

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
 I Introduction	 1
1. <i>The textual and thematic focus of the present study</i>	1
2. <i>Social-ethnic readings of justification in Paul</i>	3
3. <i>Gal 2:16 and ἔργα νόμου in context</i>	8
4. <i>Thesis</i>	11
 II Recent interpretation – scholarly main lines and key individuals	 16
1. <i>The flow of thought in Gal 2:14b–21 – a map of recent main lines of interpretation</i>	16
1.1. “Sinners” and the Antioch Incident in the flow of the argument	17
1.1.1. How and why are gentiles thought to be “sinners” in 2:15?	20
1.1.2. Are gentile Christians implicitly referred to by the expression “sinners of gentiles” in 2:15?	23
1.1.3. Does 2:15 represent Paul’s view?	24
1.2. “Our” knowledge and “our” coming to faith in Christ	25
1.3. “Sinners” and coming to faith in the flow of the argument	26
1.3.1. In what sense have “even/also we ourselves” been found as “sinners”?	26
1.3.2. Does Paul agree to the negative evaluation of “us” contained in the protasis in 2:17a?	27
1.4. The continuation of Paul’s flow of thought in 2:18–20	30

1.4.1. What do ἃ and ταῦτα refer to?.....	30
1.4.2. What does the transgressor transgress?.....	31
1.4.3. The function of 2:18 and the challenge of εἰ γάρ.....	34
1.5. What is the logic in 2:21b–c?	37
 2. <i>The flow of thought in 2:14b–21 – key individual examples</i>	39
2.1. E. P. Sanders	39
2.2. J. D. G. Dunn	42
2.3. H. Räisänen	57
2.4. N. T. Wright	63
2.5. J. L. Martyn	67
2.6. M. de Boer	75
2.7. D. A. Campbell	79
2.8. S. Cummins	84
2.9. J. M. G. Barclay	90
2.10. B. W. Longenecker	95
2.11. M. Nanos and the “Paul within Judaism” Perspective	98
2.12. R. Schäfer	110
2.13. M. Bachmann	113
2.14. H.-J. Eckstein	120
2.15. J. Lambrecht	125
2.16. V. M. Smiles	133
2.17. R. N. Longenecker	138
2.18. T. R. Schreiner	142
2.19. D. J. Moo	144
2.20. A. A. Das	148
 III On occasion, date, opponents, and issues	153
1. <i>Introduction</i>	153
2. <i>The occasion of the letter, the agitators, their identity, and message</i>	153
2.1. The identity of the agitators and their relation to Jerusalem	155
2.2. Excursus: Matters of chronology	158
2.2.1. The standpoint of the present author on matters of date and chronology	161
2.2.2. The limited dependence of my thesis on these answers	165
2.3. What did the agitators concretely require of the Galatians?	167
2.4. What was the overarching category of the concrete requirements of the agitators?	169
2.5. Requirements for what?	171

2.5.1. The moral deficit of the Galatians	171
2.5.2. The more fundamental motivation	172
2.6. Conclusion	193
 IV Structural and functional matters and matters of basic referents.....	194
1. <i>On the function, character, and structure of Gal 2:14b/15–21 in the letter as a whole</i>	194
2. <i>A survey of the structural flow of the letter</i>	195
2.1. Gal 1:1–5	198
2.2. Gal 1:6–12	198
2.3. Gal 1:13–2:21	199
2.4. Gal 3:1–4:31	201
2.5. Gal 5:1–12	205
2.6. Gal 5:13–6:10	206
2.7. Gal 6:11–18	207
2.8. A schematic representation of the structure of the letter as a whole	208
3. <i>The basic character and function of 2:14b/15–21 in relation to its context</i>	210
3.1. Is 2:15–21 a <i>propositio</i> ?	210
3.2. Is 2:15–21 a new paragraph or a continuation?	212
3.3. The double function of 2:14b/15–21	214
3.4. 2:14b/15–21 in the thematic structure of Galatians	215
4. <i>Preliminaries on basic referents within and the internal structure of 2:14b–21.</i>	224
4.1. Who are “we”?	224
4.2. Is 2:15 Paul’s view, and does it refer to the gentile Christians at Antioch?	225
4.3. On the syntactic and semantic/pragmatic main structure of 2:15–16	228
4.3.1. Model I	228
4.3.2. Model II	229
4.3.3. Model III	232
4.3.4. Evaluation	232

