

SYMBOLIC UNIVERSE, METAPHOR AND CONVICTION:
A STUDY OF THE SLAVE METAPHOR IN PAUL'S LETTER TO THE
GALATIANS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of Arts

Biblical Studies Department

University of Sheffield

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Sam Tsang

August 2001

Accepted on

CONTENTS

Abstract	
Introduction	1
Chapter 1	
ISSUES IN RESEARCHING GRECO-ROMAN SLAVE IDENTITY AND PAUL'S RHETORIC: PRELIMINARY REMARKS	28
1.1. The State of the Scholarly Questions in Greco-Roman Slave Identity	28
1.2. Scholarship on First-Century Greco-Roman Slave Identity and Paul	35
1.3. Scholarship on the Metaphors of Paul: Symbolic Universe, Metaphors and Rhetoric	39
1.4. Conclusion	48
Chapter 2	
IDENTITY SHIFTS OF THE SLAVE IN THE PROCESS OF GRECO-ROMAN SLAVERY: FROM BONDAGE TO FREEDOM AND OBLIGATION - THE SYMBOLIC UNIVERSE OF PAUL'S SOCIETY ON SLAVERY	52
2.1. Greco-Roman Slavery	52
2.2. Greco-Roman Manumission	69
2.3. Greco-Roman Re-enslavement	85
2.4. The Identity and Power Shifts in Greco-Roman Process of Slavery	87
Chapter 3	
THE APOLOGETIC USAGE OF THE SERVILE METAPHOR IN GALATIANS	90
3.1. Paul's Self Description in Gal. 1.1,10	90
3.2. Paul's Self Description in Gal. 6.17	105
Chapter 4	
THE POLEMICAL USAGE OF THE SERVILE METAPHOR IN GALATIANS	113
4.1. Paul's Attack on the Agitators in Gal. 2.4	113
4.2. Paul's Attack on the Agitators in Gal. 4.30	121
Chapter 5	
THE DIDACTIC USAGE OF THE SERVILE METAPHOR IN GALATIANS	147
5.1. Paul's Teaching of the Galatians in Gal. 3.23-26	147
5.2. Paul's Teaching of the Galatians in Gal. 4.1-10	162
Chapter 6	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	185
6.1. The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in His Self-defense	185

6.2. The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in His Attack on the Agitators	188
6.3. The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in His Teaching of the Galatians	190
6.4. The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in Galatians	191
6.5. Paul's Metaphor and Conviction in the light of the Slave Metaphor	193
Bibliography	198

Abstract

This thesis investigates the symbolic universe of Paul's social world to interpret his slave metaphors in his letter to the Galatians. It adopts the approach to metaphor belonging to the 'New Rhetoric' of C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, which not only deals with the formation of metaphors but also incorporates the formation process into the interpretive model for metaphors. This approach enables a nuanced account of the various argumentative functions of Paul's slave metaphors in Galatians. The findings are related to the question of Paul's own convictions regarding slavery as witnessed in Galatians 3.28.

In order to interpret the process and meaning of Paul's slave metaphors, this study investigates the social context from which Paul formed his metaphors, namely Greco-Roman slavery in the first century. This context provides the better-known area of discourse (the '*phoros*') under which aspect the lesser-known area is presented (the 'theme') in a metaphor (a fusion of theme and *phoros*). Galatians evidences three distinct slave metaphors, revolving around Paul as a 'slave' of Christ, the 'enslavement' threatened by Paul's 'opponents', and the manumission, adoption, and potential re-enslavement of his Galatian converts.

The route from Paul's metaphors to his own convictions about slavery is indirect, but the latter will be of vital interest to contemporary readers. This thesis raises the question of Paul's convictions only after working carefully through the argumentative functions of Paul's metaphors. Raising the question in this way, one is able to provide a more circumspect answer than is sometimes found when this latter question is placed to the fore. In his letters, Paul's concerns are not those of the modern reader. Instead, he used what he could from his environment

to further his gospel.

INTRODUCTION

The Need for This Study

In looking at the Sarah-Hagar episode in Galatians, E. A. Castelli writes, “It is troubling that Paul derives his figurative imagery in this passage from the economic institution of slavery...”¹ What bothers Castelli most is how metaphors and the real world are a reflection of each other in Paul’s religious document. What appears unacceptable in the modern perspective seems to be the norm to Paul.² Castelli’s observation is pertinent in any interpretation of metaphors because metaphors themselves come from a pool of information from the human experience. This study looks at the pool of experience regarding slavery and sees how it affects Paul’s slave metaphors in Galatians. Since this pool of experience is part of Paul’s life and society, there is also the issue of how Paul’s conviction on slavery relates to his metaphor.

How then does Paul’s metaphor relate to his conviction towards certain controversial issues in both the ancient and modern church? In order to understand the relationship, one has to understand both the meaning of Paul’s metaphor as well as the reality and limitations under which Paul ministered. As it touched many ancient societies at different levels, slavery certainly influenced Paul’s world very heavily. D. J. Williams, in his recent work, *Paul’s Metaphors*, constructs Paul’s many metaphors as an insight into Paul’s mind and the society surrounding him, cataloguing and briefly describing metaphors in Paul’s letters.³ The issues of slavery and freedom take up a whole chapter of his book. Williams’ work demonstrates the importance of slavery in Paul’s mind.

In his letters, Paul did not hesitate to use slavery as a metaphor because slavery was a large part of his world. As G. W. Hansen’s study indicates, the slave metaphor clearly dominates Galatians.⁴ In order to understand Paul and his

¹ E. A. Castelli, “Paul on Women and Gender,” in R. S. Kraemer and M. R. D’Angelo (eds.), *Women and Christian Origins* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 231.

² D. B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), p. xiii, comments accurately with the right amount of emphasis on the “modern perspective”. He writes, “Slavery in the Roman Empire was, as it always is from our modern perspective, an oppressive and exploitative institution.”

³ Williams, *Paul’s Metaphors: Their Context and Character* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

⁴ Hansen, G. W., “Paul’s Conversion and His Ethic of Freedom in Galatians,” in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road*

metaphors fully, one must also understand this cruel institution of slavery and all its related issues. Many authors have addressed the subject of the slave metaphor. D. B. Martin's *Slavery as Salvation* illuminates afresh the slavery metaphor in Paul's writings, especially in the book of 1 Corinthians.⁵ F. Lyall, who is an expert on Roman law, writes on slavery as a background to many Pauline metaphors.⁶ J. L. White uses all of Paul's metaphors to derive theological ideas from Paul.⁷ I. A. H. Combes in *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Christian Church* surveys the effect the New Testament slave metaphors had on the first five Christian centuries.⁸ His survey demonstrates the power of such metaphors over the history of the early church. However, there is little work that focuses as specifically on Galatians, particularly asking how Paul used the slave metaphor to persuade his audience.⁹

According to *The New Rhetoric* of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, "the object of the theory of argumentation is the study of the discursive techniques allowing us to induce or to increase the mind's adherence to the theses presented

from Damascus: *The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), pp. 213-221, shows how the slave metaphor is sprinkled throughout the letter.

⁵ D. B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation*, p. ix, focuses his thesis on Christian salvation and leadership from a sociological model. On the metaphor of slavery in Rom. 8 as a test case, see the fine paper by W. G. Rollins, "Greco-Roman Slavery Terminology and the Pauline Metaphors for Salvation" in K. H. Richards (ed.), *SBL Seminar Papers 1987* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 100-110. Rollins gives numerous literary examples of slavery being a metaphor. Also see D. J. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities* (London: Verso, 1987), pp. 36-37, who briefly mentions the metaphor but goes on to see the metaphor as reflecting the Christian attitudes towards slavery. Others use similar method to interpret other parts of the New Testament. See M. A. Beavis, "Ancient Slavery as an Interpretive Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8)" *JBL* 111 (1992), pp. 37-54.

⁶ F. Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984). Much of the study remains quite general but goes into little details about the specific ideas behind the major Pauline texts.

⁷ J. L. White, *The Apostle of God* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

⁸ I. A. H. Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church* (JSNTSup 156; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998). See the interesting theory that the modern work ethic has its origin from moral teaching and justification of slavery. D. J. Kyrtatas, "Slavery as Progress: Pagan and Christian Views of Slavery as Moral Training," *International Sociology* 10 (1995), pp. 219-234. Kyrtatas traces the concept backwards starting from the ideas of Hegel and Engel about slavery as a precursor to progress in civilization. Then, he looks at how the concept has been taught as applications on the individual slaves.

⁹ This is not to say that no work has been done on Paul's metaphors. Many works on slavery and Paul stop at the study of metaphor, without connection with Paul's rhetoric. E.g. Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* and J. M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992).

for its assent.”¹⁰ One common technique of persuasion is to use metaphors to connect with the audience. Paul’s letter to the Galatians is a good example of this technique. In this letter, he used the metaphor of slavery in different ways to make his point. Because of the prevalence of the slave metaphor in Galatians, the goal of this study is to demonstrate how Paul used these metaphors to persuade his Galatian audience to follow his teaching. This goal will benefit any interpreter of Paul to understand Paul’s strategy of persuasion.

In addition to the aforementioned benefits for contemporary rhetorical study of Paul’s slave metaphors, two additional benefits become apparent. First, the text provides the literary context and controls how much of the ancient background is admissible for defining Paul’s metaphor. Although this method has its weaknesses, the text is the only form of direct information one can derive from Paul himself. Second, when one understands the slave metaphor within the letter, one has a set of new lenses from which one can view other parts of the same book. Although the details of Paul’s metaphor were far from consistent, he had at least consistently adopted imagery from the institution of slavery as a persuasive instrument in Galatians. Paul’s metaphorical use of slavery was not unusual, since slavery existed as a metaphor long before Paul.¹¹ In fact, according to A. Borkowski, the social importance of slaves was great during Paul’s time but gradually waned in the late Empire period.¹² Naturally, Paul used slavery because of its common existence. Consequently, slavery becomes an important interpretive paradigm for Galatians. This study reconstructs the social-historical institution of Greco-Roman slavery and relates it to issues raised in Galatians. The resulting merger of the two should create a reasonable enough picture of Paul’s rhetorical strategy in using the slave metaphors in Galatians.

¹⁰ C. Perelman, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971), p. 4.

¹¹ G. Vlastos, “Slavery in Plato’s Thought,” in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1960), pp. 205-305, discusses slavery not only as an institution but also as a metaphor. He points out that Plato used slavery as a metaphor in his cosmology and anthropology. This is a philosophical and rhetorical tradition that existed long before Paul’s time, and was probably entrenched in the society by Paul’s time. For instance, Martin’s *Slavery as Salvation* and Combes’ *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, pp. 24-38, present a great variety of ancient sources which used this metaphor of slavery in various ways. The metaphor also exists in Josephus to describe various aspects of bondage. See L. H. Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 103-108.

¹² A. Borkowski, *Textbook on Roman Law* (London: Blackstone, 1994), p.80.

Usage of Ancient Sources

In dealing with Paul's metaphor of slavery and slavery laws, the usage of ancient sources is always important. While the influence and structure of the *familia* in the Greco-Roman society reached every level, there existed a strong tradition of slavery and power, and comments on slavery saturated almost every genre of literature.¹³ Both legal and non-legal literature form a complete picture of Paul's metaphors.

