

Paul employs negatively charged terms (“son of the slave,” “according to the flesh”) that allude to portions of the Genesis narrative where Ishmael and the circumcision covenant are featured (Gen 16–17, 21). On the one hand, Paul wants his readers to link the “Judaized” Gentiles with Ishmael and his sorry fate:

- Both represent attempts to produce heirs for Abraham by human (natural or “fleshly”) means—Ishmael through concubinage, the Gentiles through circumcision.
- Both accept circumcision as adults (Ishmael is thirteen in Gen 17).
- Both are nonetheless disinherited.

On the other hand, Gentile late-comers are meant to be associated with the late-in-coming Abrahamic son of promise: Isaac/Christ:

- Both become heirs of Abraham by supernatural means—Isaac by supernatural birth to Sarah, the Gentiles by the supernatural birth of baptism.
- Both receive the inheritance, the promise of blessing “to the Gentiles” (Gen 22:18).

Paul’s point is clear: Circumcision is of no avail (see Gal 5:6). In light of the expulsion and disinheritance of Ishmael (Abraham’s firstborn son “after the flesh,” and his first son to be circumcised), it is an inescapable conclusion that circumcision is no guarantee of the Abrahamic inheritance of the promised blessing.¹²⁸ Indeed, circumcision may have been necessary at one time, but even then it was not sufficient for what mattered most.¹²⁹ Indeed, even Abrahamic sonship is no guarantee of the inheritance, because not all sons are heirs! Paul wishes the Galatians to be the right *kind* of Abrahamic sons: namely, *son-heirs*.¹³⁰

In speaking of the apocalyptic images of the “two Jerusalems,” Paul once again draws his themes from the Old Testament.¹³¹ Paul’s statement about the “present Jerusalem” being “enslaved” reflects his prior assessment of the servile effects of the Deuteronomic covenant on the nation of Israel in history.¹³² The Judaizers, who think that covenant fidelity still requires nomistic service at the central sanctuary in earthly Jerusalem, are still bound to the curses pronounced and effected by the ancient covenant which first established the law of the central sanctuary, that is, the Deuteronomic covenant.¹³³ Paul employs his “allegorical” argument here as another way to demonstrate from the Torah that Christians are no longer under the “works

of the law” (or its “curse”), since Christ’s death has effected the termination of the Deuteronomic covenant.

Paul’s view of “the Jerusalem above” being “free” is based upon his earlier demonstration in Galatians 3:6–14 that Christ’s death has exhausted the curses of the Old Covenant and released the blessings of the New. As a result, Jews and Gentiles are offered a new way of sharing the Abrahamic blessing and inheritance of divine sonship: by faith in Christ. Paul’s allegory presents the essential shape of the new covenant in terms of the eschatological reality of divine sonship. Muller observes:

When Paul returns to the theme of the sonship of Abraham at the end of this line of thought [i.e., Gal 4:21–31], he explicitly raises the issue of the kind of sonship of Abraham it is that gains one entrance into the covenant community. Sonship of Abraham, in one instance, is fleshy. In the other it is sonship of God and is covenantal. It is precisely this distinction that Paul exploits to disinherit, as it were, circumcision Jews who reject Christ. Abraham’s true offspring belong to the covenant made with Abraham and that covenant was constituted by faith in God, not by fleshy descent. If the Jews do not manifest faith then they are outside the community of Israel (see Gal 6:16). Ishmael, who can claim fleshy descent and who was circumcised (Gen 17:23), does not share in the covenant!¹³⁴

Paul’s argument has come full circle. The starting point of the *probatio*—Abrahamic sonship—is now definitively revealed in terms of its essential and abiding reality, that is, divine sonship according to the New Covenant.

The “Works of the Law” in Light of Galatians 3–4

The vantage point afforded here at the end of Paul’s argument in Galatians 3–4 enables us to achieve a better comprehension of Paul’s critical phrase, “the works of the law.”

The primary reference of “the works of the law” is to the Levitical administration of ceremonial law (Exod 25–Lev 27) which was “added because of transgressions” (i.e., the calf; Gal 3:19) resulting in a more elaborate system of mediation (3:20) and thus greater distance between Israel and God.¹³⁵ This Levitical law may have been intended as nothing more than a tem-

porary remedial punishment for the first generation, but its bicovenantal system of mediation was rendered permanent with the institution of the Deuteronomic covenant. Thus, “works of the law” may be identified more specifically with the Deuteronomic covenant as the final and definitive socio-religious constitution of Israel as a nation-state.¹³⁶

As such, a secondary sense of the phrase may be discerned. The recent work of J. Dunn is relevant here. Dunn interprets “the works of the law” in the light of the Antioch incident (Gal 2:11–16), which highlights the boundary-defining effects of the “works of the law.” As “boundary markers,” the works of the law preserve the separation between Israel and the Gentiles:

By “works of law” Paul intended his readers to think of *particular observances of the law like circumcision and the food laws*. His Galatian readership might well think also of the one other area of law observance to which Paul refers disapprovingly later in the same letter—their observance of special days and feasts (Gal 4.10). But why these particular “works of the law”? [. . .] From the larger cultural context, provided for us by Greco-Roman literature of the period, we know that *just these observances were widely regarded as characteristically and distinctively Jewish*. Writers like Petronius, Plutarch, Tacitus, and Juvenal took it for granted that, in particular, circumcision, abstention from pork, and the sabbath were observances which marked out the practitioners as Jews. . . . It is clear, in other words, that these observances . . . *served to identify their practitioners as Jewish in the eyes of the wider public* [my emphasis].¹³⁷

There is much to be said for Dunn’s approach. For one thing, he views “works of the law” primarily in terms of the covenant obligations assumed by Israel in response to God’s redemptive grace.¹³⁸ For another, he sees the priority of the Abrahamic covenant—rather than the Mosaic—as the foundation for God’s saving plan for the nations fulfilled through Christ.¹³⁹ With his covenantal, relational approach, Dunn offers a more accurate and balanced view of Paul’s understanding of divine righteousness and justification than Luther or Calvin.¹⁴⁰

There are, however, some deficiencies with Dunn’s interpretation. He overlooks the penitential purpose of the boundary-defining laws. As has been shown above, they were added after (and because of) Israel’s rebellious acts. Consequently, he misses the self-retiring nature of the laws

peculiar to the Deuteronomic covenant, and overlooks the promises contained in Deuteronomy that point to a future act of divine renewal, eventually fulfilled in the new covenant grant of Christ's spirit of divine sonship. Indeed, once the new covenant is established, the "works of the law" are no longer necessary or proper. Instead, there are more appropriate and suitable obligations that serve as New Covenant boundary markers, for example, baptism.¹⁴¹

Conclusions

In Galatians 3–4, Paul argues for the priority and primacy of the Abrahamic covenant—rather than the Mosaic—as the foundational covenant with Israel and ultimately with all mankind. Paul sees the Abrahamic covenant as reaching its definitive form in Genesis 22:15–18, when it is ratified by God through a solemn oath promising blessing to the nations/Gentiles through Abraham's seed. Unlike the covenant of Genesis 17, the covenant-oath of 22:15–18 is not conditioned on Abraham's circumcision or any other practice or observance of Abraham or his descendants—certainly not the Mosaic law.