5. On the main structure of 2:14b–21 as a whole	237
6. Conclusion	244
 V “We” Jewish Christians and the “sinners of gentiles”	245
1. Introduction and thesis	245
2. “Sinners of gentiles” and the Jewish background	246
2.1. Surveying the texts	247
2.1.1. Jewish texts specifically connecting gentiles with sin	247
2.1.2. NT texts	249
2.1.3. Jewish texts calling other Jews “sinners”	250
2.1.4. NT texts	252
2.2. Observations	253
2.3. Preliminary conclusions	257
3. Purity, Jewish <i>amixia</i> , “sinners of gentiles,” and the food laws	258
3.1. Status level is not purity level	262
3.2. Moral impurity is not ritual impurity	262
3.3. Gentile impurity is moral, not ritual	264
3.4. Jewish social <i>amixia</i> is primarily concerned with moral impurity	266
3.5. Not eating with gentiles, purity, the food laws, and Antioch	267
4. Peter’s withdrawal and <i>ἰουδαῖζειν</i>	273
4.1. Hypocrisy in what sense?	274
4.1.1. Requiring of others what he does not require of himself/the “diachronic” understanding problematized	274
4.1.2. The <i>a fortiori</i> ethnic force	276
4.1.3. Pretending against his own knowledge	277
4.1.4. What does Peter pretend against his knowledge?	278
4.2. Being a Jew, living <i>ἰουδαϊκῶς</i> , and <i>ἰουδαῖζειν</i>	280
4.2.1. Other occurrences and the issue of reference	281
4.2.2. The issue is meaning, force, and significance rather than reference	285
4.2.3. The significance is religious	286
4.2.4. The perspective is elitist and prescriptive rather than descriptive	287
4.2.5. The Mosaic covenant is implied as prescriptive canon	289

4.2.6. The eschatological perspective.....	291
4.3. Summary	292
4.4. ἀναγκάζεις in what sense?	293
4.4.1. Not Peter's explicit demand but the gentiles' necessary inference	293
4.4.2. Peter's intentions directed elsewhere	294
4.4.3. The identity and concerns of οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς behind Peter's withdrawal.....	295
4.4.4. The necessary inference of the gentile believers	298
5. "Sinners of gentiles" and Antioch.....	301
5.1. The pre-conversion reference and its significance.....	302
5.2. Two matters of clarification	305
5.2.1. The probable presence of identity markers and the significance thereof.....	305
5.2.2. The possible presence of another view being implicitly opposed.....	305
6. Conclusion	306
VI "Even we ourselves" being found as "sinners"	308
1. Introduction and thesis.....	309
2. The character of Paul's denial in 2:17.....	311
2.1. Defining the question.....	311
2.2. Against the "Paul disagrees" camp	314
2.3. Against the "Paul agrees partly, but ultimately disagrees" camp	317
2.4. Conclusion	318
3. In what sense have "even we ourselves" been found as "sinners"? The options.....	318
3.1. The occasional/particular line of interpretation (I)	319
3.1.1. The "food" interpretation (I.a).....	322
3.1.2. The "association" interpretation (I.b).....	322
3.1.3. The options and their significance	323
3.1.4. Critique of the occasional/particular line's interpretation of 2:15–17a.....	323
3.2. The general line of interpretation (II).....	329