First, legal literature represents the official position of the government, though it is not necessarily representative of social reality in its entirety. P. Garnsey, who is a classical historian and not a biblical scholar, points out the legal context behind the Pauline metaphors of slaves and sons and further reconstructs aspects of the Christian symbolic universe of slavery from the Greco-Roman world.¹⁴ The question though is, "How useful are the legal sources for a background on slave metaphors?" Two issues surround the usefulness of legal literature. One is Paul's own familiarity with the content of this literature. Another is the relatively late date of much of ancient legal material, which can thus give an anachronistic picture of slavery. On the issue of Pauline knowledge and the social function of legal literature, perhaps the best way to handle established legal norms in Paul's time was to view the law books as legal responses to prevalent social practices.¹⁵ J. D. Hester answers the issue of Pauline knowledge best by stating, "As a Jew (Paul) would certainly have been familiar with the Jewish legal system, but as a Roman citizen his civil law was Roman. It could be expected that he would draw upon it as the source for his legal

¹³ The *paterfamilias* has become powerful because many specific laws concerning *patria potestas* were developed in Roman rule. See M. Gielen, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik* (Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1990), p. 146.

¹⁴ P. Garnsey, "Sons, Slaves — and Christianity," in B. Rawson and P. R. C. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman Family in Italy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 106, 119-120. While Garnsey rightly points out the inadequacy of Martin's model of the upwardly mobile slave, he probably makes too fine a distinction between the social-historical and legal context. Paul was probably influenced by legal and social-historical contexts more or less, depending on how each individual letter puts together the metaphor of slavery. Some have more of a Jewish context while others had more of a social-historical and legal context from the Greco-Roman world.

¹⁵ R. P. Saller, "Roman Heirship Strategies," in R. P. Saller and I. Kertzer (eds.), *The Family in Italy: from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven: Yale, 1991), p. 30, points out that there were areas on the outskirts of the Empire that were less affected by Roman law. However because of the impact of Roman legislation, Paul's mission existed in the heart of the Empire. Furthermore, certain laws had longer effects than others did. For example, the "*senatusconsulta*" would have a

illustrations.”¹⁶ On the issue of anachronistic use of later material, the legal tradition recorded later in Roman law is only useful so far as it surfaced in the literature of Paul’s time. To sum up Paul’s knowledge of Roman law, Hester states, “It appears, then, that Roman law was the most likely source of Paul’s legal illustrations. This is not to say that he was an expert on Roman law, but only to point out that the system fulfills his needs. ... They [Paul’s illustrations] are everyday instances of life upon which he draws to illustrate an act of God.”¹⁷

What function did the Roman slave laws serve in society in general and what issues did they deal with? The answer can be found by comparing the Romans with their Greek predecessors in their practices of slavery. In contrast to Greek slavery, the Romans could own other Romans as slaves. This cultural change can explain in part the reason for the elaborate laws on slavery. By the Principate, the laws had grown more specific still, especially concerning manumission. In order for society to function smoothly, a transformation had to take place at the judicial level to cope with the change from the Greek style of social hierarchy. Although the masters who held the power over slaves, wrote all legal materials, the legal foundation of the Greco-Roman society gave both the masters and the slaves a common ground on which to function. For example, the law defined the slave as the property of the master.¹⁸ O. Patterson calls the idea of human “property” a legal fiction because the person might have had some other qualities which demanded a different treatment.¹⁹ Some skills which were extremely valuable to a master such as writing might earn the literate slave some extra favor. On the other hand, manual and unskilled laborers might be more open to abuse. Thus,

longer effect than an edict of a magistrate. See J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967), pp. 22-30.

¹⁶ J. D. Hester, “The ‘Heir’ and Heilsgeschichte: A Study of Galatians 4.1ff.,” in F. Christ (ed.) *Oikonomia: Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie* (FS O. Cullmann; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich Evang. Verlag GmbH, 1967), p.121.

¹⁷ Hester, *Paul’s Concept of Inheritance* (SJT Occasional Papers 14; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1968), p. 9.

¹⁸ W. W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 3, points out the enslaved status of the human “thing” in Roman law which ultimately had some influence on the American label of a slave as a piece of property in the nineteenth century.

¹⁹ O. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 30, does not say this as an ethical comment. He dwells on the fact that slave masters would treat slaves as they would non-slave humans but still considered them things. The ethical aspect of slavery in the Roman law is also puzzling. K. Bradley, “Slavery,” *OCD*, points to proto-Stoic and Stoic concerns over the moral effects slavery had on the owners with less concern about the slaves’ own well being.

Patterson discounts the view of much of the legal literature as being a good source for research material. Since Roman law dwelt on slavery extensively, scholars wanting to construct an imagery of Paul's society have a vast amount of official information at their disposal.²⁰ Whether they represent reality or not, legal texts at least served to govern certain official transactions, such as manumission, adoption, emancipation, and citizenship. Since much of legal literature is a record of earlier precedents, the interpreter has to do some sifting. If other kinds of literature record similar practices and the laws themselves are straightforward, then it is likely that the legal records of earlier practices represent first century CE reality. Furthermore, if there are no discrepancies between the various legal sources on a certain decree, one can be sure that the record is an accurate reflection of the first century CE. Methodologically speaking, one cannot avoid legal literature and still paint a complete picture of the social history of slavery. Critical use of legal material is not only helpful but necessary.

A second source from which one can find backgrounds for Paul's metaphors is Greco-Roman non-legal literature which shows common societal conditions. Such non-legal literature represents unofficial, yet equally valid, opinions. The apparent opposite nature of legal and non-legal literature often causes scholars to make value judgment in preference of one over the other. A brief discussion on this issue is in order. Although legal literature has its limitations as to its true representation of the common condition, it gives insights into issues that the Romans resolved officially. Furthermore, the dichotomy between legal literature and social reality is more of a modern construct. As J. A. Crook points out, the likelihood of a modern western person understanding legal literature is much lower than generally supposed of the ancient person.²¹ Since ancient writers were mostly from the educated upper class, they were required to have studied at a basic level, forensic rhetoric that gave an understanding of the Law. In turn, these

²⁰ The Roman laws are a good source, not because these writings are representative of the societal view but because the societal structure forged and was forged by their legal jurisdiction. The power the laws had became the governing power that shaped the culture. The culture then also shaped the laws through time. Thus, the Roman law is the place where one can find the most information on slavery simply because slavery was a dominant social phenomenon of Rome. In W. W. Buckland's word, slavery was "the most characteristic part of" the Roman society. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery*, p. v.

²¹ J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 8; F. G. Downing, "À bas les aristos," *NovT* 30 (1988), pp. 210-230.

writers would insert legal material into their plays, which were performed in public. This meant that legal material was not off-limits to the commoner. Even the illiterate person could gain legal knowledge via legal quips in the theater. In relation to Paul, only Roman law provides the full picture of an institution such as adoption.

To understand Paul's world, one can find further sources from Greco-Roman literature apart from the legal writings. One can only derive Paul's symbolic universe from the study of the historical evidence in a variety of genres. Especially important is the assumption about historiography, from the perspective of methodology. In order to use source material with care, the scholar must consciously assume that all historiography is interpretive. Therefore, one cannot necessarily make "historical" texts the more preferred sources. It is too simplistic to assume that either the ancient or modern historical writers were more objective. No historiography dwells purely on objective facts, whether sacred or secular. Furthermore, certain genres, such as drama and some of the philosophical treatises, had profound and lasting effects on society a long time after the original composition. Therefore, these other "non-historical" sources should not be dismissed, even if one considers them to have a tendency towards exaggeration. All these careful distinctions on sources are essential to Galatians to re-create the social world of Paul in relations to slavery. In addition, Paul drew from certain conventions which applied to the higher class slave owners, by using metaphors of inheritance and adoption. This is not to say that the lower slave-owning class did not inherit or adopt. Nonetheless, the scarce inheritance of the lower class hardly fits Paul's metaphor of an upwardly mobile adoption resulting in a wealthy inheritance. Thus, Paul's metaphor in Gal. 4 of a wealthy inheritance came from an aristocratic background.²² Furthermore, the view of the masters certainly affected the view of the rest of the society because the masters and not the slaves dictated the society's values. Therefore, a careful balance of legal and non-legal sources is necessary to create as complete a background as possible for Paul's metaphor of slavery.

²² R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC, 41; Dallas: Word, 1990) p. 161, calls the background a "patrician household."

Delimitation and Definitions

Delimitation

There is a need at this point to clarify and delimit this study. There are five areas for clarification. The first three concern Paul and the last two, slavery. First, in this study, there is no deep exploration into the date or the destination of Galatians, which are issues that have already been exhausted by most New Testament surveys and commentaries. Instead, this study assumes an early date with a Southern Galatians location, as is accepted by many Pauline scholars.²³ Nor does this study seek to identify the exact group and ethnicity with which Paul's agitators were associated.²⁴ Studies which attempt to do this are speculative in nature and do not contribute to the rhetorical analysis of the Galatian text. Furthermore, these introductory issues are peripheral to the purpose of this study.

Second, there is no discussion on the important theological question of whether one should read all Paul's letters before formulating a single Pauline theological center, or whether Pauline theologies should be formulated according to the theology of each letter.²⁵ Rather, this study only addresses Galatians.²⁶ If the early date is correct, Galatians is at least one of the earliest, if not the earliest of Paul's letters. In viewing theology diachronically, it is important to leave room for intellectual evolution. Therefore, this study favors dealing with Paul's letters as individual letters addressing different problems without synthesizing Galatians' theology with the other letters'.²⁷ At this early stage of Paul's literary career, only an incomplete glimpse of Paul's theology is possible. Though there

²³ See R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, pp. lxi-lxxxviii for a thorough survey of issues on addressees and date. "Early" would put Galatians before Romans and the Corinthian correspondences.

²⁴ One may not agree with J. L. Sumney, *"Servants of Satan", "False Brothers" and Other Opponents of Paul* (JSNTSup, 188; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), on some of his interpretation. Nevertheless, his study demonstrates the need to approach the identity of agitators in Pauline Christianity with much more conservatism. The agitators could be Jewish or gentile missionaries who advocated some kind of law-keeping with some claim of authority from Jerusalem. No one knows beyond general descriptions.

²⁵ For the sake of methodology, this study only uses the commonly accepted Pauline ecclesiastical letters, without dealing with the other so-called "Deutero-Pauline" books. Authorship issues are not the focus of the present study. Beside Galatians, the books accepted for this study are Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, Philippians and Philemon.

²⁶ See Sumney, *"Servants of Satan", "False Brothers" and Other Opponents of Paul*, pp. 21-22, for the importance of looking at letters as primarily occasional productions.

²⁷ See D. A. Campbell, "The ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ from Durham: Professor Dunn's New Theology of Paul," *JSNT* 72 (1998), pp. 95-96, for comments on this approach.

are studies on slavery as a metaphor in Romans and scholars sometimes associate Romans with Galatians, this study takes the metaphor of slavery as a unique Galatian application of Paul's popular metaphor elsewhere. After all, one must treat Paul's writings for what they are, letters addressing a historical situation.