In contrast to the Abrahamic covenant, the Mosaic covenant—at least as renewed after the golden calf and other rebellions—is secondary and subordinate in Paul's eyes. For Paul, the Mosaic system as finalized in the Deuteronomic covenant can not be the economy of salvation, because under it Israel *did not receive*—and *is not receiving*—the blessings promised to Abraham. Instead, curses have come. Therefore, the Mosaic covenant is a temporary, penitential, and highly mediated arrangement which is valid only until the coming of the definitive "seed" spoken of in the oath of the Aqedah (Gen 22:18). The Book of Deuteronomy—the final form of the Mosaic covenant—reflects its self-retiring nature, when it speaks of the inevitable failure of the people and the actualization of its severe curses, after which there will be a new exodus and a supernatural initiative on the part of God to "circumcise the hearts" of the people.

Jesus Christ, the "only Son" of the Father who is sacrificed on the mountain "upon the wood," takes on himself the Deuteronomic covenant curses at the cross, thus enabling the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant-oath to flow once again to the Gentiles. Thus Jesus fulfills the sacrifice of the Abrahamic covenant typified and prefigured at the Aqedah by Abraham's one "seed," Isaac.

Paul sees at the center of this whole process the reality of divine sonship.

God has acted as a father toward Israel, bringing him to life as a son (Exodus and Sinai covenant), subjecting him to the pedagogy of the Law (Levitical and Deuteronomic codes), and bringing him to maturity through the coming of the one Son (the New Covenant) while opening the way for the other nations of the human family also to enter into this filial relationship.

Throughout our study, we have seen vindicated our original assumptions that Paul's thought is strongly covenantal, his use of the Old Testament thoroughly contextual, and the structure of his argument chiasmic and filial.

98. J. Mauchline, "Implicit Signs of a Persistent Belief in the Davidic Empire," *VT* 20 (1970), 287–303; and Polley, *Amos and the Davidic Empire*, 66–82.

99. See Strauss, *Messiah*, 190–92.

100. Pao, *Acts*, 138. Cf. Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis*, 74; D. Seccombe, "The New People of God," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. H. Marshall and D. Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 350–72; R. Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," in *The Book of Acts in Its First-Century Setting*. Vol. 4: *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (ed. R. Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 415–80, esp. 457; and Y. Miura, *David in Luke—Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism* (WUNT 2 232; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 140–98.

101. McKnight is only able to advance this thesis because he concerns himself with the "historical Jesus" rather than the Jesus presented in the Gospels. Specifically, he argues that Jesus' references to "covenant" at the Last Supper were attributed to Jesus by the early Church, but were never spoken by him; see S. McKnight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005) 308–10.

102. On the Abrahamic covenant in Luke, see Brawley, *Text to Text*, and idem, "Abrahamic Covenant Traditions and the Characterization of God in Luke—Acts," in *The Unity of Luke—Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999) 109–32.

103. On this see S. van den Eynde, "Children of the Promise: On the Διαθήκη-Promise to Abraham in Lk 1,72 and Acts 3,25," in *The Unity of Luke—Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999) 470–82.

104. Translation from F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–98).

105. Translation from Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*.

106. Cf. the conclusion of del Agua ("Lucan Narrative," 661) on the Christological and ecclesiological implications of the "Kingdom of God" in Luke—Acts: "[In Luke—Acts] the Church constitutes the eschatological people of God. This should end the reticence of properly relating Kingdom and Church. The Kingdom of God or the divine plan of eschatological salvation is realized, though perhaps not exclusively, in the Church."

Chapter 9

COVENANT, OATH, AND DIVINE SONSHIP IN GALATIANS 3–4

1. On the theological issues surrounding the relationship between the covenants, as well as various recent interpretive approaches (e.g. typology, promise and fulfillment, salvation history, continuity and discontinuity), see D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of the Theological Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments* (2nd ed.; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991); E. E. Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992); V. Poythress, *The Shadow of Christ in the Law of Moses* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1991); J. S. Feinberg, ed., *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments* (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988); L. Goppelt, *TYPOS: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); L. Sabourin, *The Bible and Christ: The Unity of the Two Testaments* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1980).

2. These issues are discussed in a number of recent commentaries, e.g., T. George, *Galatians* (Nashville: Broadman, 1994); J. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993); J. L. Martin, *Galatians* (AYB; New York: Doubleday,

- 1997; reprint, New Haven: Yale University Press); F. J. Matera, *Galatians* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992); R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Waco, TX: Word, 1992); J. A. Fitzmyer, "Galatians," *NJBC*, 780–90; R. Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); U. Borse, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Regensburg: RNT, 1984); F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); C. B. Cousar, *Galatians* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982); H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); H. Lietzmann, *An die Galater* (4th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971); H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (14th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971); J. Bligh, *Galatians* (London: St. Paul, 1969). The following older commentaries are also useful: E. D. Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920); J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians* (London: Macmillan, 1865); Aquinas, *Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Petersham, MA: St. Bede's, 1966).
3. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 75. See also, idem, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism," in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* (ed. E. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 11–44; idem, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
4. N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 260.
5. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 38, referring to F. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud* (ed. F. Delitzsch and G. Schnedermann; Leipzig, 1880); republished in *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften* (ed. Franz Delitzsch and Georg Schnedermann; 2nd ed.; Leipzig: Dörffling Franke, 1897) 262–77.
6. L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, "The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature," *HUCA* 39 (1968) 91–116
7. Smolar and Aberbach, "The Golden Calf Episode," 106, my emphasis.
8. Smolar and Aberbach, "The Golden Calf Episode," 105. See also P. C. Bori, *The Golden Calf and the Origins of the Anti-Jewish Controversy* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 9–25, esp. 13, who reaches the same conclusions.
9. See J. M. Scott, "Paul's Use of the Deuteronomic Tradition," *JBL* 112 (1993) 645–65, esp. 655; idem, "Restoration of Israel," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (ed. G. F. Hawthorne et al.; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993) 796–805, esp. 805; idem, "'For as Many Are of Works of the Law Are Under a Curse' (Galatians 3.10)," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 187–221; and N. T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992) 141. Scott draws heavily on O. H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967).
10. Scott, "Restoration of Israel," 797.
11. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 552. For a helpful response, see F. Thielman, *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans* (Leiden: Brill, 1989); idem, *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994).
12. The origin of the "contextual" approach to Pauline scriptural citation may be C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953). More recent discussion (pro and con) may

be found in the following: G. K. Beale (ed.), *Right Doctrine From Wrong Texts?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); idem, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine From the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of Jesus' and the Apostles' Exegetical Method," *Themelios* 14 (1989) 89–96; M. D. Hooker, "Beyond the Things That Are Written? St. Paul's Use of Scripture," *NTS* 27 (1981–1982) 295–309; R. M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical τυπολογίας Structures* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981); S. L. Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) 39–51; D. A. Carson and H. Williamson, eds., *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

13. D. I. Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 C.E.* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992) 2.

14. Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions*, 165–69.

15. Carol Stockhausen, "2 Corinthians 3 and the Principles of Pauline Exegesis," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 144.

16. Stockhausen, "Principles of Pauline Exegesis," 149.

17. See Stockhausen, "Principles of Pauline Exegesis," 160.

18. Stockhausen, "Principles of Pauline Exegesis," 149.

19. Stockhausen, "Principles of Pauline Exegesis," 144–45. She adds: "A third favorite occupation of Paul's in relation to the Scripture, in particular, the Torah, is the location and solution of contradictions or uneasily reconciled passages . . . [T]here is a strong element of discontinuity in . . . Galatians. It seems to me that this discontinuity is due . . . to his tendency to locate and exegetically reconcile passages in his traditional Scriptures which express this disjunction."

20. Paul's view ought not to be described as supercessionist. The New Covenant is, for him, the restoration and transformation of a form of covenant relationship with God (the Abrahamic) which is older and more stable than the Old (that is, Mosaic) Covenant. In a sense, covenant history moves backward to a better state.

21. At another level, however, Paul appears intent on showing how both the Old and New Covenants are discernible in God's manifold dealings with Abraham regarding the blessing and the seed. Paul argues this from the three sections of the Abraham narrative: (1) *Gen 12–15: justification*—God promises and Abram believes (Gal 3:6, 8–9); (2) *Gen 16–21: circumcision*—Abram acts "according to the flesh" with Hagar, and Ishmael is disinherited (Gal 4:21–31); (3) *Gen 22: God's covenant oath*—after the Aqedah, God changes the Abrahamic promise to bless the nations into a covenant oath (Gal 3:14–16) with his seed.

22. H. D. Betz, *Galatians*, 14–25.

23. E. C. Muller (*Trinity and Marriage in Paul* [New York: Peter Lang, 1990] 395 n. 103) comments: "Betz's analysis, quite important in its own right, follows almost exclusively Hellenistic patterns. Paul's style also owes much to Judaic patterns."

24. Muller (*Trinity and Marriage in Paul*, 82) comments: "Paul sets up the framework of his central argument found in Gal 3:6–4:31 in terms of the sonship of Abraham—'it is men of faith who are the sons of Abraham' (Gal 3:7) and 'Abraham had two sons, one by a slave and one by a free woman' (Gal 4:22). At the very center the focus abruptly shifts to sonship of God—'for you are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:26) and 'God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying 'Abba! Father!'' (Gal 4:6)." He then notes: "Appearing at the beginning, end,

and center, υἱός [son] is . . . a crucially important structuring term for the letter.” (416 n. 199).

25. See Y.-G. Kwon, *Eschatology in Galatians* (WUNT 2 183; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 78–100).

26. Muller, *Trinity and Marriage in Paul*, 83.

27. Gen 18:18 is not the source for *panta ta ethnē*, since, unlike Gen 22:18, this verse is not spoken to Abraham, and Gal 3:8 says: “*hē graphē . . . proeuēngelisato tō Abraam.*”

28. The meaning “become a Jew” would seem best to fit the context of Esth 8:17 LXX, where *ioudaizō* translates the Hebrew verb *hityahad* (cf. Esth 8:17 ASV, RSV, NRSV). See also Josephus *Wars* 2.454 and 463.

29. Levenson observes this argument underlying Gal 3:15–18: “For [Paul’s] dominant purpose in this letter is to argue that Gentiles can inherit the status of descent from Abraham, and all the promises that go with it, without having to convert to Judaism (and become circumcised). The idea that the blessing of Abraham should entail that Jacob/Israel ‘become an assembly of peoples’ fits Paul’s polemical intentions beautifully. As he read Gen 28:1–4, it almost certainly implied precisely the possibility for which he was doing battle—that by becoming Christian, Gentiles could have the best of both worlds, retaining their non-Jewish identity and yet falling heir to the promises of Abraham.”

30. Scott, “‘For as Many as Are of Works . . .’ (Galatians 3.10),” “The twelfth and final curse [of Deut 27], which Paul cites in Gal 3.10, is the most comprehensive, especially in the Septuagintal wording which amplifies it with a twofold πᾶς [“all” or “every”] and thus makes the curse apply to ‘everyone’ who does not keep ‘all things’ that are written” (ibid., 195). See also Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 141–42, who argues that the words “blessing” and “curse,” “occurring together, would at once . . . evoke the great covenant document Deuteronomy, in particular chs. 27–30. . . . In case there is any doubt that Paul is thinking of this passage, he quotes in 10b the concluding verse of the list of curses. . . . This means that the connection with v. 9 is . . . ‘further proved by the fact that works of Torah, so far from providing blessing, hold out curse instead.’”

31. A literal translation reflecting the ambiguities of the text: “The way of righteousness will only be realized in the (foreseeable) future by faith(fulness)—divine first, but also human.” For an able defense, see R. B. Hays, “‘The Righteous One’ as Eschatological Deliverer,” in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988) 191–215; Campbell, “Romans 1:17,” 281; J. A. Sanders, “Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul, and the Old Testament,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; JSNTSup 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 98–117; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962) 230–32.

32. See especially the argument and conclusions of Hays, “‘The Righteous One’ as Eschatological Deliverer,” 191–215. Thielman (*From Plight to Solution*, 70) comments: “In [Gal] 3:11 Paul refers to Hab 2:4, and if we examine the original context of this quotation we find that, like Paul, the prophet was concerned with God’s eschatological deliverance. . . . ‘The righteous shall live by faith’ . . . gives the correct means for attaining righteousness.”

33. See, e.g., the *Didiscalia Apostolorum* §50: “Whilst the Romans rule thou canst not perform aught that is written in the Second Legislation. . . . This is a thing impossible, to fulfil the Second Legislation while dispersed among the Gentiles” (238–40).

