



2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?

Author(s): Hans Dieter Betz

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 92, No. 1 (Mar., 1973), pp. 88-108

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3262757>

Accessed: 10/09/2014 14:57

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

2 COR 6:14–7:1: AN ANTI-PAULINE FRAGMENT?

HANS DIETER BETZ

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT, CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA 91711

THE fact that we do not possess any original writings from Paul's opponents in Galatia presents the investigator of Paul's letter to the Galatians with a very serious disadvantage. Since the letter cannot properly be understood without considering the theological ideas of Paul's opponents, exegetes have tried to reconstruct them, using the letter itself as a source. As one might expect, this is still a controversial matter.¹ There is, however, one passage in the NT itself which represents a theological position very similar to, if not identical with, the one which Paul tries to disprove in Galatians. The text which we have in mind is 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, a passage which has puzzled scholars for a long time.² Recent investigations have pointed out the abundance of parallels to the text in the Qumran literature.³ Because of these parallels and the frequency of non-Pauline concepts found in the passage, some scholars have suggested that it must be regarded as a non-Pauline interpolation.⁴ As yet, no proposed analysis of this passage has satisfactorily identified the kind of theological position which it contains. The following investigation will attempt (I) to provide a literary and religio-historical analysis, in order (II) to discuss its theology in the light of Paul's letter to the Galatians.

¹ R. Jewett ("The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation," *NTS* 17 [1971] 198-212) has recently reviewed the literature on the subject. Cf. also H. Koester, "GNOMAI DIAPHOROI," *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (eds J. M. Robinson & H. Koester; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 120-22, 144-47.

² On the history of the research, see H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Meyer 6; 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924/1970) 18-19, 211-20; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville & New York: Abingdon, 1966) 211, 214.

³ Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "Qumrân and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6,14–7,1," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 271-80; J. Gnilka, "2 Kor 6,14–7,1 im Lichte der Qumranschriften und der Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente," *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Festschrift für J. Schmid; eds. J. Blinzler et al.; Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 86-99; ET cited here in J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran* (Chicago: Priory, 1968) 48-68; H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966) 1. 201-4.

⁴ Thus R. Bultmann, "Exegetische Probleme des zweiten Korintherbriefes," *Exegetica* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967) 307, n. 17; *Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1951) 205 n.; Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 279-80; Gnilka, *Paul and Qumran*, 66-68; G. Bornkamm, "Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten Zweiten Korintherbriefes," *Geschichte und Glaube* (BEvT 53; München: Kaiser, 1971) 2. 187, 190-94; Koester, *Trajectories*, 154.

I

Analysis reveals at once that the parenesis which we have before us is very carefully constructed. The composition contains the following elements:

(1) *A Concrete Parenesis (6:14a)*. The section begins with a parenetic ordinance stated in negative form. As the analysis will demonstrate, the entire following section is subordinated to this parenesis, and the whole implicit argument leads up to it. Therefore one must conclude that this parenesis summarizes the purpose of the fragment as a whole.

Several presuppositions which clarify important points in the whole passage are made in this first sentence. First, it is assumed that there are two “yokes,” one to be attributed to the “believers” and the other to the “non-believers.” Further, the “believers” are considered to be in danger of trading their “yoke” for that of the “non-believers.” These presuppositions explain why the warning is justified.

The understanding of the sentence depends upon the meaning of the term *ἐτεροζυγείν*, a difficult term because it is a *hapax legomenon* in early Christian literature and only rarely attested elsewhere. The meaning of the term, however, can be clarified. We must assume its metaphorical use, for its association with the term *ἄπιστος* makes sense no other way.

The term *ἄπιστος* presents another problem. The primary question is whether the *ἄπιστοι* are non-Christians or non-Jewish Christians. We are, indeed, dealing with a Christian text (6:15), but this fact alone does not solve the problem. It seems clear from the following that the “yoke” of the *πιστοί* must be identical with the Torah.

The “yoke” of the “believers” represents *dikaiosynē* (6:14b), the requirements of 6:17 a-c, and it is the basis for the appeals made in 7:1cd. The interpretation of the “yoke” as “Law” finds support in other early Christian texts, in which the Law is spoken of as “Christian law.”⁵ While the Christian character of the “yoke” is obvious because of its association with *Χριστός* (6:15), scholars have pointed to close parallels in Judaism, especially in the Qumran community. J. A. Fitzmyer points to OT passages in which “yoke” is used in the sense of “believing a teaching, following a doctrine.”⁶ He also refers to the Qumran *Hōdāyōt* and the “Teacher of Righteousness,” who calls his faithful “those who are yoked to my counsel” (1QH 5:24) and “those who are yoked to my testimony” (1QH 6:19). But the quotations from Scripture in 2 Cor 6:16-18 suggest strongly that

⁵ Did 6:2a: *εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὄλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἔση*. 1 Clem 16:17: . . . *ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες*; Barn 2:6 . . . *ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὢν* . . . ; Matt 11:29-30. Cf. H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief* (HNT Erg.-Bd. 3; Tübingen: Mohr, 1920) 311; G. Bertram and K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* 2, 896-901; G. W. H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961) s. v. *ἐτεροζυγέω*.

⁶ *CBQ* 23 (1961) 276, n. 17. He mentions Ps 106:28 and Num 25:3; but see also Jer 2:20; 5:5; Ps 2:3 LXX. Cf. G. Bertram, *TDNT* 2, 848, lines 7ff.

in the fragment 6:14–7:1 we have to do not with a special law, but with the Torah itself. In this sense rabbinic theology uses the phrase “yoke of the Torah” (עול תורה), signifying the study of the Torah, or the “yoke of the commandment” (עול מצוה) as a metaphor describing the practical obedience to the Torah. This “yoke” is juxtaposed with the “yoke of flesh and blood” (עול בשר ודם), i.e., worldly cares.⁷

Interpreted in terms of rabbinic theology, ἐτεροζυγείν ἀπίστοις finds its equivalent in the expression “to throw off the yoke of heaven,” a figure describing apostasy; the rabbis may add that “throwing off the yoke of heaven” is usually accompanied by “taking up the yoke of flesh and blood.”⁸ In this sense of the Jewish Torah, the term “yoke” is used also in Acts 15:10, where Peter is shown asking the Jewish Christian authorities in Jerusalem not to impose upon the Gentiles the “yoke . . . which neither our forefathers nor we have been able to bear.”

This interpretation of πιστός parallels that of ἄπιστος. The ἄπιστοι are those who represent ἀνομία (6:14), “idol-worship” (6:16), “impurity” (6:17; 7:1). They are those who do not keep the Torah. This means that the terminology of πιστός/ἄπιστος cannot be taken in the Pauline sense, and one should not, as many exegetes do, refer to Pauline passages as parallels.⁹ Rather, the terms in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 are to be seen from the Jewish point of view. As a matter of fact, “faith” in the Pauline sense plays no role in the fragment. The Christians whose theology is contained in it are in fundamental agreement with Judaism that whether one is a “believer” or a “non-believer” is determined by whether or not one is under the yoke of the Torah.¹⁰

(2) *The Theological Foundations (6:14b-7:1)*. The parenthetic statement (6:14a) rests upon a detailed theological foundation which includes the entire remaining section and which moves from an ontological affirmation (6:14b-16a) to a self-definition of the congregation (6:16b). In 6:16c-18 the divine promises which constitute the existence of the church are set forth in the form of combined Scripture quotations. From these, the cultic and ethical responsibility is derived in the form of a general parenthesis (7:1), which then is concretized and placed at the beginning of the section as its leading theme (6:14a).

a. *An Ontological Orientation (6:14b-16a)*. This first section is structured in the form of five rhetorical questions.¹¹ The obvious answer to each of them is

⁷ Cf. the passages in Str-B 1. 608-10; Rengstorff, *TDNT* 2, 899-901.

⁸ For the meaning of *qbl* and *prq* in regard to the “yoke of God,” see R. Neḥunyah ben ha-Kanah in *Ab.* 3:6 (ed. R. T. Herford; New York: Schocken, 1962); *Sifra Lev.* 25:38 (442a); *Sot.* 47b; *Shebu.* 13a (bar.), all quoted in Str-B 1. 609-10. The terminology seems to have influenced the LXX translation of Ps 2:3: ἀπορρίψωμεν ἀφ’ ἡμῶν τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτῶν.

⁹ See 1 Cor 6:6; 7:12-15; 10:27; 14:22-24. See R. Bultmann, *TDNT* 6, 208-15.

¹⁰ Cf. P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1934) 77-83.

