christentum bei Paulus. Sozialgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu einem beginnenden Schisma, Paulus und das Antike Judentum/Tübingen-Durham-Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters (+19. Mai 1938)*, Martin Hengel, Ulrich Heckel (ed.), Tübingen 1991, p.331- 359
- VERSEPUT, Donald J., *Paul 's Gentile Mission and the Jewish Christian Community: A Study of the Narrative in Galatians 1 and 2*, *New Testament Studies* 39, January 1993, p.36-58
- VIELHAUER, Philipp, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter, Berlin/New York 1975
- WATSON, Francis, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles, A Sociological Approach*, Cambridge 1986
- WEDDERBURN, Alexander J. M., *Purpose and Occasion of Romans Again*, *ExpTim* 90/1979, p.137-141, reprinted in Karl P. Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate*, Revised and Expanded Edition, Peabody/Massachusetts 1991
- WEDDERBURN, Alexander J. M., *Keeping up with recent Studies: VIII. Some recent Pauline chronologies*, *The Expository Times* 92 (1981), p.103-108
- WEDDERBURN, Alexander J. M., *The Reasons for Romans*, Edinburgh 1988 (paperback 1991)

WEISS, Hans-Friedrich Φαρισαῖος, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament IX, Φ - Ω, Gerhard Friedrich (ed.), Geoffrey W. Bromiley (ed. and trans.), Grand Rapids/Michigan 1984, p.11-48