34. See J. Willitts, "Context Matters: Paul's Use of Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians 3:12," *Tyndale Bulletin* 54 (2003) 105–22.

35. Willitts, "Context Matters," 113.

36. Note that both Paul and Ezekiel allude to Lev 18:5 (1) in direct connection with a reference to the covenant curses of Deuteronomy (Gal 3:10, 13; Ezek 20:23–26); (2) against the backdrop of the oath to Abraham (Gal 3:8, 14, 16; Ezek 20:5, 6, 9, 14, 22); (3) in the context of YHWH's relationship to the nations (Gal 3:8, 14, 28; Ezek 20:9, 14, 41); (4) while rehearsing the sin-exile-restoration (SER) pattern of Israel's covenant history. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that Paul shares a common interpretive tradition with Ezekiel.

37. Cf. Deut 8:11–20; 29:4.

38. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 151–52. There is a clear complementarity between the different approaches and conclusions of Hanson, Bruce, and Wright. They all show how Paul argues from the contextual meaning of Deut 21:23. While Hanson and Bruce relate the curse of hanging on a tree to the event at Beth-peor, i.e., the event which marks the beginning of the Deuteronomic covenant, Wright interprets the curse-bearing act of Christ as exhausting the Deuteronomic curse of the exile.

For an even fuller explanation of Paul's contextual interpretation, see Stockhausen, "Principles of Pauline Exegesis," 162–63. She points out that the context of Deut 21:23 "discusses the proper behavior of a man with two sons born to two wives, one of whom is beloved and the other disliked. The text is concerned to confirm the right of the first-born in spite of the father's preference for a younger son. Deut 21.18–21 discusses the fate of the stubborn and rebellious son, whose parents must reject him and give him up to the punishment of all the people. There follows Paul's cited text, concerning the curse of execution." All of these themes are of concern to Paul in Galatians (cf. Gal 4.21–31), and "the Jew-Gentile question provides a reasonable *Sitz im Leben*." She also notes how several other New Testament passages represent "variations on the same theme": the parables of the prodigal son (Luke 15:32), the laborers in the vineyard (Matt 20:1–16 par.), the vineyard (Matt 21:33–44 par.); John's account of Jesus' confrontation with the Pharisees (John 8:31–59), where Jesus compares them to Abraham's servant, Ishmael: "The slave does not continue in the house for ever; the son continues for ever" (v. 35).

39. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 152.

40. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 155. Wright's last point about the apparent failure of the Abrahamic blessing has the effect of placing the God of Israel in the same predicament as Israel. Because of his solemn oath in Gen 22:15–18, God is also under a curse, since the nations have not yet been blessed through Abraham's seed. The picture is striking but it corresponds perfectly to God's plan to identify himself with humanity's plight. Christ, as both God and Israel's representative, bears the curses on both that have resulted from Israel's failure to bring blessing to mankind.

41. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 150, 156.

42. A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 6, citing *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch* (ed. and trans. J. W. Ethridge [London, 1865] 433).

43. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 6.

44. M. Wilcox, "Upon the Tree"—Deut 21:22–23 in the New Testament," *JBL* 96 (1977) 85–99, here 98.

45. See Wilcox, "Upon the Tree," 97; and C. H. Cosgrove, "The Mosaic Law Preaches Faith: A Study of Galatians 3," *WTJ* 41 (1977) 146–64, esp. 150–51.

46. G. Vermeš, "Redemption and Genesis XXII," in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies* (SPB 4; Leiden 1961; repr. 1973) 193–227, here 221. He adds: "In developing his theological interpretation of the death of Christ, Paul, in short, followed a traditional Jewish pattern" (221).

47. Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993) 212–13. See also 211–12: "Once Jesus has displaced Isaac, it follows that the promises and blessings that had been associated with the beloved son par excellence in Genesis must be available instead through the Christian messiah. This is, in fact, the implication of Paul's first clause in Gal 3:14. . . . In the Hebrew Bible, the exact words, 'blessing of Abraham,' occur only in Gen 28:4, in a passage which Isaac, having directed Jacob to avoid intermarriage, pronounces upon him the Abrahamic blessing of progeny and land (vv 1–4). It is surely relevant to Paul's purpose that this passage has to do with Isaac's confirmation of Jacob as his—and Abraham's—rightful heir."

48. For discussion of covenant in Gal 3 and esp. in 3:15–18, see most recently P. R. Williamson, *Sealed with an Oath: Covenant in God's Unfolding Purpose* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 23; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2007) 194–201; and D. Garlington, *An Exposition of Galatians: A Reading from the New Perspective* (3rd ed.; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007), 212–18.

49. J. Behm and G. Quell, "διαθήκη," *TDNT* 2:104–34, here 125.

50. Behm, *TDNT* 2:104–5.

51. Behm, *TDNT* 2:126. Aristophanes uses *diathēkē* as "covenant" once: "Not I . . . unless they make a covenant with me." (Av. 440).

52. Quell, *TDNT* 2:107.

53. Behm, *TDNT* 2:127.

54. On the definition of "covenant," see Quell, *TDNT* 2:106–24, and Gordon P. Hugenberger, *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage, Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (VTSup 52; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 168–215.

55. So Dunn, *Galatians*, 182; Betz, *Galatians*, 156; Martyn, *Galatians*, 338.

56. So Longenecker, *Galatians*, 128; and F. F. Bruce, *Galatians*, 169.

57. See S. W. Hahn, "Covenant, Oath, and the Aqedah: Διαθήκη in Galatians 3:15–18" *CBQ* 67 (2005) 79–100.

58. Behm, *TDNT* 2:129.

59. See Quell, *TDNT* 2:111–18.

60. E.g., *dithēkē* (v. 17), *nomos* (vv. 2, 5, 10–13, 17, 19, 21, 23–24), *dikaioō* (vv. 8, 11, 24), *prokuroō* (v. 17), *akuroō* (v. 17); *klēronom-* (vv. 18, 29), *protithēmi* (v. 19), *diatassō* (v. 19).

61. C. H. Cosgrove, "Arguing Like a Mere Human Being: Galatians 3. 15–18 in Rhetorical Perspective," *NTS* 34 (1988) 536–49. Cf. Witherington, *Grace*, 241; Burton, *Galatians*, 504: "To take [this expression] as meaning 'I am using terms in a Greek, not a Hebrew sense' . . . is quite unjustified by the usage of that expression."