¹¹ I agree only partially with Windisch, who thinks that the questions form “. . . five

negative. The first and the fourth are parallels and coordinate the concepts of δικαιοσύνη/πιστός and ἀνομία/ἄπιστος.¹² The terms μετοχή and μερίς are synonyms.¹³ The second and the third questions form another parallelism. They coordinate φῶς with Χριστός¹⁴ and σκότος with Βελιάρ;¹⁵ again, the terms κοινωνία and συμφώνησις¹⁶ are synonyms. The fifth question stands by itself.

This formal arrangement reveals an interesting structure of thought. It is significant that the readers are reminded at the beginning of the radical metaphysical dualism which divides all reality into the two spheres of divine salvation and satanic evil. As in Qumran, only God, the κύριος παντοκράτωρ (6:18c) is above the two spheres.¹⁷ The foci of this dualism are the two metaphysical forces of φῶς/Χριστός and σκότος/Βελιάρ,¹⁸ which simultaneously determine human existence: man exists either in δικαιοσύνη as a πιστός or in ἀνομία as an

synonymous members. . . . The first four are ordered in pairs . . . , the fifth finds its complement in an explanatory confession" (*Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 213).

¹² The contrast of δικαιοσύνη — ἀνομία is not Pauline, but Jewish, as scholars have often pointed out. Cf. Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 275; Gnilka, *Paul and Qumran*, 57, 65-66; Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 202. J. Becker (*Das Heil Gottes* [Studien zur Umwelt des NT, 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964] 240) correctly remarks about 2 Cor 6:14, "So hat denn auch 'Gerechtigkeit' hier nicht den unten zu entwickelnden eigentlichen paulinischen Sinn, sondern bezeichnet gut essenisch die Heilssphäre, die sich im Tun (6, 14a) konkretisiert und im dualistischen Gegensatz zur Tatsphäre der ἀνομία steht." (Cf. also M. J. Fiedler, "Δικαιοσύνη in der diaspora-jüdischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur," *JSJ* 1 (1970) 120-143. For the religio-historical background, see H. H. Schmid, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1968).

¹³ Μετοχή is a NT *hapax legomenon*, and μερίς occurs only here in "Paul." Cf. Acts 8:21; Col 1:12. It may be asked whether μερίς is related to the concept of *gōrāl* which is so prominent in Qumran. See Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 274-75; Gnilka, *Paul and Qumran*, 53-54; P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial* (Studien zur Umwelt des NT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969) 78-80; E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon* (Hermencia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 35-36.

¹⁴ The coordination of φῶς with χριστός, and of σκότος with Belial is found only here in the NT. It has its parallels in Qumran, where Michael, the "prince of lights," stands in contrast to Belial, the "angel of darkness." See Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 275-76; Gnilka, *Paul and Qumran*, 54-56, 64-66; Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 90-91, 202; H. Conzelmann, *TWNT* 9, 302-49; 7, 433-34, 443. P. von der Osten-Sacken remarks, "Vergleichbar wäre die Einnahme der Stellung Michaels durch Christus in 2. Kor 6,15 und vor allem im Hirt des Hermas" (*Gott und Belial*, 209, n. 4). See also G. Dellings, *Jüdische Lehre und Frömmigkeit in den Paralipomena Jeremiae* (BZNW 100; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967) 15, n. 53.

¹⁵ This name for the devil is a NT *hapax legomenon*. The form Beliar is supported by most manuscripts, but g vg Ambst have Belial, which is found also in the Qumran texts. See P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 73-78.

¹⁶ Συμφώνησις is a NT *hapax legomenon*. Cf. O. Betz, *TWNT* 9, 301.

¹⁷ On the epithet παντοκράτωρ, see G. Dellings, "Zum gottesdienstlichen Stil der Johannes-Apokalypse," *NovT* 3 (1959) 127-34 (= *Studien zum NT und zum hellenistischen Judentum* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970] 442-48).

¹⁸ See the statement of Plutarch about Apollo, the god of light, in *De sera num.* 556C: οὐδενὸς γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνι Νύκτα κοινωνεῖν. See also H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 213-15; Conzelmann, *TWNT* 9, 302; P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 80-84, 116-20, 197-213.

ἀπιστος.¹⁹ In the final question these metaphysical presuppositions are applied to the concept of "religion:" religious existence can take place only in the sphere of salvation and is identified as *ναὸς θεοῦ*,²⁰ as opposed to "idol-worship"²¹ in the sphere of evil. This ontological orientation is intended to circumscribe the possibilities within which all statements made in the passage must be understood.

b. *A Confessional Self-definition of the Congregation (6:16b)*. Windisch²² calls this sentence "a gloss in the form of a confession" which was attached to the last "antithesis" (6:16a). However, there is no reason to regard 6:16b as a gloss. It is not out of place, as Windisch seems to think, but follows properly upon 6:16a. What had been stated there as a general ontological possibility of religious existence is claimed in 6:16b to be a reality in the Christian congregation.²³ The term "temple of God" is here amplified to "temple of the living God." This epithet "living God" may ultimately go back to the mythology of the dying and rising gods and is found in the OT,²⁴ in rabbinic,²⁵ and especially in hellenistic Judaism,²⁶ where it is commonly contrasted with the "idols." Since it has not been found in the Qumran texts, it seems not to be typical of that theology.²⁷

c. *A Quotation of the Divine Promises (6:16c-18)*. The confession 6:16b is made possible by the divine "promises" (7:1) which are quoted²⁸ as the "word of God" in a purposefully composed conflation of passages from Scripture (6:16d-

¹⁹ Cf. T. Levi 19:1; T. Naph 2:7, 10; Conzelmann, *TWNT* 9, 318.

²⁰ The designation of the congregation as *ναὸς θεοῦ* is well-known in the Qumran texts. Cf. Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 277-78; Gnilka, *Paul and Qumran*, 61-62; Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 190, 202, 204; Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 240; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the NT* (SNTS Monograph Series 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1965) 50-56.

²¹ Braun (*Qumran*, 1. 202) states correctly that the juxtaposition of "temple of God" and "idols" has not been found in the Qumran texts. But the concepts are frequent in hellenistic Judaism; see F. Büchsel, *TDNT* 2, 375-80; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im Alten Testament* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, Fünfte Folge, 12; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1971).

²² *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 215.

²³ Ἡμεῖς is the better reading: see the *app. crit.* in *The Greek New Testament* (eds. K. Aland et al.; New York: American Bible Society, 1966) *ad loc.* (and contrast the English title of this section: "You are the Temple of the Living God"!); Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 215, n. 2.

²⁴ Cf. F. M. Cross, *TWAT* 1, 276; Bultmann, *TDNT* 2, 850.

²⁵ Cf. Bultmann, *TDNT* 2, 855-57.

²⁶ Cf. Bultmann, *TDNT* 2, 858; *Theology of the NT*, 1. 69.

²⁷ It is, however, found in the Book of Jubilees.

²⁸ Quotation formulae are placed before, in the midst of, and after the quotations. Fitzmyer has identified parallels to the formula in 2 Cor 6:16c (*καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι . . .*) in the Qumran texts (*CBQ* 23 [1961] 279; cf. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 [1960-61] 302). The formula in 6:18c could be taken from 2 Sam 7:8, or it could be "a spontaneous creation on the part of the author" (Gnilka, *Paul and Qumran*, 53). On the *λέγει κύριος* in 6:17b, see n. 50 below.

18b). It consists of three sections: a first promise (6:16d-f), cultic ordinances (6:17a-c), and a second promise (6:17d-18b).

The First Promise (6:16d-f). This first promise is a peculiar adaptation of the LXX of Lev 26:12, God's promise to dwell among the Israelites in his temple and the "covenant formula."²⁹ The most significant difference between Lev 26:12 and 2 Cor 6:16 is the phrase *ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς* which is not found in the LXX (nor in the MT). Exegetes have tried in various ways to show how these words came into existence. Kautzsch³⁰ thought the words had originated from Lev 26:11: *καὶ θήσω τὴν σκηνήν μου ἐν ὑμῖν*. O. Michel proposed that Lev 26:12 is "frei und unter Beimischung von Bestandteilen von Ez 37, 27 zitiert;" he thinks this happened "aus gedächtnismässiger Zitierung."³¹ However, these explanations only obscure the problem which is posed by the fact that the words *ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς* do not occur in the context.

On the other hand, Lev 26:12 plays a significant role in Jewish and early Christian literature. It is typical of these texts that they focus upon the words *ἐμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν* and expound them. They no longer understand these words to refer to the dwelling of God in his temple, but rather to God's *š'kīnāh* dwelling among them,³² to God's presence among his people in heaven,³³ or to God's spirit dwelling in the faithful.