3.2.1. The “abandoning law reliance” interpretation (II.a).....	330
3.2.2. The “new definition of covenant boundaries” interpretation (II.b).....	330
3.2.3. The “backward inference” interpretation (II.c).....	332
3.2.4. The “justification through judgment” interpretation (II.d).....	335
 4. The “positive” argument for the “justification through judgment” interpretation	336
4.1. The cross of Christ.....	336
4.1.1. The centrality of the cross in the letter generally and in 2:14b–21.....	336
4.1.2. The cross as central argument against the requirements of the agitators.....	338
4.1.3. The cross as salvation historical center and inbreaking of the aeon to come	338
4.1.4. The cross as intersection of salvation and individual history and thus encountered in conversion	339
4.1.5. The cross as fulfillment of Scripture	341
4.2. The ὅτι clause of 2:16a	342
4.2.1. The linguistic arguments for the exclusive reading	345
4.2.2. The linguistic arguments for the complementary or ambiguous reading	346
4.2.3. Evaluation of the linguistic arguments.....	346
4.2.4. The contextual argument for and against the exclusive and complementary/ambiguous readings	347
4.2.5. Evaluation of the contextual arguments	348
4.2.6. Another suggestion solving the problems	350
4.3. The semantic and structural relationships between the elements of 2:16b–17a	352
4.4. The relation between the participial clause in 2:16a and the following	357
4.4.1. The post-conversion interpretation.....	358
4.4.2. The “not particularly Christian” interpretation	359
4.4.3. The pre-conversion interpretation	360
4.4.4. The conversion/faith interpretation	362
 5. How does “our” being found as “sinners” invite the inference that Christ is a servant of sin?	363
 6. Pulling central threads together.....	366
 7. Conclusion	369

VII Tearing down, building up, dying, living, and not annulling the grace of God	371
1. <i>Introduction and thesis</i>	371
2. <i>How does 2:18 function? The challenge of εἰ γάρ</i>	372
2.1. Indications from Paul's use of μὴ γένοιτο	373
2.2. εἰ γάρ as introducing a simple condition ("for if")	374
2.2.1. 2:18 as parenthetical explanation of the evaluation in 2:17a	375
2.2.2. 2:18 as support for an implied middle step between 2:17c and 2:18	375
2.2.3. The "myself, not Christ" interpretation	378
2.3. εἰ γάρ as introducing a "necessary" condition ("for only if")	379
2.4. εἰ γάρ as introducing a "correcting" conditional argument	379
2.5. εἰ γάρ as introducing an <i>e contrario</i> conditional argument ("on the contrary, (for) (only) if")	380
2.6. εἰ γάρ as non-explanatory	381
2.6.1. εἰ γάρ as slightly adversative after a "caesura"	381
2.6.2. γάρ as a marker of inference	383
2.7. Conclusion	384
3. <i>Why the shift to the singular? The challenge of the "I"</i>	384
4. <i>Transgressor of what? – and how?</i>	387
4.1. The "concrete commandments" interpretation (I)	388
4.1.1. The "past transgression" variant (I.a)	388
4.1.2. The "future transgression" variant (I.b)	389
4.2. Critique of the "concrete commandments" interpretation	389
4.2.1. General problems	389
4.2.2. Specific problems with the "past transgression" variant (I.a)	390
4.2.3. Specific problems with the "future transgression" variant (I.b)	392
4.3. The "transgression at a deeper level" interpretations (II)	393
4.3.1. The "Paul (at least ultimately) disagrees" camps	395
4.3.2. The "Paul agrees" camp	396
4.4. Evaluation	397
4.5. Conclusion	399
5. <i>An alternative suggestion</i>	399

5.1. Excursus: Breaking/tearing down vs. building in the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, and the NT	402
5.2. The mandating paradigm: Lethal destruction	416
6. <i>Not annulling the grace of God</i>	419
6.1. The relation between 2:21 and 2:17–18 in terms of argumentative structure.....	419
6.2. The relation of 2:21b to the agitators and the consequences thereof.....	423
6.3. The connection to 2:19–20	424
6.3.1. The intentional aspect of 2:21a	425
6.3.2. The argumentative structure	426
6.3.3. The decisive theme of death	427
6.3.4. Excursus: A note on <i>δωρεάν</i>	428
7. <i>Conclusion</i>	430
VIII Conclusion.....	432
IX Appendices	437
1. <i>Appendix A: “Breaking down” vs. “building up” in (almost) the same verse in the MT and LXX</i>	438
2. <i>Appendix B: “Breaking/tearing down” in the MT and LXX</i>	442
3. <i>Appendix C: “Building” in the MT and LXX</i>	446
4. <i>Appendix D: “Breaking down” vs. “building up” in (almost) the same verse in the NT</i>	449
5. <i>Appendix E: “Breaking down” in the NT</i>	450
6. <i>Appendix F: “Building” in the NT</i>	452
Bibliography.....	455
Index of Ancient Sources	475
Index of Modern Authors	497
Index of Subjects.....	500