62. Rom 9:4, 11:27; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6, 14; Gal 3:17, 4:24; cf. Eph 2:12.

63. For the LXX, see Quell, *TDNT* 2:106–7; for the NT, Behm, *TDNT* 2:131–134, esp. 134: "In both form and content the NT use of διαθήκη follows that of the OT." See Matt 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 1:72; 22:20, Acts 3:25; 7:8, Heb 7:22; 8:6, 8–10; 9:4, 15–17, 20; 10:16, 29; 12:24; 13:20; Rev 11:19; 1 *Clem.* 15:4, 35:7; *Let. Barn.* 4:6–8; 6:19; 9:6, 9; 13:1, 6; 14:1–3, 5, 7. Only in Gal 3:15 and Heb 9:16–17 is "testament" a possibility. On these instances, see J. J. Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff. and Galatians III 15ff.:

Tradition in Juda-
 221. He adds: "In
 in short, followed
 Haven: Yale Uni-
 placed Isaac, it fol-
 the beloved son par
 an messiah. This is,
 Hebrew Bible, the
 passage which Isaac,
 him the Abrahamic
 of's purpose that this
 Abraham's—rightful
 see most recently P. R.
 Purpose (New Studies
 2007) 194–201; and D.
 Perspective (3rd ed.;
 125.
 "nant" once: "Not I . . .
 206–24, and Gordon P.
 and Ethics Governing
 52: Leiden: Brill, 1994)
 Galatians, 338.
 ms. 169.
 θῆκη in Galatians 3:15–
 23–24), *dikaiōs* (vv. 8, 11,
protithēmi (v. 19), *diatassō*
 Galatians 3. 15–18 in Rhe-
 nton, *Grace*, 241; Burton,
 using terms in a Greek, not
 expression."
 24: cf. Eph 2:12.
 Behm, *TDNT* 2:131–134,
 follows that of the OT."
 7:8, Heb 7:22; 8:6, 8–10;
 5:4, 35:7; *Let. Barn.* 4:6–8;
 16–17 is "testament" a pos-
 5ff. and Galatians III 15ff.:

A Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure," *NovT* 21 (1976–77) 27–96, esp. 66–71, and two articles by the present author: S. W. Hahn, "A Broken Covenant and the Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15–22," *CBQ* 66 (2004) 416–36; and idem, "Covenant, Oath, and the Aqedah.

64. Burton, *Galatians*, 502.

65. See Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," 83–91, Longenecker, *Galatians*, 128–30, Betz, *Galatians*, 155.

66. See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 130.

67. Martyn, *Galatians*, 366–67; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (trans. Harold Knight; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961) 182–83. To the contrary, Longenecker, *Galatians*, 130.

68. Burton, *Galatians*, 503. Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Galatians* (Orthodox Biblical Studies; Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994) 152; and D. Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998) 59.

69. See Josephus, *Ant.* 15.136: "through angels (*di' angelōn*) sent by God"; Acts 7:38, 53; Heb 2:2.

70. G. M. Taylor, "The Function of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ in Galatians," *JBL* 85 (1966) 58–76.

71. E. Bammel, "Gottes ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (Gal III 15–17) und das jüdische Rechtsdenken," *NTS* 6 (1959–60) 313–19. For a critique of Bammel, see Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," 72–76.

72. B. Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 242–43.

73. See Betz, *Galatians*, 155. The מִתְנַת בְּרִיאַ (m-t-n-t b-r-y-') is distinguished from a דִּיּוּתִיקָא (*d-y-y-t-y-q-y*, i.e. *diathēkē*) in Jewish law (cf. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 129–30; Betz, *Galatians*, 155).

74. As Martyn (*Galatians*, 344–45) admits. Cf. Burton, *Galatians*, 504: "Paul is replying to the arguments of his judaizing opponents, and is in large part using their terms in the sense which their use of them had made familiar to the Galatians."

75. On the covenant as irrevocable, see Quell, *TDNT* 2:114, Burton, *Galatians*, 505.

76. F. M. Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998) 8.

77. See M. Weinfeld, "The Common Heritage of Covenantal Traditions in the Ancient World," in *I trattati nel mondo antico: forma, ideologia, funzione* (ed. L. Canfora et al.; Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1990) 175–91.

78. See Gen 26:28 (covenant between Isaac and Abimelech); 1 Sam 11:1 (between Nahash the Ammonite and the men of Jabesh-gilead), 20:8 (between David and Jonathan), 23:18 (the same); 2 Sam 5:3 (between David and the elders of Israel); 1 Kgs 5:12 (between Solomon and Hiram), 15:19 (between Asa and Ben-hadad/Baasha and Ben-hadad), 20:34 (between Ahab and Ben-hadad); 2 Kgs 11:4 (between Jehoidada and the captains of the guards); Isa 33:8 (human covenants in general); Jer 34:8 (between Zedekiah and the people of Jerusalem); Ezek 17:13 (between Zedekiah and Nebuchadnezzar), 30:5 (an international treaty); Hos 12:1 (between Israel and Assyria); Amos 1:9 (between Edom and Tyre); Obad 1:7 (between Edom and surrounding nations); Mal 2:14 (between a husband and wife); Ps 55:20 (between a psalmist and his friend); Dan 9:27 (between the "prince" and "many"); 2 Chr 16:3 (between Asa and Baasha and Ben-hadad); 23:3 (between Joash and the "assembly"), 23:16 (among Jehoiada, people, and king). P. Kalluveetil has examined these human (or "secular") covenants

in *Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East* (AnBib 88; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1982).

79. Quell, *TDNT* 2:115; Weinfeld, "ברית *b'rit*," *TDOT* 2:256; Cross, *Epic*, 8.

80. Hugenberger, *Marriage*, 4 (cf. 182–84).

81. For the juxtaposition of "oath" (Heb. *šebû'â*, 'ālā; Gk. *horkos*, *horkismos*) with "covenant" (Heb. *b'rit*, Gk. *diathēkē*, *synthēkē*), see Gen 21:31–32; 26:28; Deut 4:31; 7:12; 8:18; 29:12, 14; 31:20; Josh 9:15; Judg 2:1; 2 Kgs 11:4; Ps 89:3; Ezek 16:8, 59; 17:13, 16, 18, 19; Hos 10:4; CD 9:12; 15:6, 8; 16:1; 1QS V, 8, 10; 4QD^b (4Q267) 9 I, 7; 4QD^f (4Q271) 4 I, 11; Wis 18:22, 12:21; *Jub.* 6:10–11; *Pss. Sol.* 8:10; *Ass. Mos.* 1:9, 2:7, 3:9, 11:17, 12:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 10.63; Luke 1:72–73; and Heb 7:21–22. For a fuller listing of Hebrew evidence see Hugenberger, *Marriage*, 183–84. For "covenant and oath" as hendiadys in Hittite, Akkadian, and Greek literature, see Weinfeld, "Common Heritage," 176–77; in the Targums, see C. T. R. Hayward, *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra* (Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies; Totowa, NJ: Allanheld Osmun, 1981) 57–98. The Targumists "understand the covenant as an oath sworn by God to the Fathers" (*ibid.*, 57).