It is the last interpretation which concerns us most. In Philo we find several important statements which support the interpretation of *ἐμπεριπατεῖν* as the indwelling of God in man. In *De somn.* 1, § 146ff. Philo gives an allegorical interpretation of the "ladder" of Gen 28:12. The cosmic ladder which he describes in § 134-45 has its counterpart in the human soul, the lower end being *αἰσθησις* and the top being *ὁ καθαρῶτατος νοῦς*. Up and down this "ladder" climb the "words of God" (§137). In those souls which are totally purified, i.e., in the *διανοίαι*, the God of the universe is fully present.³⁴ After describing how polluted souls may be purified, Philo concludes with this appeal: "Be zealous therefore, O

²⁹ Cf. K. Elliger, *Leviticus* (HAT 1/4; Tübingen: Mohr, 1966) 360-79.

³⁰ Ac. F. Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo apostolo allegatis* (Leipzig: Metzger & Wittig, 1869) 90.

³¹ O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 2/18; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929) 81-82, cf. 63, 85; similarly Gärtner, *The Temple*, 53. See also J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Studies on the Text of the Desert of Judah, 4; Leiden: Brill, 1965) 16-17, in his discussion of Lev 26:11-12, in 4QLXX Lev^a.

³² Cf. A. M. Goldberg, *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur* (Studia Judaica 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969) 315, 386, 454; Str-B 2, 323.

³³ Cf. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 395-96; Str-B 4/2, 1150 (R. Eliezer b. Jaacob II); 1154 (*Sifra Lev 26:12* [451a,4]). In the NT, see Rev 21:3, where Ezek 37:27 is quoted in reference to the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem.

³⁴ §148: *ταῖς μὲν δὴ τῶν ἄκρως κεκαθαρευμένων διανοίαις ἀποφητὶ μόνος ἀοράτως ὁ τῶν ὄλων ἡγεμῶν ἐμπεριπατεῖ — καὶ γὰρ ἔστι χρησθὲν τῷ σοφῷ θεοπρόπιον, ἐν ᾧ λέγεται: "περιπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν, καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός."*

soul, to become a house of God, a holy temple, a most beautiful abiding-place; for perchance, perchance the Master of the whole world's household shall be thine too and keep thee under His care as His special house, to preserve thee evermore strongly guarded and unharmed."³⁵ In a similar way, and again with reference to Lev 26:12, Philo in *De praem.* §118ff. speaks about the human body as a "house of the soul" (§120). The body should be kept in healthy condition διὰ τόνδε τὸν καθάρσει τελείας νοῦν καθαρθέντα (§120). This νοῦς is then described as a heavenly entity, richly endowed by God, initiate of the holy mysteries, companion of the stars, etc. Of the νοῦς residing in a healthy body, Philo can say: "This it is in which God, so says the prophet, 'walks' as in a palace, for in truth the wise man's mind is a palace and house of God."³⁶ Such people belong to the ruler of the universe as "a people holy as He is holy."³⁷ They have been set free from the "yoke" of "slavery."³⁸ Of course, all of these ἀγαθά are reserved for those who keep the law.³⁹

On the basis of the Philonic interpretation we can conclude that ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς interprets ἐμπεριπατεῖν as God's indwelling in his faithful and that this interpretation has then become part of the quotation itself.⁴⁰

We do not learn from 2 Cor 6:16 just how God dwells in his faithful, but we can safely assume that he does so through the Holy Spirit. Paul understands the matter thus,⁴¹ and the later Church Fathers interpret Lev 26:12 in this way also.⁴²

The beginning of the Book of Jubilees is very important for this question, because there we find close parallels to the whole section 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. In connection with the giving of the Torah to Moses on Mount Sinai, God announces that Israel will break the covenant, forget the Torah, and go over to the idol-worship of the Gentiles (Jub 1:5-14).⁴³ But God promises that, when Israel will again turn to him "with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their strength," he will gather them from among the Gentiles, in order to restore

³⁵ §149, Whittaker-Colson translation (LCL 5. 377).

³⁶ §123: οὗτος ᾧ φησιν ὁ προφήτης τὸν θεὸν "ἐμπεριπατεῖν" οἷα βασιλείῳ, καὶ γὰρ ἐστι τῷ ὄντι βασιλείων καὶ οἴκος θεοῦ σοφοῦ διάνοια. The translation is that of Colson (LCL 8. 387). Cf. also *De sobr.* 62-68.

³⁷ §123: τούτου καλεῖται θεὸς ἰδίως ὁ τῶν συμπάντων θεός, καὶ λαὸς ἐξαιρετός πάλιν οὗτος, οὐ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀρχόντων, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄρχοντος, ἀγίου ἁγίου.

³⁸ §124: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πρὸ μικροῦ πολλαῖς μὲν ἡδοναῖς, πολλαῖς δ' ἐπιθυμίαις, μυρία δ' ἀνάγκαις κακιῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν ὑπεξενγμένος· τούτου τὰ κακὰ τῆς δουλείας συνέτριψεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἐλευθερίαν ἐξαιρούμενος. This is an interpretation of the Exodus event (Lev 26:13).

³⁹ §126: . . . ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἀγαθῶν . . . καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἔργοις ἐπιτελούντων. . . . Cf. also *De mut. nom.* 265-66, where Lev 26:12 is taken to mean: ἀρετώσας δ' ἐμπεριπατεῖ ψυχᾶς. Cf. also *De sacr.* 87.

⁴⁰ On this form of Scripture interpretation, see O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel*, 73-79.

⁴¹ Cf. Cor 3:16; 6:19; Rom 8:9, 11; also 2 Cor 5:1-2; Col 3:16; 2 Tim 1:14.

⁴² Cf. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s. v. ἐμπεριπατέω, ἐνοικέω.

⁴³ Cf. G. L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (Studia Post-Biblica 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971) 19-29. Davenport considers Jub 1:4b-26 a secondary framework supplied by a redactor.

to them "peace with righteousness" (Jub 1:15-16).⁴⁴ Then Lev 26:12 is cited: "And I will build my sanctuary in their midst, and I will dwell with them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people in truth and righteousness. And I will not forsake them nor fail them; for I am the Lord their God" (Jub 1:17-18). In Jub 1:19-21 Moses prays for his people, asking God not to let them be ruled by the spirit of Beliar, but to give them a clean heart and a holy spirit. In answering Moses, God promises:

. . . and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their seed, and I will create in them a holy spirit, and I will cleanse them so that they shall not turn away from me from that day unto eternity. And their souls will cleave to me and to all my commandments, and they will fulfill my commandments, and I will be their father and they shall be my children. And they shall be called children of the living God, and every angel and every spirit shall know, yea, they shall know that these are my children, and that I am their father in uprightness and righteousness, and that I love them (Jub 1:23-25).⁴⁵

Therefore, since we can assume that Lev 26:12 is taken in 2 Cor 6:16 to refer to the indwelling Holy Spirit, we must conclude that this first "promise" has already been fulfilled. The Spirit which God has promised has been given to the church, so that this church can claim to represent the *ναὸς θεοῦ ζῶντος* (6:16b) and God's *λαός*.⁴⁶

The Cultic Ordinances (6:17a-c). The first promise is followed by three ordinances prefaced by *διό*. This seems to indicate that the ordinances are taken to be the consequence⁴⁷ of the fact that God has established his temple. The three ordinances are quoted from Isa 52:11 (LXX), but obviously intentional changes have been made.⁴⁸ The *ἐξέλθατε . . . ἀφορίσθητε* section, which comes second in Isa 52:11, has been moved forward in 2 Cor 6:17. In this way the *ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν* of 2 Cor 6:17 calls the Christians out of the *ἄπιστοι* instead of from Babylon.⁴⁹ Between the second and third command a *λέγει κύριος* has been inserted.⁵⁰ These

⁴⁴ Translation by R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 2. 12.

⁴⁵ Significantly, 2 Sam 7:14 is quoted here, as also in 2 Cor 6:18. Cf. the note by Charles, *APOT* 2. 12-13.

⁴⁶ The concept of *ναὸς θεοῦ* is not typical for Paul; in his letters it occurs only as part of Scripture quotations. N. A. Dahl (*Das Volk Gottes* [2d. ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963] 221) recognizes the synonymy of *ναὸς θεοῦ* and *ναὸς θεοῦ* in 2 Cor 6:16, and the differences between Galatians and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 (which, however, he takes to be Pauline because of its similarity to Paul's sacramental concerns in 1 Corinthians).

⁴⁷ For the introduction of parenesis by *διό*, see 1 Thes 5:11; Rom 15:7; Eph 4:25; Jas 1:21; 1 Pet 1:13. Cf. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 216.