Third, in dealing with the background of Judaism, there is also no consideration of rabbinical evidence.²⁸ By the time of the Rabbis, Judaism might have taken a different form than Paul's religion. The notoriously difficult task of separating genuine early traditions from later imitations within Judaism demands another in-depth study, which is beyond the scope of this work. Furthermore, there are still many unknown factors in relation to early Jewish traditions, and the danger of anachronism is ever present. Biblical and extra-biblical evidence from Paul's century and before should suffice for the purpose of this study. After all, Paul's own Jewish identity imparts to Galatians at least some pre-rabbinical Jewish background. Even with his Jewish background, Paul was writing to a gentile audience. Thus, his writing must also have a Greco-Roman bridge to reach this audience.

To summarize the first three clarifications, the early date determines the course of Paul's development. Furthermore, the present study looks at the individual theological conclusion of Galatians only as a single letter sent to a specific group of churches. Finally, Paul's Jewish and Roman background are given equal importance in the study of any concept or metaphor.

Fourth, since many scholars, such as O. Patterson, have already made diachronic efforts to demonstrate the similarities between Greco-Roman and modern colonial slavery, the present study will make no effort to repeat such a enormous task. In fact, there are places in this study where clarifications are necessary to prevent Greco-Roman slavery being confused with colonial slavery. Though it would seem that the present study seeks to point out the similarities between the two for clarification purposes only, the emphasis only serves as a

²⁸E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977) p. 437. This is where Sanders' ingenious book becomes a little confusing. His hybrid of rabbinical material probably creates a Judaism not easily recognized by Paul himself. J. Neusner's comments regarding the danger of using rabbinical material to re-create first century Judaism should be taken seriously. See *Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Origin* (London: SCM Press, 1991) and *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984). Thus, as Meeks, *The*

precaution against anachronistic definitions. A methodology keeping clear of anachronism by no means claims that there are no similarities between the two. Patterson's work already points out in general terms some of the similarities between all forms of slavery. Since colonial slavery was quite different in many of its social dynamics to Greco-Roman slavery, comparison between the two is a task for another study. Therefore, the reader should expect neither an extensive comparison between Greco-Roman and colonial slavery, nor any ethical commentary on slavery as an institution.

Fifth, there is no extensive survey on every aspect of ancient Greco-Roman slavery because many have already filled library shelves with such works.²⁹ For instance, there is little mention here of the economic aspect of slavery in terms of its societal effects. However, economy is a well-documented subject which interests many Marxist scholars and others who have a political interest in the overall conditions of Roman society.³⁰ Without aiming to discount such important studies, Paul's concern for the Galatians seems to be about the individual experience of the slave rather than about the macro-economic impact the institution of slavery had on Roman society. Therefore, both the content and the chronology of this study are under the control of the Galatian text. There is no discussion on the emergence and the impact of slavery in Paul's society. Questions such as, "Did slavery cause the downfall of the Roman Empire?" are better answered by other more specialized studies. In chapter two, all the topics and issues selected are related to Galatians in some way. The chronological period is within the century before or during Paul's lifetime, unless there are reasons to believe that a certain work had a diachronic effect on Paul's current society. For example, the performance of many of the ancient plays in Paul's time was a public event. Views from these plays would directly affect society at every

First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul, p. 33, states, "we will be on safer ground to restrict these terms (like rabbinical or rabbi) to second-century and later development."

²⁹ A work like R. Gayer, *Die Stellung des Sklaven in den paulinischen Gemeinden und bei Paulus* (Bern: Hebert Lang; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1976), has given a concise summary of the ancient social-historical comparison on views of slavery.

³⁰ Much of the scholarly work by M. I. Finley deserves more than the little mention made in this study. His works on Roman economy and slavery are quite helpful in studies of economic impact by slavery. This topic of economy and slavery is a completely different discipline than the present study. See Z. Yavetz, *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Rome*, pp. 118-153, for a brief but helpful survey on such issues.

level.³¹ Furthermore, chapter two also cannot and, indeed, does not mean to represent every perspective towards slavery within the period under the current investigation. In other words, chapter two can only present those points of view that have some parallel or antithetical ideas to the issues raised in Galatians. In doing so, one can easily see where Paul's thought overlapped or clashed with his societal currents.

In summary, there are three models of ethical, economic, and social-historical studies on slavery, as discussed above, and this study does not belong to the first two. Instead, it deals with the social experience within the slave metaphor in relation to Paul's work. In other words, social-historical study is here to serve the literary examination. As important as ethical and economic interpretations are on the institution of slavery, this study can only refer to these issues so long as they are relevant to the task in hand.

Definitions:

Slave

In defining what a slave is, the interpreter must immediately define what a slave is not.³² A slave is not simply a person who lives under the oppressive dominion of another person. For instance, an ancient tenant farmer might have been severely socially and financially oppressed by the owner of the farm. His lifestyle might have been no better, and at times even worse, than a slave's. Another group from a slightly different era is the Helots under Sparta, who served in a subservient status but were by no means enslaved.³³ However, a "lifestyle" does not automatically indicate social status. A slave is not just a person who has many obligations in a client-patron relationship. At times, the client-patron

³¹ This is not to stress the great intellectual chasm between the intellectuals and the commoners, as is previously assumed in some quarters. After all, much of what one considers as classical literature was performed in public, and many in the lower class had equal access to these works by the New Testament time. See F. G. Downing, "À bas les aristos," pp. 210-230, for an informed discussion and evidence against the alleged class differences in literature.

³² The following distinctions are almost standard in the study of Greco-Roman slavery. See discussions on such distinctions in M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York: Viking, 1980), pp. 74-75.

³³ See M. I. Finley, "Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour?," *Historia* 8 (1959), pp. 145-164. One can even see an involuntary element in the Helot servitude, but the Helots had some practical and legal civil rights above the Greco-Roman slaves while being fully integrated into the Spartan society.

relationship can be enslaving or controlling and even overtake the client's life. However, this "relationship" does not necessarily make a person a slave. What then constitutes a slave? One must define slavery in terms of Roman law and ideologies. A slave is a person with a definite financial value under the ownership of another person.³⁴ Legally, the slave is under the supervision of the owner who is responsible for the slave's welfare. He or she is a chattel or property of the owner. The slave only receives his or her rights as a result of the owner's generosity. In turn, the slave serves in the *familia* as an alienated member. At the same time, all of his or her social movement is connected to the *familia*.

Familia

When it comes to the relationship between slavery and early Christianity, one cannot study slavery and its associated metaphors in abstraction from the *familia*. As D. J. Kyrtatas and W. A. Meeks have shown, early Christianity cut across social boundaries and conversion was often through the *familia*.³⁵ As a result of its widespread influence, the *familia* is the most appropriate context with which to interpret Greco-Roman slavery in general and in particular here to interpret Galatians. Slaves themselves belonged to a *familia*, as did everyone who lived

³⁴ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York: Viking, 1980), p. 73, demonstrates the unique relationship between masters and slaves, from Latin philology, when the slave was both property and human. Although the Old Latin word *erus* was used to describe masters in preference over *dominus* in the comedies of Plautus and Terence, *erus* eventually extended its semantic range in latter times also to mean an owner of non-human properties.

³⁵ K. Kautsky, *The Foundations of Christianity* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1953) and F. Engels, *On Religion* (Moscow: Progress, 1975), pp. 275-300, model Christianity in terms of a lower class religion. Such formulations might have found their roots in the anti-Christian writings of Celsus who was alleged to have claimed that Christianity was able to convert the non-intellectual lower class easily (Origen *Contra Celsum* 3.44). E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960); "The Social Identity of the First Christians: a Question of Method in Religious History," *JRH* 11 (1980) pp. 210-217; *Rank and Status in the World of the Caesars and of St. Paul* (Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1982), first challenged the thesis that Christianity was primarily a religion of the oppressed poor. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*, p. 48, discusses the mysterious absence of the title 'slave' from the sepulchral inscriptions of Christianity. He sees this as evidence that early Christianity was not being spread through the lower class only. One can also make the case that the slaves themselves did not have that view under their Christian masters. Conversion probably was under Christian masters, rather than 'individual' slaves themselves converting one another. The structure of the *familia* was probably the primary influence. It is primarily because the *familia* cut across the society in its influence. See also W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 51-73 and J. E. Stambaugh and D. L. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), pp. 138-140, A. Segal, *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1986), p. 97.

within Greco-Roman society. Since Paul derived his metaphors from the symbolic universe of his society, the Galatians would understand his message. As this study hopes to demonstrate, Paul used the slave metaphor to defend his legitimacy, to change his audience's conviction and to attack his agitators. In Paul's story, as in his society, the individual slave belongs in the periphery of the Roman *familia*. Specifically, Paul's language refers to the male slave. Whichever way one chooses to apply Paul's language on gender, Paul's analogy of "sonship" had social significance that demands the interpreter to use the male slave as the primary case. The later part of this study will discuss the significance of the male slave and the adopted son. Through his manumission and identity shift from adoption, he not only came into the inner circle of the *familia*; he actually became part of the legal family, which entitled him to the rights of inheritance. This identity transformation is analogous to the shift from the power of the agitators and the Law to that of Christ.³⁶ When one wishes to look at the Roman laws behind the *familia*, the laws of persons and the laws of things are the two broad categories of Roman law. In the terms of Roman "laws of persons", a person in the *familia* was either *sui iuris*, one who had power over, or *alieni iuris*, one who was in the power of another (Just. Inst. 1.8). To further clarify these laws, anyone obligated officially or unofficially to someone else became the *alieni iuris*. Slaves were the extreme case of *alieni iuris*. Based on the above assessment, the *familia* should be the overarching Pauline metaphor to describe the soteriological relationship between humanity and its Creator.

Pauline scholars who deal with servile themes usually find some connections between the text and the society within which slavery existed. The *familia* was central in Roman society. One finds this world of the *familia* coexisting comfortably with passages about slavery in Paul. This was a strange world for the modern reader. It was a world full of patron-client relationships based on official and unofficial obligations.³⁷ It was a place where one could only exercise

³⁶ The problem of identity through either the Torah or Christ is named by T. D. Gordon, "The Problem at Galatia," *Interpretation* 41 (1987), p. 40., to be the main problem of Galatians. If one puts the Spirit into the equation as well, then it is a balance of being identified by Christ through the outward expression of the Spirit. The slave metaphor in this study will confirm the problem of identity along with inheritance of God's promise.

³⁷ See S. N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, "Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (1980), pp. 50, 62, for a detailed

limited freedom within societal boundary lines, and where acceptable and deviant actions had rewards and consequences. In the *familia*, power resided in the *paterfamilias*, in one form or another. Hence, the *patria potestas* was the paradigm or starting point for the Romans in discussing many societal issues. Thus, discussion on Paul and slavery should not neglect the environment of the *familia* and dismiss its far-reaching influences. For instance, scholarly discussion of Philemon never strays far from the formation of the house church and the power Philemon, as a *paterfamilias* figure, might have exercised not only over his slaves but also the church itself.³⁸ Other discussions on 1 Corinthians and the “Prison letters” have revolved around either the house church structure or the role of the household members within the primitive Christian family. The world of the *familia* fits in comfortably within Paul’s letters precisely because Paul could not ignore this convention and still adequately deal with relational issues.