82. Hugenberger, *Marriage*, 194.

83. So F. C. Fensham, "The Treaty Between Israel and the Gibeonites," *BA* 27 [1964] 96–100, esp. 98–99, and W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, (2 vols.; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975) 2:69.

84. Quell, *TDNT* 2:114–15, my emphasis.

85. On the inviolability of human covenants, in addition to Josh 9:3–27 and 2 Sam 21:1–14 mentioned in the text, see Ezek 17:11–18; Mal 2:14–15; and Fensham, "Treaty," 96–100. Paul may have had this biblical background in mind, and/or the fact that commitments ratified by oath are inviolable in human culture generally—certainly in first-century Hellenistic culture. Cf. J. Plescia, *The Oath and Perjury in Ancient Greece* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1970); P. Karavites and T. E. Wren, *Promise-Giving and Treaty-Making: Homer and the Near East* (Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava Supplementum 119; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 48–81, 116–200; and J. T. Fitzgerald, "The Problem of Perjury in a Greek Context: Prolegomena to an Exegesis of Matthew 5:33; 1 Timothy 1:10; and *Didache* 2.3," in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (ed. L. M. White and O. L. Yarbrough; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995) 156–77.

86. Witherington, *Grace*, 243.

87. P. R. Williamson, *Abraham, Israel, and the Nations: The Patriarchal Promise and Its Covenantal Development in Genesis* (JSOTSup 315; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 1–25 *passim*.

88. Verses 16 and 18 speak of a "promise(s)," and v. 14 of a "blessing." Some suggest Paul equates the "covenant" (vv. 15, 17) with the "promise(s)" in vv. 16, 18 (e.g., F. J. Matera, *Galatians* [ed. D. J. Harrington; Sacra Pagina 9; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992] 128; J. R. Wisdom, *Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law: Paul's Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8–10* [WUNT 2 133; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001] 147–48); and the "promise" with the "blessing" in v. 14 (Wisdom, *Blessing*, 143, 145; Martyn, *Galatians*, 323). But the proper relationship is this: Paul is describing a covenant containing a promise of blessing.

89. See previous note. Significantly, v. 14a is an interpretive reworking of Gen 22:18; see N. A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), 171; J. D. Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son*

(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993) 212–13; G. Vermeš, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (SPB 4; 2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1973) 221.

90. Wisdom (*Blessing*, 23) and Martyn (*Galatians*, 339) point out that, of the three patriarchal promises of land, descendants, and blessing to the nations, only the promise of blessing to the nations concerns Paul in Gal 3. Gen 15:17–21 and 17:1–27 promise only land and descendants. Other points that count against Gen 15:17–21 or 17:1–27: (1) In Gen 17:1–27, God does not ratify the covenant (Alexander, “Genesis 22 and the Covenant of Circumcision,” *JSOT* 25 [1983] 17–22; Williamson, *Abraham*, 69–71). Abraham does, through circumcision (cf. Hugenberger, *Marriage*, 196). Note v. 17: *prokekurōmenēn hypo tou theou*. (2) Neither Gen 15:17–21 nor 17:1–27 describe Abraham as receiving “blessing” (*eulogia*). But cf. Gal 3:14a (*hē eulogia tou Abraam*) with Gen 22:17a (*eulogōn eulogēsō se*).

91. The translation is mine, highlighting what may have been important nuances to Paul.

92. The MT has *yēhîdēkā*, “your one/only”; the LXX, *agapētos*, “beloved.” But Paul is aware of the MT, as will be shown later in the text.

93. MT has *’ōyēbāyw*, “his enemies,” with a singular (collective) suffix to agree with *zera’*, “seed.”

94. On ratification by oath, see T. D. Alexander, *Abraham in the Negev: A Source-Critical Investigation of Genesis 20:1–22:19* (Carlisle, U.K.: Paternoster, 1997) 85: “The divine oath of ch. 22 marks the ratification of the covenant.” The covenant in Gen 17:1–27 is not ratified by God; see n. 60.

95. Stockhausen remarks that “when the constitutive presence of Abraham’s story in Paul’s argument” is recognized, “then segments of Galatians not generally seen to relate to Paul’s scriptural argument . . . become less isolated and problematic” (“Principles of Pauline Exegesis,” 150). The relationship between Gen 21:22–34 and Gal 3:15 may be a case in point.

96. Matera (*Galatians*, 131) and Burton (*Galatians*, 141) recognize Paul’s *kai va-homer* argument in vv. 15, 17; but unless *diathēkē* is taken with the same meaning (“covenant”) in both verses, the argument’s logic fails, and apologies must be made for it (e.g., Dunn, *Galatians*, 181–82; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 127–30).

97. See discussion in Witherington, *Grace*, 244. Because v. 16 contains *kai tō spermati sou*, Gen 17:8 is usually considered the referent. But *kai tō spermati sou* also occurs in Gen 13:15, 24:7, 26:3, 28:4, 28:13, 35:12; and 40:4. Collins (“Galatians 3:16”) sees v. 16 as a reference to Gen 22:18a: “*kai . . . en tō spermati sou*.”

98. See Levenson, *Beloved Son*, 210–11; Witherington, *Grace*, 244–45; Dunn, *Galatians*, 184–85.

99. Levenson (*Beloved Son*, 211) denies an Isaac-Christ typology. But Wilcox (“Upon the Tree,” 96–99) interprets Gal 3:16 as a *peshet* on the Aqedah.

100. Betz (*Galatians*, 19–22, 238–40) argues that the epistolary *probatio* (main argument) extends from Gal 3:1–4:31. Thus 4:21–31 is not an afterthought but a climax.

101. M. Pérez Fernández, “The Aqedah in Paul,” in *The Sacrifice of Isaac in the Three Monotheistic Religions: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Interpretation of the Scriptures Held in Jerusalem, March 16–17, 1995* (ed. F. Manns; Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 41; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1995), 81–98, here 90. Cf. Wilcox, “Upon the Tree,” 96–99.

102. G. Wenham, *Genesis 16–50* (WBC 2; Dallas: Word, 1994) 117.

103. On Gal 3:16 as typology, see Pérez Fernández, “Aqedah,” 88–89.

104. See above, n. 100.

105. See T. Callan, "Paul and the Golden Calf," in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Bible Societies* 10 (1990) 12, citing *Exod. Rab.* 32:1–3, 7.