⁴⁸ The LXX, in conformity with the MT, reads: *ἀπόστητε ἀπόστητε ἐξέλθατε ἐκείθεν καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε, ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῆς* (i.e., Babylon) *ἀφορίσθητε, οἱ φέροντες τὰ σκεύη κυρίου*.

⁴⁹ Cf. the apocalyptic interpretation of Isa 52:11 in Rev 18:4.

⁵⁰ This also seems to be taken from Isaiah 52; cf. vss. 3, 4, 5, and E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1957) 107-12.

changes are undoubtedly the result of a particular understanding of the Isaiah text. They express a cultic concern.⁵¹ The Christians are called to separate from the *ἄπιστοι* because of the “holiness” which the Christian community as the “temple of God” and the “people of God” must achieve (2 Cor 7:1). In this sense there is a characteristic difference between Paul and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. For Paul the Christian church is already “holy,”⁵² while the Christians responsible for this text see it as their specific Christian task to achieve “holiness.”

The ordinance *ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσον αὐτῶν* draws in the theme of the eschatological exodus of God’s people,⁵³ here understood as cultic-ritual separation from the “unclean.” The term *ἀφορίζειν* was already used in the OT in this sense,⁵⁴ and one can see in it the opposite to *ἐτεροζυγεῖν ἀπίστοις* (6:14a). The third ordinance reveals the real purpose of all three: *ἀκαθάarton μὴ ἄπτεισθε*.⁵⁵ The concept of *ἀκαθάarton* includes everything belonging to the realm of Beliar, and does not point, as elsewhere in the NT,⁵⁶ to a specific matter.

The Second Promise (6:17d-18b). The second promise, in contrast to the first, is made for the future. The *κἀγώ* follows the cultic ordinances and thereby shows the relationship between them and the promise; it seems to indicate that the promise will be fulfilled as the result of the obedience to the ordinances.⁵⁷ Thus the cultic purity of the community becomes the precondition for the second promise, which, for that reason, can find fulfillment only in the future.

The first line *καὶ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς* seems to be an eschatological interpretation of the exodus tradition. It is generally assumed that the words come from Ezek 20:34 (LXX): *καὶ ἐξάξω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν λαῶν καὶ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν χωρῶν*.⁵⁸ However, the meaning of *εἰσδέχεσθαι* is a problem. In Ezek 20:34 (LXX) *ἐξάγειν* and *εἰσδέχεσθαι* are synonymous and both refer to the eschatological gathering of Israel out of the dispersion. If this tradition is appropriated in 2 Cor 6:17d we will have to translate, “and I shall gather you together.” This is possible, but in no

⁵¹ This is true even for the OT. Cf. Braun, who thinks that “impurity” in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is understood ethically, not ritually (*Qumran*, 1. 202).

⁵² See 1 Cor 6:11, and Bultmann, *Theology*, 1. §13; §29,2.

⁵³ Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (HNT 16; 2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1953) 131, 149.

⁵⁴ Cf. W. Paschen, *Rein und Unrein* (München: Kösel, 1970) 44. The concept is very important to Qumran; see Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 202; 2. 288–89. In the NT, the term *ἀφορίζειν* in this sense occurs only in 2 Cor 6:17 and Gal 2:12.

⁵⁵ Problems with “purity” are reflected also in Acts 10:14, 28; 11:8; 1 Cor 7:1, 14; Col 2:21. Cf. Lohse, *Colossians*, 123–24.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Paschen, *Rein und Unrein*, 155–94.

⁵⁷ See Rev 3:10; Matt 10:32–33; 18:33; 21:24.

⁵⁸ The term *qbs* (piel) is, in an almost technical way, connected with the tradition of the gathering of God’s people from among the nations (Isa 11:12; 40:11; 43:5; 54:7; 56:8; Jer 23:3; 29:14; 31:8, 10; 32:37; Ezek 11:17; 20:34, 41; 28:25; 34:13; 36:24; 37:21; 39:27; Mic 2:12; Neh 1:9; 1 Chr 16:35; Ps 106:47; 107:3. The Hebrew term is translated by *συνάγειν* and *εἰσδέχεσθαι*, the latter being used in Jer 23:3; Ezek 11:17; 20:34, 41; Mic 4:6; Zeph 3:19, 20; Zech 10:8, 10. The phrase *εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς* occurs in Zeph 3:20 and Ezek 20:34.

way compelling. In the first place, one can never be certain whether two words are in fact a quotation. In the case of 2 Cor 6:17 the assumption of a quotation from the LXX would also add the problem that in the LXX εἰσδέχεσθαι has a rather special meaning when it occurs in the traditions mentioned above. In 2 Cor 6:17 it would be stripped of its traditional context and remains, therefore, ambiguous.⁵⁹ In common Greek εἰσδέχεσθαι means “to admit;”⁶⁰ it may also have a cultic connotation.⁶¹ It occurs in patristic literature in this sense also.⁶² It may be that this usage caused W. Bauer⁶³ to render the term as “take in, receive, welcome.” All things considered, this seems to be the more likely option. Thus, κἀγὼ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς would not be regarded as a LXX quotation.⁶⁴ Rather, it should be considered an interpretation of the quotation from 2 Sam 7:14 which follows. Because it is parallel to 2 Cor 6:16, ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς, this interpretation has become part of the question itself. In this second promise God assures those who have kept themselves pure that he will admit them as his “sons and daughters” into heaven.⁶⁵ In order to express this idea, 2 Sam 7:14 (LXX) has been adapted with notable changes.⁶⁶ While 2 Sam 7:14 (LXX) has only the singular of υἱός, in 2 Cor 6:18 this has been changed to “sons and daughters,” so that the promise is no longer made to the son of David, but to the Christian community.

⁵⁹ References in early Christian literature to the tradition of God’s gathering of his people use *συνάγειν*; cf. Did 9:4; MartPol 22:3 (also John 11:52).

⁶⁰ Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940) s.v.

⁶¹ Cf. Herodotus 1:144, 206; Josephus, *Ant.* 14.11, 5 §285; 1 Clem 12:3; also Delling, *Jüdische Lehre*, 60-61.

⁶² Cf. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v.: 1, of admission into the church.

⁶³ W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957) s.v.; however, he takes the words as a quotation from Ezek 20:34.

⁶⁴ Windisch also seems to hesitate to regard it as a quotation (*Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 217). Cf. Delling, *Jüdische Lehre*, 44-45. There may be a parallel in Apocalypsis Sedrach 14 (*Apocrypha Anecdota* 1 [ed. M. R. James; Texts and Studies II/3; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1893] 136, lines 4-8): οἰδας Σεδράχ, ὅτι εἰσὶν ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμου ἔχοντα <καὶ τὰ> τοῦ νόμου ποιούσιν· ὅτι <εἰ> εἰσὶν ἀβάπτιστοι καὶ ἐνέβη τὸ θεῖόν μου πνεῦμα εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπιστρέφονται πρὸς τὸν ἐμὸν βάπτισμα καὶ δέχομαι αὐτοὺς μετὰ τῶν δικαίων μου ἐν κολποῖς Ἀβραάμ. Cf. also T Dan 6:9; Ign Phld 11:1; Acts 3:21; 7:59; furthermore, W. Grundmann, *TDNT* 2, 52-53.

⁶⁵ As G. Heinrici (*Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* [Meyer 6; 8th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900] 243) writes, “. . . κἀγὼ εἰσδέξ. ὑμ. [bezieht sich] auf die Aufnahme zur Kindschaft, s. V. 18. Es ist dem ἐξέλαθε correlat; die Ausgezogenen will Gott aufnehmen in sein Vaterhaus. . . .” Similarly Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 217: “Der Gedanke ist hier: die Ausgezogenen finden bei Gott Zuflucht und Unterkunft. Das Bild vom ‘Haus’ hat sich also gewandelt: nicht Gott kommt zu ihnen, sondern sie kommen zu Gott.”

⁶⁶ Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν. Cf. G. Fohrer, *TWNT* 8, 350-54. 2 Sam 7:14 is now attested in 4QFlor 1:10-11, where, in a pesher-type exegesis, the “son” is interpreted as a reference to the Davidic messiah who appears together with the “Teacher of Righteousness.” Cf. Y. Yadin, “A Midrash on 2 Sam vii and Ps i-ii (4 Q Florilegium),” *IEJ* 9 (1959) 95-98; Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 278-79; *NTS* 7 (1960-61) 314; de Waard, *A Comparative Study*, 24, 81-82.