How, then, must one view the term *familia*? The differentiation between the *familia* and family is important. The *familia* was anyone who was under the direct power of the *paterfamilias*. The family in terms of the nuclear family was within the relational structure with the *paterfamilias*, whether through adoption or natural birth.³⁹ In Greek vocabulary, the idea of *familia* can be found in words associated with οἶκος or οἰκία. Normally, there are a few different meanings of for these words. The first meaning is a house as a building structure and no more. The second meaning is a household as a *familia* composed of various members.⁴⁰ The second meaning is relevant to the present study. Within the second meaning, there are two different kinds of usage. First, writers could use such vocabulary literally. For instance, in many cases, the early Christians seem to convert by the household (Jn. 5.52; Acts 16.14-15; 16.31-34; 1 Cor. 1.16; Phil.

description of the patron-client relationship. They mention networks and groups of various hierarchy structured around unofficial “rules”. In addition, they point out that economic and political forces (which are factors beyond the scope of this study) were important in the formation of such a relationship. Without a doubt, Roman expansion was a major contributing factor in the area of economic and political structure. Beside ownership of land by the Caesars and the state, landowners were still the most powerful group of people. This allowed for social control.

³⁸ For house churches, see also Rom. 16.5; 1 Cor. 16.19; Col. 4.15; Philemon 1.2.

³⁹ See J. Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 271-272, who devotes an entire thesis to the terms, for the importance of this distinction.

⁴⁰ See Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), p. 7, for another study, which takes the *familia* seriously as an essential part of the discussion on slavery. Other instances show the members’ roles within the *familia* (Jn. 8.35). Joseph’s job was to be in charge of Pharaoh’s οἶκον (Acts. 7.10). One is to provide for those in one’s οἰκείων (1 Tim. 5.8).

4.22) which included people of diverse social ranking, and therefore, conversion touched every level of society.⁴¹ There are even hints that the early Christian church aspired to be one big spiritual *familia* to meet the social needs of its members (e.g. 1 Tim. 5.1-16).⁴² The second usage of the οἶκος and οἰκία is metaphorical. Again, there is an abundance of examples in the early Christian literature (Lk. 11.17; 12.39; Jn. 8.35; Heb. 3.5-6). Possibly, because Jesus borrowed extensively from the *familia* for his parables, the Gospel writers have often linked Jesus' parables with words descriptive of the *familia*.⁴³ Within the Pauline tradition, any discussion of the household not only includes its related members at the top but also deals with the role of slaves (Eph. 5.22-6.9; Col. 3.18-25). Both Ephesians and Colossians follow a certain hierarchical order by starting with marriage and ending in slavery. Here the ranking in the Pauline Christian household follows the Greco-Roman *familia*. To confirm further the influence of the *familia* in Paul, one can go further than surveying Greco-Roman literature. One can also look at the literature produced by the early church to see just how commonplace the *familia* was. As the previous discussions introduce the concept of the *familia* as being central in the Roman society, it is reasonable to assume that the same concept did exist within the symbolic universe of the early Christians. To be without a *familia* was to suffer the ultimate social death (Lk. 15.32).

Metaphor

The work of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, points out that there are unintentional ideas within human language that act as signs pointing to

⁴¹ Assertions of E. A. Judge, "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History" *JRH* 11 (1980), pp. 201-217, *Rank and Status in the World of the Caesars and St. Paul* (Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1981) and Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, pp. 72-73, are confirmed through the *familia* conversion. In *Rank and Status*, Judge shows through a study of papyri that wealth was accessible for those with social shrewdness. In "Social Identity," Judge points out the commonality as well as the uniqueness of Christian existence in comparison to the society. As a movement, an evolving set of teaching opened the opportunities to moral instruction at all levels. In Judge's formulation, Christianity brought the higher end of education down to all levels of society among the believers. However there is little said about the method of propagation. Such propagation could work through the social structure of the *familia*.

⁴² The familial language can also describe Israel as a nation (e.g. "house of Israel" Heb. 8.8)

⁴³ Further, note the prevalence of slavery in the parables. See J. A. Glancy, "Slaves and Slavery in the Matthean Parables," *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 67-90.

the metaphors behind the words.⁴⁴ The scholarly arguments either favor the metaphor as being intentional or unintentional. The present study proposes that Paul had created such a metaphor on slavery which does not end in and of itself but tells a coherent story about the Galatian situation, the problems they face and Paul's view of the agitators. How then can one assume that the metaphors are within the intention of the book? When all these metaphorical words consistently create a coherent whole and Paul repeated them throughout Galatians, one can no longer assume that they were accidental rather than intentional. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca argue that metaphor is a trope (a Greek word, *τρόπος* naturally meaning 'to twist, turn'), "that is, 'the artistic alternation of a word or phrase from its proper meaning to another.' ... In the context of argumentation [which is the literary nature of Galatians], at least, we cannot better describe a metaphor than by conceiving it as a condensed analogy, ..."⁴⁵ What they appear to mean is that the author or speaker somehow alters the literal sense of the expression, the phrase or the word, into a metaphorical sense, through a shared set of cultural ideas with the reader or listener. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca explain in *The New Rhetoric* that the separation between the literal or metaphorical sense is not as precise as is stated here. Philosophy of Language scholars have argued that a metaphor has a literal and a metaphorical sense.⁴⁶ Often, for one who does not have the cultural awareness of the user of metaphors, the literal sense of the metaphor can be quite puzzling. For example, a person might describe a crafty man this way, "The man is a snake. Watch out, he can eat you up." A young child who has no grasp of the societal linguistic rules might ask somewhat naively, "Does he have fangs?" Indeed, in a metaphorical, non-literal sense, the man has fangs by using his craftiness to harm others. Therefore, even in the metaphorical sense, the literal idea is not completely lost or misleading.⁴⁷ In other words, the lexical idea of the words in a metaphorical expression is never

⁴⁴ G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

⁴⁵ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, pp. 398-399. LSJM. J. R. Searle, "Metaphor" in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, p. 84.

⁴⁶ W. G. Lycan, *Philosophy of Language* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 208-226, gives a clear and concise review of the various theories on metaphor.

⁴⁷ See D. Davidson, "What Metaphors Mean" in A. P. Martinich (ed.), *The Philosophy of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 420, on the importance of the 'literal' sense to work out the metaphor.

completely lost. Instead, the speaker's manipulation of certain ideas, within the semantic range of words, gives birth to another idea.

How exactly do speakers or writers use metaphors? What are the goals of such rhetorical practices? In *The New Rhetoric*, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca suggest that the formation of a metaphor is through the fusion of the "theme" and "*phoros*", which results in a new self-contained expression. The "theme" is the idea which the author tries to convey. The "*phoros*" is the picture the author paints to convey that idea. Because authors are trying to use a theme or an idea to get across a message, they come up with a word picture or an image. Authors can modify this picture by emphasizing or subverting the important elements to fit the theme.⁴⁸ For example, an author may choose to use the *phoros* of the monkey having its hand stuck in a jar to illustrate the theme of greed. However, the whole essay might not be about greed at all. Greed may only be a minor aspect of an essay with a broader overall purpose. Since the force of a picture or an image is not sufficient to describe a metaphor, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca focus on the whole process of how an author forms a metaphor in the reader's minds. The reader must recognize the metaphor to make the communication work.⁴⁹ Based on the discussion in this study about the prevalence of both slavery and the *familia* structure, the Galatians certainly would have recognized Paul's metaphors. As the communication process reaches the reader, the fusion of the two elements of theme and *phoros* in an analogy is a good way not only to describe what a metaphor is but also how it functions. Fusion implies the interdependence of *phoros* and theme. *Phoros* exists within the metaphor because of the theme. Theme is made clear because of the *phoros*. The two interact and fuse to create a metaphorical expression. While an analogy follows the same process, metaphor is a much shorter version in the theory of the *New Rhetoric*.⁵⁰

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca propose nine different ways the fusion of

⁴⁸ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 378-380, shows that the author can suppress or highlight elements within the *phoros* to achieve the intended theme.

⁴⁹ More helpful is M. McCall, *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1969), p. 110, who suggests that one should only consider metaphors recognized by the readers.

theme and *phoros* occurs. First, authors can employ metaphor derived from an analogy within an argument.⁵¹ The goal of this practice is to accustom the reader to seeing things as the authors describe them. For example, an author can describe a person's life as a tragedy and then add, "His foolishness is playing its part."⁵² This reveals the cause of the tragedy which then becomes the theme. The *phoros* here is the play itself which implies that life is like a play. Second, an author can fuse the superior terms of the theme and *phoros* (A and C) but at the same time leave the inferior terms unexpressed (B and D).⁵³ For example, in the sentence "As A is to B, so C is to D," the A and B together create the theme, while C and D together make the *phoros*. The metaphor can imply B and D without stating the premise, while explicitly stating A and C. The implication and explicit statement are both within the intention and creation of the author. The author of Proverbs 7.23 describes the whoremonger this way, "As a bird hastens to the snare, so he does not know that it [immorality] *will cost him* his life. (NASB)" As the bird is to the whoremonger, so the snare is to his death (i.e. cost of his life). If the author chooses to leave out two elements together, he or she can choose to state matters this way, "The bird (i.e. the whoremonger in the context of Proverbs) hastens to the snare (i.e. death in the context of Proverbs)." This is assuming that one already understands the context of Proverbs 7.

Third, fusion can occur "by simple determination."⁵⁴ One term determines and defines the meaning of another. The expression "the evening of life" denotes the very last phase of life. This expression is the perfect illustration of fusion. The *phoros* is the evening which denotes a time of day. The theme is the time of one's life. When the fusion occurs, the time of day is used to show which stage of life the author is describing. The longer version of this fusion would be "the time of one's life now is like the evening in the span of the day." This fusion describes a late stage of one's life which contains both *phoros* and theme.

⁵⁰ H. M. Gale's *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul* makes an attempt to understand Paul's thoughts by studying a cross-section of analogies in Paul's letters. Thus, analogies and metaphors can reap a broader benefit in dealing with a "theology" or thought world of a certain author.

⁵¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 400.

⁵² Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 400, have a similar ancient example.

⁵³ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 401.

⁵⁴ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402. E.g. "an ocean of false learning".

Fourth, fusion can also occur “by means of an adjective.”⁵⁵ The expression “a luminous account” uses the *phoros* light to point towards the theme of how an account is being told. Fifth, fusion can occur “through use of a verb.”⁵⁶ Verbs can provide a metaphorical imagery. For instance, “she trumpeted her cause” uses the *phoros* “to trumpet” to show the theme which is the intensity of the manner of a person’s campaign. Sixth, fusion can occur “by a possessive.”⁵⁷ The expression “my cross to bear” emphasizes the individual person suffering his or her own persecution. Normally, the cross in Christian thought is associated with Jesus’ crucifixion or the disciple’s burden, but the possessive “my” defines the specific kind of cross the speaker has to bear. Therefore, the *phoros* is the disciple’s cross and the theme is “my” burden. The metaphor “my cross” is the fusion of the disciple’s cross and my burden. Seventh, fusion can occur through direct identification.⁵⁸ “He is a pig” is not talking about a male pig, but rather a person who behaves in a sloppy and dirty manner. The *phoros* is the pig with which a person is identified. This *phoros* brings out the theme of a disorderly lifestyle. “He is a pig” is the fusion of the pig and the disorderly lifestyle. The focus is not on the pig but on a person living out a certain pig-like quality. Eighth, fusion can occur through creation of compound words.⁵⁹ The American expression ‘egghead’ indicates that a person has a certain studious, other-worldly quality and not that his head is shaped like an egg. The image of a inverted egg-shaped head, with an overdeveloped brain, is the *phoros* which illustrates the absurd quality of the person described. The absurd quality becomes the theme. Ninth, fusion can occur with hyperbolic imageries.⁶⁰ For example, when a person is described as “talking at a rate of one hundred miles an hour”, this indicates that the person talks like speeding car. In this case, the hyperbole and metaphor merge.