106. The vast literature on this term includes: T. D. Gordon, "A Note on ΠΑΙΔΑΓΩΓΟΣ in Galatians 3:24–25," *NTS* 35 (1989) 150–54; A. T. Hanson, "The Origin of Paul's Use of ΠΑΙΔΑΓΩΓΟΣ for the Law," *JSNT* 34 (1988) 71–76; N. H. Young, "PAIDAGOGOS: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *NT* 29 (1987) 150–76; D. J. Lull, "The Law Was Our Pedagogue: A Study in Galatians 3:19–25," *JBL* 105 (1986) 481–98; R. N. Longenecker, "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19–4:7," *JETS* 25 (1982) 53–61; J. W. MacGorman, "The Law as Paidagogos: A Study in Pauline Analogy," in *New Testament Studies* (ed. H. L. Drumwright and C. Vaughn; Waco, TX: Markham Press, 1975) 99–111.

107. Hanson ("The Origin," 71–72) argues that Paul has in mind Num 11:11–12, pointing out that Tg. *Neofiti* renders the Hebrew *'-m-n* (LXX *tithēnos*) as *p-y-d-g-w-g-h*, i.e. *paidagōgos* transliterated. See also L. Bellville, "'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3.21–4.11," *JSNT* 26 (1986) 53–78, especially her citation of Josephus (*Ap.* 2.174): "[A]ccordingly he made the Law the standard and rule that we might live under it as under a father and master."

108. For a thorough discussion of Paul's concept of "sonship" in Galatians (and elsewhere), see most recently T. J. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 22; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006) esp. 111–20.

109. In Gal 5:3–4 Paul draws on the judgment-symbolism of the act of excision to declare that circumcised Gentiles are "severed from Christ." On this, see J. T. Sanders, "Circumcision of Gentile Converts," *BR* 7 (1991) 21–25, 44; P. Borgen, "Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men," in *Paul and Paulinism* (ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson; London: S.P.C.K., 1982) 37–46; N. J. McEleney, "Conversion, Circumcision, and the Law," *NTS* 20 (1974) 319–41.

110. See B. H. Brinsmead, *Galatians—Dialogical Response to Opponents* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982) 80; R. Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964) 62–67; and O. S. Brooks, *The Drama of Decision: Baptism in the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987) 92–111 (who agrees that Paul has baptism in mind from 3:1–4:7 but argues that baptism is simply a dramatization of faith).

111. Brinsmead, *Galatians*, 160.

112. Brinsmead, *Galatians*, 194.

113. Brinsmead, *Galatians*, 201. See also Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 532–33 n. 39: "The *Sitz im Leben* of this creative act of justification is baptism, and the gift of the Spirit the means. For Paul, baptism, justification of the sinner, and creation are inseparable (II Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15)."

114. See Brinsmead, *Galatians*, 141; B. Byrne, *'Sons of God'—'Seed of Abraham'* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979) 171: "All are sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus' because faith, acted out in baptism, has brought about the being 'in Christ.'" See also Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul*, 124–25: "It is clear that for [Paul, baptism] possesses the same importance as faith. . . . This fellowship of Christ through baptism . . . brings us into the sonship of God."

115. Brinsmead (*Galatians*, 159) argues that Paul's opponents were from, or similar to, the Essenes, and thus placed much less emphasis on baptism.

116. See Brinsmead, *Galatians*, 73.

117. See 1 Pet 3:21, "Baptism . . . now saves you . . . as an appeal to God for a clear conscience through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." E. G. Selwyn (*The First Epistle of St. Peter* [New York: Macmillan, 1977] 205) comments: "Baptism [as] a seal of contract given by a good conscience towards God is not far removed from . . . [the] application of the word *sacramentum*, 'military oath,' to Baptism and the Eucharist." For the OT roots of *sacramentum* as "covenant oath" in Tertullian, see D. Michaélidès, *Sacramentum Chez Tertullien* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1970) 73–194.

118. See M. G. Kline, *By Oath Consigned* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 81: "As an oath-sign of allegiance to Christ the Lord, baptism is a sacrament in the original sense of *sacramentum* in its etymological relation to the idea of consecration. . . . For, as we have seen, covenant oath rituals were enactments of the sanctions invoked in the oath. Indeed, from these historic antecedents we may infer that baptism as an oath ritual symbolizes in particular the curse sanction, the death judgment threatened in the covenant." See also C. F. D. Moule, "The Judgment Theme in the Sacraments," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964) 464–81; A. Mawhinney, "Baptism, Servanthood, and Sonship," *WTJ* 49 (1987) 35–64; and P. D. Gardner, "Circumcised in Baptism—Raised Through Faith," *WTJ* 45 (1983) 172–77: "Christian baptism is a sign . . . of coming under the . . . covenantal dominion of the Lord. Christian baptism is thus the New Covenant sign of consecration."

119. W. Bousset (*Kyrios Christos* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1970] 158) thinks Paul's "mystical" view of baptism as "sonship through the miracle of the sacrament" in Gal 3:24–29 is in stark contrast with the "sober judicial rigor" characterizing Paul's view of sonship and servanthood elsewhere in the Galatian Epistle. But Bousset assumes a false disjunction between the "sacramental" and the "judicial," perhaps failing to see how oath-swearing and covenant-making in the Old Testament—particularly the divinely sworn covenant oaths—shaped Paul's sacramental outlook.

120. On the covenantal background for Paul's notion of Israel's sonship, see J. M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992) 121–86; Byrne, 'Sons of God'—'Seed of Abraham,' 174–85.

121. R. M. Grant (*The Letter and the Spirit* [New York: Macmillan, 1957] 52–53) identifies the law that Paul regards as "invalidated" by Christ with Deuteronomy. Eusebius takes a nearly identical approach in Book One of his *Demonstratio Evangelia* (in *The Proof of the Gospel* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981] 1–62), arguing that "the polity of Moses" (i.e. Deuteronomy) was too nationalistic to serve as a universal religion for mankind and thus had to be replaced. T. R. Schreiner ("The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul," *JSNT* 35 [1989]: 47–74) makes similar observations.

122. Byrne, 'Sons of God'—'Seed of Abraham,' 176.

123. On *huiothēsia* as "full (legal) rights of sons" rather than the less precise "adoption of son" see Hughes ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," 85 n. 217); Byrne, 'Sons of God'—'Seed of Abraham,' 183; and Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, 174–77.

124. Byrne, 'Sons of God'—'Seed of Abraham,' 184, citing M. D. Hooker, "Interchange in Christ," *JThStud* ns 22 (1971) 349–61; here 352.

125. See F. Ocariz, *Hijos de Dios en Cristo: Introducción a una teología de la participación sobrenatural* (Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1972).

126. See Kwon, *Eschatology in Galatians*, 82–89.

127. T. L. Donaldson, "The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3:13–14," *NTS* 32 (1986) 94–112, here 106. Donaldson argues that Israel's plight is

an intense form of the universal plight of mankind: “Being under νόμος [law] is a *special* way of being under τὰ στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου [the elements of the cosmos], because only under the former can the true nature of the bondage to the latter be clearly seen” (204).