Though this community represents God's "temple" and his "people" on earth, they will enjoy being God's sons and daughters only in heaven. A striking and undoubtedly intended addition is *καὶ θυγατέρας*. This addition accounts for a clear distinction from Qumran literature, with which the text otherwise has so much in common.⁶⁷ The promise, although Christian, corresponds fully to Judaism.⁶⁸

d. *A General Parenesis (7:1)*. The final parenetical section is introduced by the characteristic *οὖν*⁶⁹ and by the address *ἀγαπητοί*.⁷⁰ Like the other parts of the text, this concluding sentence is also carefully structured within itself. First of all, the promises (6:16-18)⁷¹ are named as the "indicative," upon which the parenesis is to be based. Because it "has"⁷² those promises, the Christian community's task is to implement that part of the divine word which contains the cultic ordinances (6:17 a-c). Therefore, the only concern of this parenesis is: "Let us purify ourselves from all the pollution of the flesh and of the spirit." The whole task of the Christian existence in this world can be subsumed under this appeal. It has often been observed that the anthropology as well as the doctrine of purification presupposed here are both non-Pauline⁷³ and typical of the Qumran community.⁷⁴ Man is seen as composed of "flesh" and "spirit." As a result of being in this world,⁷⁵ both components are defiled in many ways. By purifying them, man must achieve⁷⁶ the proper state of holiness, without which he is not acceptable before God. The second promise (6:17d) had made this clear. The goal of purification, therefore, is to gain the state of *ἀγιωσύνη*⁷⁷ as the es-

⁶⁷ The role of women in Qumran is still an open question; see Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 40-42; 2. 288.

⁶⁸ This eschatological interpretation is found also in Rev 21:7; see also E. Lohse, *TWNT* 8, 360-61.

⁶⁹ Cf. W. Nauck, "Das οὖν-paraeneticum," *ZNW* 49 (1958) 134-35.

⁷⁰ For this typical address, see Bauer, *Lexicon*, s.v. *ἀγαπητός* 2.

⁷¹ The plural corresponds to Jewish understanding; see J. Schniewind/G. Friedrich, *TDNT* 2, 579-81. Paul uses the concept mostly in the singular, but prefers the plural when he refers to the Jewish concept (cf. Rom 9:4; Gal 3:16, 21).

⁷² Cf. 2 Pet 1:19 and Paul's way of stating the indicative in Rom 5:1-2; 15:17; 1 Cor 8:1; 2 Cor 3:4; Gal 2:4.

⁷³ Paul is not interested in purification. Apart from this passage, terms referring to purity are rare: *καθαρίζειν*, *καθαρισμός* and *καθαρότης* are not attested at all; *ἀκαθαρσία* occurs in traditional lists of vices. Although he states his view openly in Rom 14:20, Paul takes up the issue only at the request of the congregation (1 Cor 7:1, 14). *Μολυσμός* does not appear elsewhere in the NT, *μολύνω* only metaphorically in 1 Cor 8:7. Paul would not say that the "flesh" is capable of purification; cf. Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 202-3; E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist* (WMANT 29; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968) 101.

⁷⁴ Cf. Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 278; Gnllka, *Paul and Qumran*, 58-59; Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 240-41; E. Schweizer, *TDNT* 7, 125; von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 220-21; Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 178-79, 202-3; F. Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," *RQ* 2 (1959-60) 163-81, 315-44; W. Paschen, *Rein und Unrein, passim*.

⁷⁵ Cf. Col 2:21 and Lohse, *Colossians*, 122-24.

⁷⁶ *Ἐπιτελεῖν* refers to the fulfilling of the ordinances of 2 Cor 6:17a-c. Cf. another view by Delling, *TWNT* 8, 62-63.

⁷⁷ *Ἀγιωσύνη* is another non-Pauline concept. It appears in the pre-Pauline formula of

chatological precondition for acceptance in the last judgment. The concluding phrase 7:1c shows this eschatological purpose of the Christian existence by pointing to God's final judgment.⁷⁸

II

(1) *The Historical Situation.* A discussion of the theology of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in the light of Paul's letter to the Galatians⁷⁹ requires first of all a clarification of the historical situation. At the outset, it must be clearly stated that the Christian Galatians were not the addressees of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. These congregations were Gentile, while, as we have seen, this fragment addresses Jewish Christians. Paul demonstrates in his account of the Galatian problem, however, that the same crises which had occurred earlier in a Jewish Christian context are now present in a Gentile Christian situation.

Paul reports that the present problems were already evident during his second visit to Jerusalem (Gal 2:1-10), when he and Barnabas presented to the authorities "the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles" (Gal 2:2). This gospel does not require Gentiles to come under the yoke of the Torah in order to become partakers of Christian salvation. Among the Christians assembled in Jerusalem there had been a group — Paul calls them *οἱ παρεισάκτοι ψευδάδελφοί* (Gal 2:4) — which expressed strong opposition to Paul's (and the Gentile Christians') practice of "freedom in Christ." Paul, however, did not yield to their pressure and succeeded in preserving that freedom (Gal 2:5). From Paul's language, vague as it is, we can safely conclude that the group opposed to Paul regarded taking up the yoke of the Torah as a *conditio sine qua non* for the salvation of Gentile Christians.⁸⁰ At that time the question as to whether the Gentile Titus should be

Rom 1:4, and as a metaphor in 1 Thes 3:13. The prominence of the Hebrew equivalents in Qumran has been pointed out by Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 278; Gnlika, *Paul and Qumran*, 59; Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 241. Cf. O. Procksch, *TDNT* 1, 114-15.

⁷⁸ *Ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ* is a non-Pauline phrase, pointing, as in Judaism, to the eschatological judgment. Cf. H. Balz, *TWNT* 9 (1970) 213, n. 149.

⁷⁹ Because of limited space, this essay must exclude most of the current debates about controversial passages and issues. For the full evidence for my views, the reader must await the appearance of my commentary on Galatians in the "Hermeneia" series.

⁸⁰ Paul does not reveal who these people were. It is my view that they were Christian Jews who insisted upon observing the Torah, and who, for that reason, were opposed to Paul. They were not identical with the authorities, James, Peter, and John, nor with Paul's present opponents. With regard to the "Apostolic Council," I agree with the description of it given by H. Conzelmann, *Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Grundrisse zum NT, NTD Ergänzungsreihe 5; 2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 67-75. Cf. also H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Meyer 7; 12th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962) 71-72; Koester, *Trajectories*, 120-22; W. Schmithals, *Paul and James* (SBT 46; Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1965) 38-62, 107-9, who suggests that they were non-Christian Jews who had to supervise officially the negotiations in Jerusalem (see also his essay, "Die Häretiker in Galatien," *Paulus und die Gnostiker* [Theologische Forschung, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, 35; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Evangelischer Verlag, 1965] 10).

circumcised or not had already been debated (Gal 2:3). Of course, they insisted on this requirement because they viewed it as an absolute necessity for themselves also. Paul deals with them as the representatives of the same theology to which the Galatians are about to subscribe (cf. Gal 5:2-4; 6:12-13; 4:21). The name of *παρεισάκτοι ψευδάδελφοί* is given to them by Paul not because he questions their honesty and moral integrity, but because he regards them as "illegitimate" Christians in the sense that, in their theology, Christ plays *de facto* no role as a savior.⁸¹

A similar crisis occurred at Antioch; Paul describes this incident in Gal 2:11-14,⁸² again with the present problems in mind. While for him Peter's practising table-fellowship with the Gentile Christians was a step in the right direction, it was obviously an illegitimate act in the eyes of other Christians who were faithful to the Torah. Their reaction to Peter's joining together with Gentile Christians showed that, in their view, a disastrous move had been made. This move included more than table-fellowship. What Peter was doing must have been for them, to use the words of 2 Cor 6:14, a case of *ἐτεροζυγεῖν ἀπίστοις*.⁸³

As Paul sees it, the question at stake is whether henceforth Peter and the Jewish Christians should live "as Gentiles" or "as Jews."⁸⁴ Paul claims that Peter has already in fact given up the Jewish way of life. Then, under the influence of a Jewish-Christian group called *τινες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, Peter and other Jewish Christians went back under the yoke of the Torah.⁸⁵ Although he succeeded at Jerusalem, Paul has now lost the contest.

With the Galatians in mind, he argues that the Jewish Christians at Antioch, at least in principle, have compelled the Gentile Christians to do the same, viz., to take up the yoke of the Torah.

What caused Peter to change his mind we do not know with certainty. We can suppose that he must have had serious theological reasons when he retracted. He must have been persuaded by the "men from James" that a Christian outside the Torah is not included in the covenant of salvation. In fact, he does precisely what 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 demands. However, it is not possible to prove that the Antioch affair was the specific *Sitz im Leben* of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. What happened at Antioch must have been a more widespread phenomenon among Jewish Christians. One can say, therefore, that incidents like that at Antioch must have been the cause of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1.