The above nine ways the fusion of *phoros* and theme occur, as proposed by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, are helpful when looking at a text and trying to ascertain what the author is attempting to do with a metaphor. The claim of

⁵⁵ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402.

⁵⁶ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402.

⁵⁷ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402.

⁵⁸ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402.

⁵⁹ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, which is based on their observation of how language works, implies that metaphors themselves follow certain rules.

One form of metaphor that deserves some discussion is the dead or dormant metaphor.⁶¹ What makes the metaphor dormant is its overly popular usage. Such metaphors have already gained cultural acceptance so that they have almost become clichés. Six different usages can re-awaken such dormant metaphors. First, dormant metaphors can become fresh by an original usage from an ingenious analogy.⁶² Second, certain details of an argument can evoke the *phoros* of a metaphorical expression by an extension of an analogy.⁶³ Suddenly, the cliché can be viewed in a new and fresh way. Third, dormant metaphors can present themselves in combination with each other, thus resulting in some new usage.⁶⁴ Fourth, one dramatic method of rekindling an old metaphor is to place the metaphor alongside its literal meaning.⁶⁵ Fifth, another way the dormant metaphor can work is to use it under extraordinary circumstances.⁶⁶ A slight distortion of the “normal” usage can give it a fresh meaning. Sixth, dormant metaphors expressed in a different translation can give them a new life on their own.⁶⁷

What then, makes a specific metaphor important for studying a given text? In H. M. Gale’s work, *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul*, what makes a metaphor or analogy meaningful is the frequency and thematic coherence of its use with other similar analogies and metaphors.⁶⁸ Ideas about slavery recur so often in almost every chapter of Galatians so as to make slavery a meaningful

⁶⁰ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 403.

⁶¹ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 405, use “dormant” to show that the metaphor has the possibility of awakening. Many such metaphors are popularly considered cliché.

⁶² Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 405.

⁶³ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 406. See also Lakoff, “Contemporary theory of metaphor” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 237-238. The extension or the grouping of certain metaphorical ideas tells a story or paints a lively picture to convey certain emotions or abstractions. The story or the picture is culturally bound.

⁶⁴ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 406.

⁶⁵ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 406. E.g. “We must all hang together or we shall all hang separately.” Some want to discard the literal-metaphorical categories. However a simple disposal of the dichotomy misunderstands the function of metaphors. These theorists have helpfully pointed out the semiotic function of words but a sign is not necessarily metaphorical. Rather, signs point to meanings.

⁶⁶ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 407.

⁶⁷ Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 407.

⁶⁸ Gale, *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), pp. 18-19. Some analogies may be used in passing without any associated word pictures.

metaphor in the letter.⁶⁹ Certain metaphors express specific ideas, which in turn create a pattern with some resemblance to a story. Such metaphors have their own rules of what is good and bad, honorable and shameful, right and wrong. The author and the society usually express such rules by the way they comment on each metaphor. Sometimes, the rules are different from modern rules which is why Paul's portrait of himself as an upwardly mobile slave has puzzled many scholars. To the modern mind, upward mobility is very limited in colonial slavery, thereby making Paul's metaphors confusing. Parts of the metaphor are the communicative instrument for Paul. They originated from Paul's symbolic universe. By adjusting his metaphors according to the situation, each letter uses similar metaphors differently and creatively. Each letter expresses its own rules based on the text's comments about the metaphors.

Symbolic Universe

Every society has its own symbolic universe through which every member interprets certain cultural phenomena.⁷⁰ Although it is somewhat simplistic to assume that all the people at Paul's time thought exactly the same way, this society did have basic boundaries of what was acceptable. If these sets of beliefs were undermined, the affected institutions would be greatly jeopardized. Individuals of the first century identified themselves more with this corporate personality, which is governed by a set of values or rules, than as individual persons. Although the ancient way of dealing with the honor system seems drastically different from the modern, there is a degree of the same social behavior in modern society as well. In the modern West, spitting on the road is considered an unacceptable form of behavior. Such acts will not only expose one to the annoyance of one's fellow citizen; in some places, such behavior is punished. There is less difference in the nature of societal boundaries from the

⁶⁹ B. Witherington, *Paul's Narrative Thought World* (Louisville: WJKP, 1994), focuses on this idea of the narrative world of Paul's theology. Here the focus starts with a social institution deliberately picked by Paul to illustrate his message. According to Lakoff, "Contemporary theory of metaphor," p. 245, "the system of conventional conceptual metaphor is mostly unconscious, automatic and used with no noticeable effort." With its frequent occurrence in Galatians, one can hardly say that the metaphor is automatic.

⁷⁰ Concerning metaphors, this concept is very similar to what Lakoff calls the metaphor map of a given language. He distinguishes two kinds of map: conceptual and image. In the case of Paul, both

ancient mindset. Only the degree and way in which boundaries and rules operate may differ from society to society. Ancient Roman society seems much more uniformly different than modern society in the way rules govern individuals. Though the individual applied and interpreted this set of rules or values according to the circumstances, the whole society was in fact governed by its system of rules and values. Thus, this phenomenon is conducive to a social-historical model. As a member of his society, Paul made use of the imagery emerging from the social rules and values in order to communicate his point. In the process of interaction with the symbolic universe of his society, Paul's own background also surfaces here. As his background crossed with the society's symbolic universe, certain imageries arise from Paul's own experience. These imageries are from Paul's background. An awareness of this symbolic universe, as an information pool, is vital in understanding the source of Paul's *phoros*.

Various scholars have understood the term "symbolic universe" differently. Scholars such as N. R. Petersen prefer to see it as a narrative world. They may understand the term to be a world behind the text. Petersen defines "narrative world" as the story *behind* Philemon and *behind* the whole Pauline corpus. This study defines "symbolic universe" as the sources of Paul's metaphors in Galatians. Though Paul's own symbolic universe can encompass much more than what the New Testament records, the symbolic universe for this study is restricted to the metaphors *within* the argument of Galatians and the world of the *familia*.⁷¹ This is not to say that background studies are not important, as the wealth of publications on Galatians clearly shows, but the focus of the present study is more on the text itself than background. Furthermore, Petersen uses the whole Pauline corpus to map out the narrative world of Paul, while this study

culture and language are closely related. Lakoff, "Contemporary theory of metaphor," pp. 206-249.

⁷¹ For symbolic universe, see J. Neyrey, *Paul: in Other Words* (Louisville: WJKP, 1990). N. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), p. 2. His idea of "narrative world" would be what the present study considers the symbolic universe. Paul created his metaphors in Galatians by drawing upon his symbolic universe. This is not to exclude an occasional background from Paul as a Jew, as his quotation of the Old Testament surely shows. M. Hengel, "The Pre-Christian Paul," in J. Lieu et al (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 29-52, gives an important short study on Paul's pre-Christian background. His background should form the basis of his symbolic universe.

does not rely too heavily on Paul's other letters.⁷² Instead, this study mines its sources from the Greco-Roman world, from which Paul created his Galatian metaphors about slavery. There are several reasons for omitting the other Pauline letters as a major body of evidence. First, this study could easily turn into a study of Pauline slave metaphor, which is something that has already been surveyed by others.⁷³ Second, each letter has its own purpose. To synthesize all these letters is a formidable task that involves a complicated procedure of understanding each letter. Such an endeavor is beyond the scope of this study. Third, as Paul wrote Galatians earlier than most of his other letters, he did not draw from these letters and hence they are not relevant to the study. Although these other letters themselves could represent Paul's thoughts in some way, no one knows how extensively they represented Paul's earlier thinking. Rather, Paul drew from his literary and cultural tradition. While Petersen's study is mainly about Pauline familial metaphors as an expression of Pauline convictions about Onesimus, this study is about the Pauline metaphor of slavery. Although Petersen is probably correct in seeing a link between Paul's metaphor and convictions about slavery in Philemon, a study on Galatians should be more about *how* Paul used the metaphor of slavery instead of *what* Paul thought about slavery.⁷⁴

Rhetorical

The term 'rhetoric' will occur in parts of this study, and hence it is necessary to define it in this context. What exactly does rhetoric mean in this study? Scholarship on Pauline rhetoric has identified various approaches. The best summary of different approaches is by P. Kern in his recent work on Galatians. Since there is more discussion in chapter one on rhetorical approaches, a summary of Kern's ideas suffices for the present discussion. In reviewing many of the works on rhetoric and noting much of the confusion, Kern divides

⁷² C. B. Kittredge, *Community and Authority: The Rhetoric of Obedience in the Pauline Tradition* (Harvard Theological Studies, 45; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998), p. 10, criticizes Petersen for not keeping each letter in its historical context.

⁷³ E.g. K. Russell, *Slavery as Reality and Metaphor in the Pauline Letters* (Ph.D. diss., Rome: Pontifical University, 1968). F. Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984) provides a less technical and more accessible study as well.

⁷⁴ Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, pp. 25-27, is especially clear about the correspondence between the metaphors and reality of Philemon.

rhetorical analysis on Paul, especially on Galatians, into four levels.⁷⁵ Level one rhetorical analysis looks at rhetoric as the mere act of persuasion, which may or may not include making a speech. The whole point is to arrive at how the creator of the rhetoric wants his or her audience to react. This is rhetoric in the widest and most liberal sense. Recent studies on the new rhetoric are within this category. The task of rhetorical analysis is more descriptive than prescriptive or restrictive. Level two limits its analysis to speech or written communication. Level three uses the categories of Greco-Roman rhetoric to understand a text without restricting the text to a Greco-Roman style or specie. Level four is more specific still and tries to rigidly fit the analysis within the classifications of the Greco-Roman handbooks. In the analysis of level four, the interpreter looks at the text completely as a Greco-Roman product. As one surveys the various works and the more one approaches the level four rhetorical analysis, the less consensus there is on which category Galatians fits within the Greco-Roman classification of rhetorical species.

Since the present study is only dealing with the phenomenon of metaphor, the analysis does not focus on other figures of speech. In view of the many rhetorical analyses, the present study only analyzes one feature of Paul's rhetoric. Based on Kern's discussion on metaphors and the material used, this study falls loosely under level one analysis. The main concern is not so much on the division of Galatians within the tradition of Greco-Roman speeches. Most scholars who have conducted rhetorical analysis of Paul have already paved the way for this structural work. Rather, this study uses observations on how metaphors function to see how Paul used the slave metaphors to persuade his audience, thereby making this study much narrower in scope. By making use of the observations on some of the discussions about metaphors, this study seeks to describe the way Paul used his metaphors. What steps are then involved in seeing Paul's rhetoric in his metaphors? The steps must follow the path of how a metaphor is formed. First, one has to identify the metaphor. In a sense, this first step resembles what D. J. Williams tries to do with the whole of Paul's letters but

⁷⁵ Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians* (SNTSMS, 101; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) pp. 7-8.

only with the focus on Galatians.⁷⁶ One can find a metaphor easily because the literal meaning of the *phoros* usually does not fit the context well. Second, one has to see how the metaphor acts in its context. Since the *phoros* is closely involved with the metaphor itself, the second step is to see how the *phoros* gives birth to the theme. The *phoros* is easily identifiable through the symbolic universe of the *familia* and its connection with various aspects of slavery. The surrounding context in the text can limit the semantic field of *phoros*, so that the meaning of the theme does not turn into an allegory. The third step involved would be to use the nine observations by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca to classify how the meanings fuse together. By seeing this, one can identify Paul's rhetorical strategy and message more readily. Therefore, the present rhetorical analysis of the slave metaphor is a study of how Paul formulated the slave metaphor and how it delivers his intended message.