128. See also R. E. O. White, *The Biblical Doctrine of Initiation* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960) 21: “Clearly, the circumcision of non-Israelite people did not qualify them for covenant privileges, nor did the circumcision of Ishmael bring even a son of Abraham into the covenant.”

129. Curiously, Paul nowhere explicitly states this simple but profound inference; rather, he lets his readers draw it themselves.

130. See Kwon, *Eschatology in Galatians*, 93–95.

131. See A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 9–32, for a useful summary of the background in the Old Testament and intertestamental/apocalyptic literature. See also R. L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992) 65–81; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969) 141–44. For the rabbinic view of the heavenly/earthly Jerusalem(s), see Z. Vilnay, *Legends of Jerusalem* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1973) 128–32, 155–57.

132. For an explanation of the geographical link between Jerusalem and “Sinai in Arabia,” and their connection with Hagar and Ishmael, see M. McNamara, *Palestinian Judaism and the New Testament* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983) 247–52.

133. The dramatic tension in Gal 4:29–30 about Ishmael's disinheritance and expulsion indicates Paul's sense of imminent fulfillment relative to the impending judgment on the earthly Jerusalem. See N. T. Wright (“Putting Paul Together Again,” in *Pauline Theology* [vol. 1; ed. J. M. Bassler; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991] 208–9), who argues that the anti-Jerusalem and anti-Temple sentiments found, for example, in Stephen's speech and the apocalyptic discourses in the Gospels were widespread in early Christianity and also reflected in Paul's Epistles, as in the passage in Galatians.

134. Muller, *Trinity and Marriage in Paul*, 83.

135. See F. Matera (*Galatians* [Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1992] 93), who observes that, since the reformation, “works of the law” have been equated with *all* law; recently, the view of Sanders and Dunn that “works of the law” are ritual “boundary markers” nearly represents a return to the Patristic and Medieval interpretation. See e.g., Aquinas, *Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Albany, NY: Magi, 1966) 54: “The ceremonial works are properly called the ‘works of the Law.’” For further discussion see T. R. Schreiner, “The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul,” *JSNT* 35 (1989) 47–74, esp. 59; and R. H. Gundry, “Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul,” *Bib* 66 (1985) 7–8.

136. M. Simon (*Verus Israel* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986] 88) explains the patristic outlook apropos the “works of the law” (e.g., *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus): “Here an interesting distinction is made between the two codifications of the covenant. In the former case the code consists of the law, i.e., the Decalogue, whose content is primarily moral, and of those precepts which were promulgated before the worship of the calf. This code is simple and easy to fulfil. Insofar as it takes any account of ritual observances, of oblations or sacrifices, these are presented as discretionary observances and as prefigurations of things to come. The second code, however, the *deuterosis* . . . is the primarily ritual code that Moses received during his second sojourn on the mountain. It is this code which the rest of the Old Testament,

and especially the Deuteronomic and Levitical codes, is concerned to develop and fill out, and which was imposed on the Jews because of their idolatry. It was meant for the Jews alone and was the instrument of divine punishment."

137. J. Dunn, "New Perspective," in *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990) 190–91.

138. J. Dunn ("The Justice of God," *JTS* ns 43 [1992] 1–22, here 17–18) comments: "Any thought of using the law to gain access to that covenant relationship with God is wholly lacking and wholly antithetical to the spirit of the covenant theology classically set out in Deuteronomy."

139. Dunn ("New Perspective," 197) notes: "From the beginning, God's eschatological purpose in making the covenant had been the blessing of the nations . . . (Gal 3.8; Gen 12.3; 18.18). So, now that the time of fulfillment had come, the covenant should no longer be conceived in nationalistic or racial terms. . . . The covenant is not thereby abandoned. Rather is it broadened out as God had originally intended. . . . This is roughly the argument of Galatians 3–4."

140. Dunn ("The Justice of God," 17) notes that appreciation for the OT and Jewish context of Paul's thought "would have short-circuited the old Reformation disputes: . . . Is 'the righteousness of God' subjective genitive or objective genitive? . . . And does the equivalent verb, 'to justify,' mean 'to make righteous' or 'to count righteous'? . . . Once we recognize that righteousness and justification are the language of relationship it becomes evident that both disputes push unjustifiably for an either-or answer."

141. Cf. Gal 3:27: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ." See A. F. Segal, *Paul the Convert* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) 138: "For Jews and gentiles to attain the same level of ritual purity so as to engage freely in these intimate social activities, there must have been a radical cultic boundary-crossing ritual. For Paul that ritual was baptism. By means of baptism the believers take off their old physical body and invalidate old identities. On re-clothing they put on Christ." He adds: "The alternative to ceremonial Torah is not lack of Torah but a new apocalyptic form of it, which . . . has as its center the identification of Christ as the Glory of God and the consequent irrelevance of all special laws of Judaism" (143).

Chapter 10

HEBREWS 1–9: COVENANT, OATH, AND ROYAL PRIESTLY PRIMOGENITURE

1. On the notion of "covenant" in Hebrews, see V. R. Gordon, "Studies in the Covenantal Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," (Ph.D. Diss.; Fuller Theological Seminary, 1979); S. Lehne, *The New Covenant in Hebrews* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990); G. Vos, "Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke," *PTR* 13 (1915) 587–632; idem, "Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke," *PTR* 14 (1916) 1–61; idem, *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. R. B. Gaffin; Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980) 161–233; and S. R. Murray, "The Concept of Διαθήκη in the Letter to the Hebrews," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 66 (Jan 2002) 41–60. The following commentators understand *diathēkē* as "testament" rather than "covenant": G. Vos, *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956) 27–48; G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* (AYB 36; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972; reprint, New Haven: Yale University Press) 151; T. G. Long, *Hebrews* (IBC; Louisville: John Knox, 1997) 99; H. W. Attridge, *Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 253–56; P. Ellingworth, *Commentary on Hebrews* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 462–63; V. C. Pfitzner, *Hebrews* (Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abing-

THE ANCHOR YALE BIBLE REFERENCE LIBRARY

KINSHIP BY COVENANT

*A Canonical Approach
to the Fulfillment of God's
Saving Promises*

SCOTT W. HAHN



YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

New Haven & London

Published with assistance from the Mary Cady Tew Memorial Fund.

Copyright © 2009 by Scott W. Hahn.

All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Designed by Leslie Phillips.

Set in Fairfield type by dix.

Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008940687

ISBN 978-0-300-14097-2 (cloth: alk. paper)

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

The paper in this book meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

5 7 9 10 8 6 4