We know of these earlier incidents because of their connection with Paul's difficulties in Galatia, which caused him to write his letter to the congregation

⁸¹ Cf. Conzelmann, *Geschichte*, 69. In Paul's view, the same is true of his present opponents.

⁸² Cf. Conzelmann, *Geschichte*, 74-75 (which presentation I follow); Koester, *Trajectories*, 121-22; Schmithals (*Paul and James*, 63-78) differs in a number of points.

⁸³ Cf. Gal 2:12, where Paul explains Peter's withdrawal with the words *φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς*. The meaning is disputed. Cf. the brief but informative remarks in Acts 10:45; 11:2-3; 15:1, 5; 21:20-21.

⁸⁴ In Gal 2:14b Paul formulates Peter's theological dilemma as a question.

⁸⁵ This is what Paul describes in Gal 2:12: *ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον ὑπέστειλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν*.

there.⁸⁶ A similar conflict was occurring among them, probably brought about by the same type of people who were behind the earlier opposition to Paul. Referring to those earlier incidents helps Paul to demonstrate that, in his response to the present crisis, he makes the same points that he has made before. To be sure, other witnesses holding different theological views would have given us a different picture of these events and their implications. What Paul thinks Peter did at Antioch, at least in principle,⁸⁷ has now been done openly to the Galatians:⁸⁸ they are being cajoled into circumcision and subjugation to the Torah. Paul's opponents have "persuaded" (Gal 5:8) them that, even as Christians, they will be "excluded" (Gal 4:17) from salvation, unless they come under the Torah, a move which they are presently considering (Gal 4:21).

Paul's defense of his theological position, which until now has been shared by the Galatians without any complaints (Gal 4:12-20), follows two lines of strategy: he argues historically by showing that his position has been consistent all along, and theologically by demolishing the theological views of his opponents.

As far as his own position is concerned, Paul demonstrates that it has been consistent since he was in his mother's womb, when God decided to single him out (Gal 1:15). Later, through grace, he was called by a revelation of God's son to proclaim the gospel among the Gentiles (Gal 1:16). From the very beginning Paul's missionary activity was based upon God's free will and grace, not upon the traditions and achievements of man (Gal 1:1, 10-12). The fact that he gave up his Jewish way of life was also in conformity with his gospel, which did not include the observance of the Torah (Gal 1:13). As the early mission went on without any contact with Jewish Christians, the church authorities in Jerusalem recognized, first tacitly, then by formal agreement, his way of proclaiming the gospel; this was done even against a powerful opposition (Gal 1:16-24). Compared with this, the behavior of Peter and the other Jewish Christians at Antioch was self-contradictory and inconsistent with the policies of the church.⁸⁹ The conclusion the Galatians must draw from this is clear: they will come under the same verdict as Peter and his companions, if they join Paul's opponents and subjugate themselves to the law.⁹⁰

At this point the historical and the theological arguments are joined. Paul reminds the Galatians of their own Christian beginnings. He can safely ask them whether at that time they received the spirit ἐξ ἔργων νόμου or ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως.⁹¹ The answer is obvious. But their problem only begins here. What is it that the

⁸⁶ Cf. Koester, *Trajectories*, 144-47.

⁸⁷ See Paul's question to Peter (Gal 2:14b); also Gal 2:3.

⁸⁸ See Gal 6:12 on the goals of the present opponents: οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι.

⁸⁹ Cf. the description of the behavior of Peter and his group, Gal 2:11-14.

⁹⁰ See Gal 2:4; 3:4; 4:9-10, 21; 5:1-12.

⁹¹ Gal 3:2-3. See the statement made by Christian Jews in Acts 10:45: ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχυται. (Cf. also 11:15; 15:7-11).

Galatians have to do now while they are still "in the flesh?"⁹² Does the gift of the spirit mean that they should remain outside the Torah, or are they obliged to come under the Torah?

Apparently Paul's opponents have persuaded them of the latter. We can understand how the opponents evaluate the situation of the Galatians. That which Paul in Gal 3:3 raises as an absurd question is in fact the problem the Galatians find themselves confronting when they listen to people who represent a theology like that in 2 Cor 6:14ff. For that theology, the gift of the spirit apart from the Torah is an altogether impossible idea.⁹³

Yet as the letter to the Galatians shows, such a claim has in fact been made. To be sure, for the people of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 this must remain an empty claim, unless the Galatians do what their "word of God" demands (cf. 2 Cor 6:16-18; Acts 15:1, 5; 21:20-21). How else could the Galatians obtain the state of "holiness" which is required for acceptance by God?⁹⁴ Since "flesh and spirit" would not be cleansed from pollution, they would in fact be "excluded" from salvation.⁹⁵ Their recommendation can only have been: *ἐπιτελεῖν ἀγιοσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ* (2 Cor 7:1). Paul rightly calls this *ἔν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖν* (Gal 3:3). This activity amounts, in his words, to *σπεῖρειν εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ, ἐνπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί, and καύχῃσις* (Gal 6:8, 12, 13). All such activities, however, are nothing but "works of the law."⁹⁶

On the other hand, in Gal 3:5 Paul confronts them with the fact that, from the beginning until now, without being under the Torah, the Galatians have been experiencing miracles as manifestations of the "spirit." Do these present experiences occur *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου* or *ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως* (Gal 3:5)? The dilemma of

⁹² The Galatians are plagued by the problem of what to do about the "flesh." Paul addresses himself to that problem clearly in his parenthesis.

⁹³ It should be noted that the author of Acts describes, with care and in detail, how the spirit came to the Gentiles without the law. He seems still to be conscious of the crisis which had disturbed Jewish Christianity.

⁹⁴ On Paul's lack of interest in purification, see n. 73 above. For him the problem is not "purity," but "works of the law," and he treats the matter under that term. See Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10.

⁹⁵ They would still be "sinners" in the view of the opponents; Paul deals with that problem summarily in Gal 2:15-21, and throughout the letter.

⁹⁶ Cf. Koester, *Trajectories*, 145: "As various references in Paul's letter reveal (e.g., Gal 4:9-10), these Judaizers must have emphasized the spiritual implications and the cosmic dimensions of the observance of the ritual law of the Old Testament in particular. It is equally obvious that such spiritual renewal of the law was understood as a gospel which must have assigned a particular role to Jesus in the context of this theological endeavour. Such a gospel must have been a call for obedience to the law as the cosmic rule of God (perhaps: revealed through Christ). This obedience, which is a participation in this cosmic order, is primarily accomplished through the observance of certain rituals, of which circumcision is the most conspicuous. Aspects of morality apparently receive only secondary emphasis."

the Galatians is that they have no reason to deny the reality of these experiences, while at the same time they have been led into doubting whether they are relevant to their salvation. Decisive as they are, the experiences of the spirit do not solve the problem.⁹⁷

(2) *Paul's Critique of the Theology of His Opponents.* The discussion of the historical situation has established several points of contact between Paul's theology and that represented in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. Since Paul developed his position in Galatians polemically, we can assume that his opponents must have held a theological conception diametrically opposed to Paul's. A careful comparison shows that such a conception is found in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1.

Paul's development of his concept of divine promise is based entirely upon the tradition of God's promise to Abraham.⁹⁸ Is it only accidental that this is diametrically opposed to 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, where the divine promises are grounded in the "covenant formula" (Lev 26:12)? By starting with the promise to Abraham, Paul is able radically to separate what in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 are equally radically identified: promise and observance of the Torah.

Beginning his argument in Gal 3:6ff. with Gen 15:6 (LXX) provides Paul with the opportunity to separate "righteousness" from the "doing" of the Torah. Since the Torah was not yet given,⁹⁹ Abraham did not observe it, but gained his "righteousness" through "faith." What was true of Abraham is a possibility also for all sons of Abraham; or rather, sons of Abraham are all those who "believe" (Gal 3:7). Everyone who is *ἐκ πίστεως* is blessed together with Abraham (Gal 3:9). Because "righteousness" comes *ἐκ πίστεως* it cannot originate *ἐν νόμῳ*, so that "no one is justified before God through the law" (Gal 3:11).

Those who nevertheless base their existence upon the law deprive themselves of the "blessing" and of the "promise," and, for that reason, exist under the curse (Gal 3:10-13). Since the Jews have chosen to do so, the Gentiles have become the beneficiaries of Abraham's blessing (Gal 3:14). This fact has been foreseen and foretold by Scripture (Gal 3:8), and it has been experienced by the Galatians themselves. They received the spirit as "believers," not as people committed to the Torah (Gal 3:2-5, 14). Thus, they also have the status of "righteousness" (Gal 3:8, 14, 24).