The Approach of this Study

Based on the above discussion of rhetorical analysis, the main body of this study divides into six chapters, which represent the steps required to understand Paul's rhetorical use of slavery in Galatians. Since there is a vast amount of researched material on Greco-Roman slavery, it is redundant to survey the overall literature on this topic. Therefore, the first chapter focuses on research about slavery pertaining to this study only. First, there is a survey on slavery studies which is concise in order to highlight the issues involved, especially issues pertinent to constructing the Pauline symbolic universe. Then, there is a survey on how research in Roman slavery affects Pauline interpretation. The second chapter deals with the institution and perspective of Paul's society towards slavery within the period of first century BCE to first century CE. This chapter gathers data on the recurring themes in Galatians: slavery, manumission, and re-enslavement. In so doing, these topics, which Paul used as *topoi* for his rhetoric, provide a glimpse of the process of enslavement and freedom in Paul's time, within the context of the *familia*. This pool of information comes from the literal institution of slavery. This is the symbolic universe from which Paul derives his metaphors.

The third to fifth chapters examine the various passages that involve the

⁷⁶ Note especially Williams, *Paul's Metaphors*, pp. 111-140, where slavery is the main topic.

slavery metaphor. Chapter three looks at the apologetic use of slave metaphors. Here, through an analysis of the slave metaphors Paul uses, one can see how Paul viewed himself. Chapter four looks at the polemical use of slave metaphors. In this case, Paul's use of slave metaphors is an indication of how Paul felt about the agitators. Chapter five looks at the didactic use of slave metaphors. Paul's thoughts on the Galatians and their situation is evident from his use of the slave metaphor. These are the chapters that will follow the process and effects of Paul's metaphors, and in which the rhetorical analysis is put into practice, based on the data gathered in the first two chapters. In this analysis, one can detect at least three perspectives of Galatians. Within the apologetic, polemical and didactic perspectives of Paul, one must establish two criteria to decide on the possible meaning of Paul's metaphor: location and context. Before one talks about the literary context, one has to locate the slave metaphor by asking two questions. What is the surrounding material about? How is the subject portrayed by the surrounding material? The societal information provides the second criterion of cultural context which further clarifies, confirms and adjusts the interpretive orientation text. At this point, the meaning of the metaphor becomes clear. Only then can one arrive at the rhetorical strategy Paul had in mind when using the slave metaphor. The sixth chapter synthesizes collected material in the previous two chapters and tries to make sense of the various ways Paul used the slave metaphor to persuade his audience.

The Purpose of This Study

Based on the above brief introduction, this study aims to find out how Paul used the slave metaphor to persuade the Galatians to adhere to his gospel. With the slave metaphor, was Paul mainly attacking his agitators? Alternatively, was he defending himself? Or was he mainly trying to teach the Galatians something? Hermeneutically, how does one account for the Jewish element within the letter having an impact on the gentile audience? A closely related issue, which this study seeks to highlight, is the relationship between Paul's metaphor and his convictions. This is a pertinent issue for slavery in the Gal. 3.28 'manifesto' and the slave metaphor. Is there any connection at all between how Paul used the slave metaphor and what Paul thought of slaves in his gentile churches? By looking at the slave metaphor as a rhetorical or persuasive tool, this study can

find full or partial answers for many of the aforementioned questions.

Chapter One
ISSUES IN RESEARCHING
GRECO-ROMAN SLAVE IDENTITY AND PAUL'S RHETORIC:
PRELIMINARY THEORETICAL REMARKS

1.1. The State of Scholarly Questions in Greco-Roman Slave Identity

Since the manumission of black slaves in the nineteenth century, there has been no lack of interest in the topic of slavery. If one were to survey the scholarship on slavery in general or Greco-Roman slavery in particular, the task alone would take several volumes.¹ In fact, discussions on the topic of classical slavery go all the way back to Plato's time, if not before.² In addition to the previous discussion on sources in the introduction of this study, one has to think about the geographical location of slavery in Paul's letters. Was it a rural or urban form of slavery? According to a thorough study of slavery across cultures, O. Patterson shows that slavery together with manumission flourishes in urban conditions.³ The Roman Empire was not an exception. As is expected, both themes of slavery and manumission dominate many parts of Paul's letters. Various relevant scholarly issues surface from the study of ancient slavery. This section will discuss the following important issues, directly and indirectly relating to Paul's

¹ Scholars such as Karl Marx, F. Engels and some of the neo-Marxists deserve mention because of their unique contribution on slavery from a materialistic or economic perspective. Though Marx did not major in slavery, his ideas influence many who do. However, the Marxist political application on slave revolt is especially vulnerable to criticism. Marx's own careless application of modern models of slavery towards ancient slavery probably does not help his case. Such studies draw much criticism from eminent scholars such as M. I. Finley and M. Grant, who advocate looking at history from multiple perspectives without making value judgments. However, the aforementioned studies do not directly affect Galatians. For a critical look at Marxist interpretation, see M. Grant, *The Social History of Greece and Rome* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1992), pp. 137-138. Typical of those who are involved in this debate are K. Bucher, M. Weber, E. Meyer, G. E. M. de Ste. Croix and D. J. Kyrtatas. For a concise but complete study of how scholars have treated slavery in the past, see M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York: Viking, 1980), pp. 11-66. Finley takes special care to separate his position from those who follow E. Meyer's position (p. 90).

² G. Vlastos, "Slavery in Plato's Thought," pp. 205-305.

³ O. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, pp. 266-268, 274. In a survey of selected large scale slave societies, Patterson demonstrates by table 10.5 (p. 274) that both Greece and Italy in the time of Paul had a very high rate of manumission in the urban areas. Y. Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece* (trans. J. Lloyd; Ithaca: Cornell, 1988), p. 81, uses K. Hopkins' data to demonstrate a similar increase of manumission. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*, p. 57, shows that earlier epigraphic evidence in Attica (340-320 BCE) indicates only ten percent of manumitted slaves were agricultural, while the remainder of slaves were urban. K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, p. 103, shows that slaves who worked closer to the owners stood a better chance of having a good relationship with them, which resulted

letter to the Galatians: first, the normality of slavery in Greco-Roman society; second, the identity of an individual Roman slave within the society and how slaves found that social identity; and third, how slaves related to their surrounding.

Before even discussing the scholarship on the experience of the individual slave, one needs to clarify that Paul's society was a slave society. Slavery was the norm. Whatever Roman citizens' moral or religious convictions were, very few gave any thought to the evil of slavery. As J. A. Harrill in his study on slavery rightly says, "I believe that slavery was, is and always will be an evil, but I cannot make Paul and Ignatius abolitionists."⁴ According to K. Hopkins' estimate, the slave population was around two million in Roman Italy, which was about thirty five to forty percent of the population.⁵ Whatever the precise figure, the size of the slave population was enough to intimidate Seneca into opposing the requirement that slaves wear uniforms (*Clem.* 1.24).⁶ Seneca feared that slaves could have realized their strength in number on seeing so many uniformed peers. However, visible or not, slavery was a dominant institution. Paul's society did not only have members of the upper class who owned slaves; people at all levels owned slaves in what was a slave society. Indeed, Greco-Roman reliance on slave labor was different from that of the American Deep South.⁷ In K. Hopkins' statistics on manumission at Delphi, one can further see that manumission was a popular practice in Paul's time.⁸ From these combined situations, slavery seems

in manumission in some cases. The landowners of the rural areas were often absent and the contact with the slaves was through slave managers called *vilicui*.

⁴ Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*, p. 9. See also R. MacMullen, "What difference did Christianity make?" *Historia* 35 (1986), pp. 322-341. However, one might also find R. Jewett, *Paul the Apostle to America* (Louisville: WJKP, 1994), pp. 59-69, an interesting application towards abolitionist ideas.

⁵ K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 8-9. He goes on to quote other important scholars such as Bloch and Brunt who give estimates between one to three million. As a trained sociologist and classicist, he proposes a study based on a socio-economic model of the phenomenon of slavery.

⁶ All classical references are from the *Loeb Classical Library* and abbreviations of classical works follow *Oxford Classical Dictionary* third edition.

⁷ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, pp. 80-81, makes the distinction between a society which allows slave ownership and a society which depends on slave ownership. The Romans even had slaves owning other slaves. Thus, the permanent work force was the slave population, whereas the freeborn population had the choice of leisure. Slaves dominated the large-scale production as well as different small-scale services in society.

⁸ K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, p. 140, shows an increase in male slaves being manumitted, even if home-born slaves decreased, from the period of 48-100 CE. Though this was far from the highest percentage of manumission, the comparison of the number of slaves available versus the

to be a prevalent phenomenon that was part of the everyday life of the ancient population. It is not too far-fetched to agree with the scholarly cliché that ancient society was founded on slavery.⁹ Although it is almost impossible to give an absolute figure of the slave population, it is safe to assume that slavery was much more extensive than in later times.¹⁰ Many economic studies in the vein of Karl Marx and M. I. Finley prove beyond doubt that slavery was a very important factor in the productivity of the Greco-Roman world.

In addition to dealing with the peculiar phenomenon of how a society maintains slavery as an institution, there is also the issue of the slave's personal identity. One can emphasize the slave as a member of the *familia* under the authority of the *paterfamilias*, which became a model of the society. This is the proposal of scholars such as W. K. Lacey.¹¹ In other words, slaves did not gain individual identity for themselves without some kind of relationship to a *familia*. According to the research of W. Eck and Lacey, in order to illustrate the Roman *familia* as being the foundation of society, household terms like *pater* also described political leaders.¹² In 2 BCE, Augustus was not only the *paterfamilias*

actual number freed is significant. The record at Delphi is just one indication of the rest of the Empire but its significance in terms of manumission makes it an interesting candidate for study of a partial picture of the social history. Y. Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece*, p. 81, reshuffles charts from K. Hopkins' "Between Slavery and Freedom" and demonstrates some very significant facts in first century Greece. Garlan shows the increase of postmortem manumission and the price for gaining freedom. Also there was a larger percentage of women slaves at the first half of the century. In Paul's days, manumission, along with the freedom it brought, was increasingly hard to come by.

⁹ R. H. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. xiv.

¹⁰ A combination of written and epigraphic evidence indicates to K. Bradley a rough free to slave ratio of 3:1 in the Roman world. K. Bradley, "Slavery," *OCD*. See also the comparative figures with the New World in K. Bradley, "On The Roman Slave Supply and Slavebreeding," in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Classical Slavery* (London: Frank Cass, 1987), p. 42.

¹¹ W. K. Lacey, "Patria Potestas" in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 121-144. Borkowski, *Textbook on Roman Law*, p. 102, points out the uniqueness of the Romans in legally embracing the institution of *paterfamilias* more thoroughly than any other ancient civilization.

¹² See W. Eck, "Hadrian als *pater patriae* und die Verleihung des Augustatitels an Sabina" in G. Wirth *et al* (eds.), *Romanitas Christianitas* (FS Johannes Straub; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), pp. 217-229, who discusses this very issue. See Lacey, "Patria Potestas," p. 132 for the lexical parallels and differences between political and household arenas. The model of the *familia* reflects the political arena. The early church, as an integral part of the Greco-Roman environment, failed to launch a frontal assault against slavery because of the fundamental importance of the *familia*. To destroy slavery in the Greco-Roman world would have been to undermine the structure of the *familia*. Therefore, the Roman would have considered the abolition of slavery dangerous and subversive.

of his *familia* but also the *pater patriae* of the whole nation.¹³ It follows that the stability of society was closely related to the stability of the *familia*. This is why it was important to regulate relationships in the *familia* through legal means (Arist. *Pol.* 1; Dio. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.24-27). Moreover, one needs to look no further than Jesus' own analogies to see a political application of the *familia* (Matt. 12.25; 13.57; Mk. 3.25; 6.4).

When dealing with the *familia*, one needs to understand the difference between the *familia* and the modern nuclear family.¹⁴ Scholars caution against understanding the term *familia* as coequal to its modern etymological derivation 'family'. *Familia* was a Greco-Roman creation that had a male authority figure at its head.¹⁵ The *familia* contained members and non-members of the nuclear family. To put the matter another way, J. L. White writes, "The difference arises primarily not from the fact that the household was more multigenerational, but from the fact that the family included non-kin as members. The upper-class Roman household (*familia*) ... often included tenants, freedmen (former family slaves), laborers and business associates."¹⁶ All these participants were under the oldest surviving male authority called the *paterfamilias*. Because the Romans built their society on reciprocity, every member was related in some way to another member (Sen. *Ben.* 1.10.4; Cic. *Off.* 1.48). As P. Garnsey and R. Saller write, "Just as a loan created a relationship between creditor and debtor, so a favor or service gave rise to a social relationship between Romans."¹⁷ The slave

¹³ B. Rawson, "The Iconography of Roman Childhood," in B. Rawson and P. R. C. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman Family in Italy*, p. 215.

¹⁴ Martin, *Slavery as Salvation*, pp. 2-4, points out the assault on the family structure in Greco-Roman slavery. Based on Greco-Roman laws, did the slave even belong in his or her family? The answer must be a resounding "No." His observation is correct according to the modern perception of the family. Certainly, this was not necessarily the view of the legislators of Greco-Roman laws. Martin further deems the *familia* model not being in conformity to reality. He suggests a more modern model of a nuclear family. As much as he criticizes epigraphic studies, there are other sources like legal and historical literature that point in the direction of the *familia*. He writes that the epigraphic evidence is formulaic and not a good indicator of reality. One can also argue for the contrary that reality gave birth to Greco-Roman formulae.

¹⁵ On the distinction between the word "family" in the modern sense and *familia*, see B. Rawson, "The Roman Family," in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 7-8. Most scholars on the Roman *familia* are careful to make such a needed distinction. See Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, p. 30. A similar concept is the Greek words οἶκος and οἰκία or the Latin word *domus*.

¹⁶ J. L. White, *The Apostle of God*, pp. 208-209. White in fact makes the household one of the major components of Pauline thought.

¹⁷ P. Garnsey and R. P. Saller, "Patronal Power Relations" in R. A. Horsley, *Paul and Empire* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1997), p. 97. However, the relationship between slave and master was much

was no exception. Within the *familia*, the slave functioned according to certain conventional structures both within the *familia* and society.

Scholarly discussion on the slave's personal identity can also address the alienation the slave suffered within the *familia*. Such studies attempt to trace the life of a slave with little interest in the symbolism of the *familia* in relation to society. Various legal and non-legal sources are helpful in reconstructing the slave's life from the owner's point of view. While slaves were considered members of the *familia*, they were at the same time alienated from full participation in the *familia* and were not within the 'nuclear family'. If the *familia* was a simple reflection of society, slaves were by nature on the periphery of this symbiotic relationship. Many researchers emphasize this idea of alienation when dealing with slavery in Paul's time. Patterson suitably calls this the social death of the slave, as the title of his massive work indicates.¹⁸ According to scholarly research on alienation among enslaved people, the slaves are alienated in several respects. They are alienated socially. For example, Watson's *Roman Slave Law* states that the *lex Cornelia* "ordered the execution of a will of a citizen who died a captive as if he had died at the moment of capture [i.e. assumed enslavement]".¹⁹ In dealing with the difference between ancient and colonial slavery, one can see that the difference in social alienation is largely by degree rather than in kind. Evidently, Greco-Roman slavery was social death. This one area continues to fascinate scholars. There is a definite and radical difference between the master and the slave in social standing in both colonial and Roman slavery. In addition to the slave's social alienation, scholars also note the slave's

more severe than client and patron relationships. The hierarchy of power was much more polarized. See Glancy, "Slaves and Slavery in the Matthean Parables," *JBL* 119 (2000), p. 70, for a critique of Saller's terminology in the work *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

¹⁸ Writers linked the idea of death with Roman laws at various periods. See O. Patterson's *Slavery and Social Death* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982). When people became slaves, their past disappeared: debts were no longer debts. See Buckland, pp. 2-3 for this idea of death. The legal death of Buckland should correctly link with Patterson's social death. Can one then agree so readily with R. H. Barrow's seemingly optimistic assessment on captive enemy slaves? He states, "to grant life instead of destroying it was in itself a mark of progress, even though the life spared was to be dragged out in the hewing of wood and drawing of water." *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (London: Methuen, 1928), p. xvi. Barrow suggests slavery as a punishment (p. 2) but Patterson goes further to label it social death.

¹⁹ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 21, dates the law around 84 to 81 BCE. Even marriage was annulled, unless remarriage took place.

natal alienation.²⁰ The instances of ‘breeding’ and selling slaves are too numerous and common to name among slave societies. In societies that practice breeding, the captors and owners snatch the slaves from their history, culture, religion and, most importantly, parental care.²¹ All such forms of alienation further strip the individual slaves of any kind of personal identity. Throughout his well-documented study, O. Patterson shows that different people groups probably practiced different degrees of alienation for different reasons.²² Apart from the drawback of alienation, scholars notice that some slaves could manipulate the societal rules to move upwardly in the Greco-Roman world. By the Principate, P. Garnsey and R. P. Saller conclude that Augustus did not and, indeed, could not block the upward movement of slaves.²³

Studies on slavery, in terms of the individual experience of the slave, tend to follow two basic methods. They either talk about the similarities between Greco-Roman slavery and black slavery, or they focus on the differences between the two.²⁴ The emphasis largely depends on whether the scholar conducts the studies through intercultural and diachronic means or synchronically via an analysis of individual cultures. The differences between the two methods are by no means as extreme as the simple delineation here but will suffice for the general introduction of issues. The general research approaches on slavery show that,

²⁰ Of great importance is the Greco-Roman differentiation between the born “free person” and the “freed person” who was set free.

²¹ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, p. 76, shows from Egyptian papyri an overwhelming amount of sales of children separate from their mothers. If sold together as a package, children received as similar upbringing from alternative female figures in the new household. Hence, the slaves could belong to a *familia* without a proper nuclear family. J. H. Neyrey, *Paul, in Other Words* (Louisville: WJKP, 1990), pp. 192-194, makes a good observation that Greco-Roman society caused the individual to be identified by others in the society, whether by family, geographical location or owner.

²² O. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, pp. 55-59.

²³ Garnsey and Saller, *The Roman Empire*, p. 110, make this conclusion with the previous observation of S. Treggiari and P. A. Brunt.

²⁴ A typical study of sociological similarities would be Paterson’s *Slavery and Social Death*. An important work on the differences in terms of political backgrounds between the recent and ancient slavery is M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York: Viking, 1980). Some others talk ambivalently of Greco-Roman slavery in terms of modern conceptions, thus making their judgment anachronistic. See R. H. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (London: Methuen & Co. 1928), pp. 31-32, who condemns the Romans for mistreating their “fellowmen”. However, did the Romans understand the slaves to be a complete human being, on equal terms with a non-slave person? Alternatively, Barrow states that the legal system miscarries justice against slaves. While this is true, did the Roman have a different sense of what justice and order are? Much literary record shows a great gulf between the modern and the Romans on justice and order.

while there are vast similarities between various types of slavery in different periods, there are also very complex and sometimes confusing differences between ancient and black slavery.

The similarities between the relatively recent black slave trade and ancient slavery are summarized in the word 'power'. Much of the sociological effects on slavery are related to power, manipulation and struggle for control. Furthermore, there are qualities as well as quantity attached to power. K. Bradley devotes an entire book, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire* to the concept of power and the use of power. Although he acknowledges that slaves and masters could have had an equal share of power in some cases, Bradley focuses on the oppressive nature of the overall Greco-Roman institution of slavery. Along with power, there is also the dichotomy of freedom and slavery. To study slavery is to understand freedom at the same time. This is especially important as one looks at the way certain philosophies viewed enslaved human nature at the time of Paul.²⁵ Scholars such as O. Patterson note that even though slavery and freedom stand as opposing forces of history, slavery is also an essential element in a society which values freedom.²⁶ Apart from power and freedom, the other differences between the two kinds of slavery are easily identifiable. D. B. Martin has noted the possibility of gaining more freedom within the ancient framework of slavery, while that kind of freedom is virtually unknown in black slavery.²⁷ The Roman slave had easier access to power than the black slave. Not only is the subtle use of power an important issue in studying ancient slavery, but the slaves' extensive use of power and control are also important. Unless one understands the powerful social fraternity of Greco-Roman slave ownership, as briefly described

²⁵ H-D. Betz, *Paul's Concept of Freedom in the Context of Hellenistic Discussions about the Possibility of Human Freedom* (Berkeley: University of California, 1977), p. 2. The tendency became stronger in later Gnostic beliefs. Betz's argument has a great deal of effect on the discussion of slavery.

²⁶ O. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, p. ix, attempts to explain the curious phenomenon of slave owners who value freedom while holding slaves. In pp. 1-14 of his magisterial study, Patterson surveys all the common elements in the institution of slavery across the ages. The essential term he uses is "domination" as by psychological, physical and cultural forces. His idea of domination denotes the relationship of the slave owner with the slave, supported by a societal as well as an individual set of rules. The slaves are as fully integrated into such a system as the owner is. Each party plays its respective role in this structure. The commonalties seen by Patterson are apparent in his first chapter outline. They are power, authority, alienation, social death, honor and degradation (or "shame" in the vocabulary of some anthropological interpreters of the Bible).

at the beginning of this chapter, the relatively few slave revolts in ancient times can be a puzzling phenomenon for the modern mind.

From the above brief discussion of slave scholarship, some very important methodological tendencies surface. When one focuses on ancient and modern slavery, the oppression common to both is clear. However, when one focuses on the differences between the two institutions the advantages of the ancient slaves had over their modern counterparts become evident. This is not to say that the approach of showing the differences between ancient and black slavery plays down the oppressive nature of slavery in general. However, it can lead to a belief that the difference resulted in Greco-Roman slaves being at an advantage, when one views the situations from a modern perspective. Furthermore, whether one takes more of a negative or positive view on ancient slavery depends largely on whether one studies the normal social institution or exceptional individual cases of slavery.²⁸ Apparently, one can find individual cases of exceptionally benevolent masters who treated their slaves beyond the social conventions and institution.