However, the Galatians received the spirit not simply because they were believers, but because they were believers *in Christ*. Paul substantiates this by a proof from Scripture which says that God made the promise to Abraham "and his seed;" for Paul the "seed" is Christ, so that the promise was given to the believers on the basis of their faith in Christ (Gal 3:16, 22, 29).

⁹⁷ Cf. Acts 15:7-21, where the gift of the spirit does solve the problem. The imposition of the law upon Gentile Christians is not regarded as necessary for salvation (cf. 15:1, 5), but as *παρενοχλεῖν* (15:19; cf. vss. 10, 28).

⁹⁸ Gal 3:6-29. Cf. G. Klein, "Individualgeschichte und Weltgeschichte bei Paulus," *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation* (BEvT 50; Munich: Kaiser, 1969) 203-15.

⁹⁹ In Gal 3:17 Paul explains that it was given 430 years later and did not invalidate the promise made to Abraham (3:18-29).

Paul's contention that the "law" has no room for this doctrine of ἐκ πίστεως (Gal 3:12) can be documented by 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. Here the terms πιστός/ἀπιστος have no distinctively Christian content but coincide with the meaning they have in Judaism. Is it accidental that Paul, who nowhere else uses πιστός, takes up the well-known attribute of Abraham,¹⁰⁰ interpreting it, however, in a Christian sense?¹⁰¹

At this point the emphasis upon the crucified Christ in Paul's christology must be mentioned.¹⁰² He insists that, until now, the Galatians have based their Christian existence upon the cross of Christ.¹⁰³ The change which they are presently considering implies, in Paul's view, a turning away from that theological foundation (cf. Gal 1:6-7; 3:1; 5:7-12). He claims that Christ's crucifixion has no place in the theology of the opponents, so that the Galatians, in subscribing to that theology, would deprive themselves of the benefits of the salvation event.¹⁰⁴ In 2 Cor 6:15 "Christ" is mentioned as the cosmic force opposed to Beliar. No mention is made of the crucifixion, nor does it seem to express any concept of salvation in the Pauline sense. Only God is superior to the dualism, while Christ seems to occupy a position like that of the archangel Michael and the "prince of light" in Qumran.¹⁰⁵ Both have their significance for the faithful as cosmic powers, not as figures in a historical salvation event.¹⁰⁶ It should also be added that the terminology of πιστός/ἀπιστος does not appear to be connected with "Christ." The way in which the Christian relates to Christ is not faith, but purity.

In his critique, Paul, while grounding his theology in the promises made to Abraham, uncompromisingly demolishes the position of those who base it upon the Sinai covenant.¹⁰⁷ He calls them οἱ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (Gal 3:10; cf. 2:16; 3:2) and denies that they are partakers of the divine promises at all (Gal 3:15-18). Their very lives are preoccupied with fulfilling the demands of the law; preoccupation with the ποιεῖν of them, however, prevents them from living ἐκ πίστεως (Gal 3:12). Therefore, they do not share the "inheritance" of the promises made

¹⁰⁰ Paul makes use of a common attribute of Abraham. It is interesting that he does this only here. Cf. Bauer, *Lexicon*, s.v. πιστός, 2.

¹⁰¹ At this point there arises the question of how Paul would distinguish between the Christian's faith and Abraham's faith. In Galatians, Abraham does not believe in Christ, but his faith does not seem to be different from that of the Christians. See the discussion of this problem by H. Boers, *Theology out of the Ghetto* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 74-82.

¹⁰² Cf. Gal 2:20-21; 3:13, 26-29; 4:4-7; 5:11, 24; 6:12, 14.

¹⁰³ Cf. Gal 1:6-7; 3:1, 26-29; 4:14; 5:7-12.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Gal 1:6-9; 2:4-5, 16, 21; 3:3, 27; 4:9, 11, 19-20; 5:1-2, 4, 6, 26; 6:7-8.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 209, n. 4 (and n. 14 above). However, in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 there is no trace of the apocalyptic war tradition. Of course, the fragment does not contain all the doctrines to which that theology may have subscribed. Cf. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 206-13; Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 275-76; Gnlika, *Paul and Qumran*, 54-56; Braun, *Qumran*, 1. 202.

¹⁰⁶ Whether the traditions of the historical Jesus were connected with 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 remains altogether unclear. Neither does Paul ever refer to them in the letter to the Galatians. This calls into question the statement of Koester quoted above in n. 96.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Klein, *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation*, 209-17.

to Abraham. They are not blessed together with him, but, as Paul states in contradiction to 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, they live in a situation prior to redemption, in slavery, and under a curse (Gal 3:10; cf. 3:18, 29; 1:6-9; 5:10).

According to Paul, the giving of the Torah on Mount Sinai can in no way be compared with the promises made to Abraham. The Sinai event neither added anything to, nor took anything from, the promise made to Abraham (Gal 3:15-18). In fact, the Sinai event was inferior (Gal 3:19-25). The Torah was not revealed as the promise to Abraham was, by God himself, but was given through angels (demons?) and a mediator. The Torah was never intended to "give eternal life" or "righteousness," nor in any other way to compete with the promises to Abraham (Gal 3:21). In function it was restricted to a certain period of time, from the Sinai event to the coming of Christ. Rather than leading to "righteousness," this period was one of enslavement under the *στοιχῆια τοῦ κόσμου* and a total confinement under sin (Gal 3:22-24; 4:3, 9-10; 5:1-4).

Since Christ had come (Gal 3:19, 23-25; 4:4-5) the promises made to Abraham had been fulfilled, so that those who are believers in Jesus Christ have also become heirs of the promises (Gal 3:7, 14, 22, 24, 29; 4:7). This is the reason why the Galatians received the spirit (Gal 3:14). In distinction to 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, Paul really knows of only one promise, although he may also use the term *ἐπαγγελία* in the plural.¹⁰⁸ It is the promise made to Abraham, the promise now fulfilled. On this basis Paul defines the "indicative" of the Christian existence; but he does it differently from 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. Neither in Galatians nor in Romans does he use the concept of *ναὸς θεοῦ*; he does so only in 1 Corinthians and in a different sense.¹⁰⁹

Both the people of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and Paul have a similar view of present and future eschatology. For the former, "righteousness" is both present and future: it is present as the cosmic sphere of salvation, while the Christians participate in that sphere now to the extent that they possess the spirit and purify themselves; ultimately their "righteousness" depends upon their status of "holiness" in the final judgment. In Galatians, "righteousness" also lies in the future, but it is also a present reality as part of the Christian "faith:" the Christian "believes," and, in doing so, he "hopes" to be justified by God.¹¹⁰ But this hope does not depend upon anything other than God's promise to justify the believer in Christ.

The fact that the Christian has in the present, under the same condition of

¹⁰⁸ Paul uses the singular in Gal 3:14, 17, 18, 22, 29; 4:23, 28; and the plural in 3:16, 21. In Romans he frequently uses the singular (4:13, 14, 16, 20; 9:8, 9), but he uses the plural when he refers to the Jewish concept (9:4; 15:8).

¹⁰⁹ 1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19. In 1 Corinthians, it should be noted, Paul must confront libertarian enthusiasm.

¹¹⁰ Gal 5:5, where Paul summarizes the essentials of his doctrine of justification: *ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίζομεν δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα*. See also Gal 2:16-17; 3:8, 11, 22, 24; Bultmann, "ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ," *Exegetica* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967) 473-74; K. Kertelge, *Rechtfertigung bei Paulus* (NTAbh ns 3; Münster: Aschendorf, 1967) 147-51. By contrast, no justification can be expected from the law (Gal 2:16, 21; 3:11, 21; 5:4).

faith, been given the Spirit, makes this hope in the future a certainty.¹¹¹ On the basis of this hope Paul is able to declare solemnly that all Christians are already¹¹² "sons of God" (Gal 3:20-29; 4:5-7; cf. 3:7). Is it accidental that in Galatians Paul emphasizes the presence of salvation in an almost gnostic fashion?¹¹³ According to him, Christians are not "sons and daughters of God" (2 Cor 6:18), but simply "sons of God" because the distinctions between Jew and Greek, slave and free man, male and female are abolished in Christ.¹¹⁴

What has Paul's soteriology to say about the present situation of the Galatians before God? In view of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, three important points must be considered.

First of all, the Galatian Christians presently enjoy the state of *ἐλευθερία* (Gal 2:4; 4:21-31; 5:1, 13). This implies, most importantly, freedom from a yoke (Gal 5:1) like that in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: freedom from the obligation to purify themselves and to achieve the state of holiness.

Secondly, remaining in this state of freedom, and outside of the Torah, the Gentile Christian Galatians cannot be regarded as *ἐξ ἔθνων ἁμαρτωλοί*. Both groups, Jewish and Gentile Christians, are justified "through faith in Christ Jesus and not through works of the law."¹¹⁵

Thirdly, this "indicative" provides the foundation for Paul's parenesis (Gal 5:1-6:10). The task of Christian life is not purification, separation, and preparation for the future. Rather than doing the "works of the law," it is "life according to the Spirit" (Gal 5:5, 16-18, 22-25; 6:1, 8). Here Paul's parenesis is diametrically opposed to that of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. His parenesis concerns itself with only one point: to prevent Christians from losing the state of freedom which they presently enjoy (Gal 5:1, 13; 2:4). This may happen either through deliberate subjugation to the yoke of the Torah, as the Galatians are considering at

¹¹¹ Cf. Gal 3:14: *ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως*; also Gal 3:2, 3, 5; 4:6; 5:5; 6:8. For a different view, see Schlier, *An die Galater* (esp. pp. 172-73), who interprets his Roman Catholic sacramentalism into Paul wherever he finds an opportunity. In his view, baptism provides an objective "Realgrund" which precedes faith, to which faith subjectively responds, and upon which it can safely rest. To this thoroughgoing misinterpretation of Galatians one ought to respond with Paul: the promises to Abraham preceded not only the Sinai covenant, but also baptism. The fact is that Paul mentions baptism only in Gal 3:27, which is probably part of the pre-Pauline formula 3:26-28. Paul's insertion of *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* (3:26) clearly shows his emphasis to be other than baptism. It is only in Romans 6 that Paul clarifies the relationship between "faith in Christ" and "baptism."

¹¹² This is different from 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, as has been shown above.

¹¹³ For a different view, see E. Schweizer, *TWNT* 8, 394-95.

¹¹⁴ It is worth mentioning that *οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ* appears only in Gal 3:28, but not in the parallels 1 Cor 12:13 and Col 3:11. Cf. G. Widengren, *Religionsphänomenologie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969) 83-86; W. C. Robinson, "The Exegesis on the Soul," *NovT* 12 (1970) 111-14; R. A. Baer, *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 79-80.

¹¹⁵ This is the point Paul makes in Gal 2:15-21. Cf. Klein, *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation*, 181-202.

the moment,¹¹⁶ or by allowing themselves to be enslaved again by the evil forces of the "flesh."¹¹⁷ Both forms of relapse would amount to the Christian being in a state of *κενοδοξία*.¹¹⁸ Paul has little of a positive nature to say in his parenesis.¹¹⁹ He does not include a single law of the kind that 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 has to offer, but only advice on how to facilitate and preserve the Galatians' existence in freedom.¹²⁰ Paul once calls this a fulfilment of "the law of Christ" (Gal 6:2; cf. 5:14, 23b), but he has no laws to deliver which the Galatians can then fulfill. Thus, one may assume that he picks up and uses polemically a concept which has prominence with the opponents.¹²¹

Like 2 Cor 7:1, Paul in Gal 6:7-10 concludes his parenesis with a reference to the eschatological judgment. We have seen that in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 the outcome of the final judgment for the Christian depends upon whether or not he has achieved "holiness" in regard to his "flesh and spirit." For Paul the Christian's future with God depends upon an equally serious though very different condition.¹²² The Christian is acceptable to God, if he *maintains* (see Gal 1:6-9; 2:4-5, 11-14; 5:1, 13) in this life on earth (see Gal 6:9a, 10; 2:20b) his existence in freedom and in the sonship of God, based upon the Spirit¹²³ and carried out in *ἀγάπη*.¹²⁴ Using a proverb, Paul concludes with this characteristic eschatological rule: "He who sows upon his own flesh will harvest corruption from his flesh, but he who sows upon the spirit will harvest eternal life from the spirit" (Gal 6:8).

¹¹⁶ Paul warns against this in Gal 5:1-12.

¹¹⁷ Paul warns against it in Gal 5:13-24.

¹¹⁸ See Paul's warning in Gal 5:26a.

¹¹⁹ Gal 5:25 sums up his parenesis.

¹²⁰ The section 5:26b-6:6 provides instances in which *κενοδοξία* may occur and advice on how to avoid it. We should also point to the concrete instances in Gal 2:5, 11-14, as well as the present crisis. Paul not only warns the Galatians against becoming *κενόδοξοι* (see 1:6; 3:1-4; 4:9, 11, 15-20; 5:4, 7-10, 15; 6:12), he shows that the opponents are such people (see 1:7-9; 2:4-5, 13-14; 3:1; 4:16-18; 5:7-12; 6:11-12). By his letter, Paul defends himself against being *κενόδοξος* (see esp. 1:1, 10-24; 2:2, 5, 18, 21; 4:12-14, 16, 18-20; 5:11; 6:14, 17).

¹²¹ This suggestion seems to have been first made by D. Georgi in "Exegetische Anmerkungen zur Auseinandersetzung mit den Einwänden gegen die Thesen der Bruderschaften," *Christusbekenntnis im Atomzeitalter?* (Theologische Existenz heute, ns 70; Munich: Kaiser, 1959) 111-12; see also his views in *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem* (Theologische Forschung 38; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Evangelischer Verlag, 1965) 35-36. See further the Claremont dissertation of D. A. Stoike, *The Law of Christ* (unpublished; School of Theology at Claremont, 1971) esp. 236-50.

¹²² Cf. Gal 5:19-21; 6:3-5, 7a, 9b. Hence his recommendation in 6:4: τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμάζετε ἕκαστος.

¹²³ The designation *ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοί* is to be taken seriously; Paul regards the Gentile Christians in Galatia as well as himself as *πνευματικοί par excellence*. While the Galatians are about to make peace with Jewish-Christian nomism, Paul remains radically anti-nomistic. All parties, however, claim to have the spirit; they differ only in the question of what place they should assign to the Torah. For a different view, see Schmithals, *Paulus und die Gnostiker*, 32-36.

¹²⁴ See the summary of Paul's doctrine in Gal 5:6: *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*. The *ἀγάπη* is part of the "fruit" of faith in Christ (cf. 2:20; 5:13-14, 22-24).

III

The analysis of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 has shown that we have before us a carefully constructed parenthesis, a literary unity which appears to be complete in itself. If it is a fragment, the question arises, "Of what is it a fragment and how did it become part of the corpus Paulinum?" Its Jewishness is so obvious that the name of Christ seems out of place. But it is undoubtedly Christian: Christ is the decisive divine force opposing Beliar both cosmically and upon earth. The Christian people are under Christ's protection, as long as they stand firmly in the Sinai covenant. The purpose of the Christian life is to achieve the state of holiness and thus to become acceptable to God in the final judgment. This is done through purification from all defilement brought about by Beliar and his forces. Because of this goal, any contact with people outside of the covenant must be eliminated.

The discussion of Paul's letter to the Galatians reveals that he not only advocates a theology diametrically opposed to that of the people of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, but also that he is determined to disprove such a theology. The only difference is that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 addresses Jewish Christians, while Paul's Galatian opponents are at work among Gentile Christians. However, Paul himself explains in his letter how his opposition was first at work among the Jewish Christians and then went over to convert the Gentile Christians in Galatia.

Paul must have been the embodiment of everything that the Christians speaking in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 warned against. For them, his "freedom" from the law must have been nothing but the committing of those who followed him to the realm of Beliar and the turning of Christ into a "servant of sin" (Gal 2:17). In fact, the Paul of Galatians, building the entire salvation by God upon "faith" and "Spirit," looks very much like a radical pneumatic, not far from gnosticism.

The conclusion is unavoidable that the *theology* of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is not only non-Pauline, but anti-Pauline. Whether the parenthesis is intentionally anti-Pauline remains a question. The incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11-14) would fit perfectly as a *Sitz im Leben*. In any case, it must be assumed that the redactor of the Pauline corpus, for reasons unknown to us, has transmitted a document among Paul's letters which in fact goes back to the movement to which Paul's opponents in Galatia belonged. By providing the background against which Paul argues, 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 makes it possible to interpret the Galatian letter in a more objective way.¹²⁵

¹²⁵ After the completion of this article, two publications which have some bearing on the subject became available: G. Klinzing (*Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumran-Gemeinde und im Neuen Testament* [Studien zur Umwelt des NT, 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971] 172-82) discusses the Qumran texts which are parallel to 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 and proposes the baptismal liturgy as the *Sitz im Leben* of the passage. K. Wengst (*Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes* [Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 42; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1971] 82-89) deals with "The Law and Christ."