Since slavery is a complex and sometimes puzzling institution, studies of its metaphorical use in Paul must carefully examine which part of this institution is useful and discard the less useful. There is always the danger of making the modern interpretation Paul's conviction.

1.2 Scholarship on First Century Greco-Roman Slave Identity and Paul

There is a huge amount of literature on Christian freedom, especially as a result of the Reformation. Those who study Pauline theology can claim with K. Kertelge, "Gesetz und Evangelium, Gesetz und Glaube an Christus, Gesetz und Freiheit" as being very central concerns of Pauline theology.²⁹ In fact, Kertelge's assertion seems to link the ideas of the gospel, faith and freedom in a closely interconnected picture of Paul's thoughts. Unlike many classical scholars, not many biblical scholars study Pauline freedom in terms of the Greco-Roman *familia*. Before one uses the *familia* background on Paul's writing, there is a need

²⁷ Martin, *Salvation as Slavery*, p. xiii.

²⁸ K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, pp. 19-20, deals with this presupposition from an institutional point of view. As an institution, Bradley suggests that although slavery was oppressive, individual cases of kindness were possible.

²⁹ K. Kertelge, "Gesetz und Freiheit im Galaterbrief," *NTS* 30 (1984), p. 382.

to show the necessity for such a background to a fuller understanding of Paul's thoughts. Three important studies which demonstrate such a need come to mind. First, an interdisciplinary forum headed by H-D. Betz makes a significant contribution to linking the background and theology of Paul more closely. In this forum, based primarily on Romans, H-D. Betz talks about the connection between the political and spiritual concept of freedom.³⁰ Nevertheless, the subject of slavery in connection to freedom is not a major issue in Betz's discussion. From his training as a classical scholar, W. S. Anderson's response to Betz's discussion is intriguing and goes some way towards filling the void on slavery and freedom in Betz's work.³¹ Anderson compares the metaphor of slavery in Romans and Galatians to a drama with its own plot and intrigue. The implication of Anderson's insight is that such a drama was an intricate part of the symbolic universe of Paul and Greco-Roman society. A further response to Betz comes from T. Conley, a professor of rhetoric, who argues from examples ranging from Aristotle and Josephus to Philo to prove the possibility that freedom and slavery were a part of the Greco-Roman *topos*.³² Conley's research shows the normality of using the familial *topos* in Greco-Roman writings. Hence, Paul's practice is not a departure from the literary norm. Within the discussions and insights of Betz's forum, one can gather that the *familia* and slavery are important in exploring Paul's thoughts on freedom, whether one wants to relate theology, Greco-Roman background or classical rhetorical practices with Paul's ideas or not. Betz's discussion demands that the basic premise of using the *familia* in dealing with slavery in Paul be taken seriously.

Second, N. R. Petersen provides yet another method of looking at Paul's convictions on slavery by first formulating a 'narrative world' which in turn becomes an interpretive paradigm for Philemon.³³ He does this by going outside

³⁰ H-D. Betz, *Paul's Concept of Freedom in the Context of Hellenistic Discussions about the Possibility of Human Freedom*.

³¹ Betz, *Paul's Concept*, p. 15. He calls the slave narratives, within Pauline writings, a "divine comedy".

³² Betz, *Paul's Concept*, pp. 19-22.

³³ N. R. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985). Petersen's method gives three steps to "rediscover" Paul in Philemon. First, he reconstructs the historical circumstances of Philemon through a story, which is historical criticism in the form of a narrative. Second, he recreates the underlying social structure of his story by analyzing the social relationship between the "actors" within his story. Third, he relates Paul's theology (or symbolic universe) with the social relationships in Philemon.

Philemon to other Pauline books and then uses the picture to frame Paul's convictions regarding Philemon. As the introduction of the present study indicates, Petersen's method has its drawbacks. His study begs the question of how much of Paul's occasional letters can be used as an interpretive paradigm for one letter. The limitation of Petersen's method is that Paul's thoughts are not restricted to his letters, but belong to part of a greater Greco-Roman society and mentality, within which his letters are written. This is not to say that there is no merit in using Paul's letters as a 'pool of information.' However, can one really limit the paradigm mainly to the Pauline corpus? The occasional function of Paul's letters should surely point to a negative answer.

Third, one of the more recent treatments of Paul's imagery on slavery is D. B. Martin's aforementioned work *Slavery as Salvation*. Martin adopts the sociological model that hypothesizes that Paul is both "the patron of the patronless" and Christ's upwardly mobile slave in 1 Corinthians.³⁴ Some of the primary sources Martin uses are also helpful in studying Galatians and the slave metaphor. Both Martin's work and the present study take seriously the Greco-Roman convention of slavery. Both derive data from Greco-Roman society. There are some differences between Martin's approach and that of this study. First, Martin focuses strongly on Paul's leadership as is appropriate to 1 Cor. 9, whereas this study takes into consideration all of the characters in the drama Paul created in Galatians. Second, Martin's focus is on the ironic power of the slave, whereas this study mostly emphasizes the powerlessness of the slave. Naturally, because of the stated differences here, the selection and usage of data from ancient slavery are also different. The language relating to patronage confirms the *familia* as a major governing force in the Greco-Roman society. Furthermore, I. H. A. Combes gives further insights into the same matter Martin originally

³⁴ Martin, *Salvation as Slavery*, pp. 147, 149, seeks to show Paul's humility to Christ being a reversal of the societal value by turning slavery as a shameful institution into a point of "authority as Christ's agent and spokesperson." Martin's Paul turned shame into honor, thus challenging some of the societal assumptions about honor. C. Frilingos, "'For My Child, Onesimus': Paul and Domestic Power in Philemon," *JBL* 119 (2000) pp. 91-104. Frilingos states that Paul's aim was to assert his own power as a patron of Philemon rather than having Onesimus' welfare in mind. Frilingos' reading is the latest attempt to provide an alternate reading of Philemon, by seeing a dichotomy between the welfare of Philemon and Onesimus.

explored.³⁵ Combes compares the institution of slavery with the metaphorical use of self-slavery in Christian writings. In this comparison, Combes notes many incompatibilities between honor and self-enslavement which leads to the question of whether Paul can see both positive and negative aspects of slavery. Can Paul selectively use these imageries and be inconsistent in his overall picture of slavery? This question is treated differently by Martin and Combes. Martin points to a peculiar dimension in Paul's slave metaphor, while Combes points out the tension of Paul's conviction on the same issue.

As is asserted at the beginning of this chapter, the general social context in which Greco-Roman slavery occurred is the *familia*, whether one looks in Greco-Roman or Pauline literature. Recent works of scholars such as Gardner, Rawson and Weaver have shown that the *familia* was not only a legal but also a social entity.³⁶ From the viewpoint of Roman law, Gardner asserts, "Roman society was made up of *familiae*."³⁷ Whatever implications the structure of Roman society have on Roman studies, it certainly influences Pauline studies. Since scholars in other fields have pointed out this social phenomenon, discussions on Paul's conviction about slavery have moved in the direction of the *familia*, whether scholars choose to use the term *familia* or not. Like Greco-Roman literature and society, the slave in Paul's metaphor moved in the world of the *familia*. Scholars who research the conversion pattern of the early church confirm that it centered around the household or *familia*.³⁸

From the aforementioned world of the *familia*, it is easy to summarize how one must look at slavery from the perspective of the *familia*. The slave always functioned within the *familia*, no matter how alienated he or she felt. Not only was the *familia* an indispensable part of the Greco-Roman world, it also played a

³⁵ *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church* (JSNTSup 156; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

³⁶ Recent monographs such as Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, and collected essays such as B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome* (London: Routledge, 1986), and B. Rawson and P. R. C. Weaver (eds.), *The Family in Italy* all take slavery as a part of the discussion of the Roman family.

³⁷ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 1. See especially W. K. Lacey, "Patria Potestas," pp. 125-130, who takes examples from the Vestal cult.

³⁸ Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*, pp. 49-54; E. A. Judge, "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History," *JRH* 11 (1980), pp. 201-217; W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, pp. 72-73.

major part in the early Christian mission. As the following discussion will show, the conversion and missionary pattern directly affected the importance of the *familia* in the early church. Thus, it is impossible to understand slavery in isolation from its function within the Greco-Roman *familia*. The slave's personal identity and movement within society under the influence of the *familia* need to be considered. In other words, because the *familia* is a common theme within the Greco-Roman and early Christian traditions, which both use metaphorical familial images, studies in ancient slavery would do well to keep within the boundary of the *familia*.

1.3 Scholarship on the Metaphors of Paul: Symbolic Universe, Metaphors and Rhetoric

The discussion thus far leads to a few presuppositions on which this study is based. First, slave scholarship has indicated that slavery is a norm in Roman society, thereby making Paul's metaphorical usage within general convention. Because there are so many differences between slavery in Paul's time and colonial slavery, this study only focuses on the metaphor within Roman society and does not talk about implications for modern slavery. The struggle for power is presupposed in slavery. The system within which the slave struggles is the Roman *familia*. Second, Pauline scholarship on slavery shows that there are areas of tension in Paul's view of slavery. These presuppositions bring out three more issues: symbolic universe, metaphors and rhetoric. The context of slavery within the *familia* points out the symbolic universe within which Paul operated. The imageries of slavery point to the significance of understanding how metaphors work. The tension in Paul's letters concerning slavery points to the importance of rhetoric and its role in analyzing the Pauline letters. After all, using metaphor to persuade is part of rhetoric.

For every *topos* an author uses, there is always a pool of information from which he draws his idea. This study uses the symbolic universe as a pool. There are two different ways to look at the symbolic universe in the context of literary sources. First, there is the symbolic universe behind the text, within which both Paul and his audience moved. Historical criticism reconstructs this world in a fair amount of detail. In the investigative work of reconstruction, one is likely to find out the kind of situation that caused Paul to write. One may choose a number of

ways to reconstruct the background. Some may choose to let the text tell them about the recipients, the writer, and any other characters (e.g. agitators etc.) who were involved with the issues of the text. Others may choose to speculate further from more backgrounds that are external, and decipher ideas to fit the textual situation. Second, in addition to the world behind the text, there is also the narrative world within the text. B. Witherington's *Paul's Narrative Thought World* is an attempt at synthesizing the narrative world behind all of Paul's texts but really is a summary of Paul's thoughts. A more pertinent work is Combes' *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, in which he proposes that culture cannot act as a guide for one's interpretation of the Christian slave metaphor. More specifically, he refers to the problematic metaphor of a Christian being a voluntary slave to God or to Christ. To complicate matters more, U. Eco points out that authors can sometimes create characters as metonyms to certain concepts.³⁹ Such metonyms have sometimes become metaphorical expressions. Another important work which advances the symbolic universe of Paul's metaphor is D. J. Williams' *Paul's Metaphors*.⁴⁰ Although Williams does not invoke vocabulary, such as 'symbolic universe', he no doubt creates the world of Paul based on Paul's metaphors. Williams' work serves as a useful primer for this study or any other study on metaphors in Paul. In looking at metaphors in terms of expressions, they are no longer just singular expressions apart from their contexts, and there are not always clear-cut literal or 'metaphorical' meanings. Metaphors, because of their alleged persuasive power, already became a regular rhetorical convention by Paul's time (Dion. Thrax 77-78). Hence, from the first approach, one can glean a pool of interpretive information to create the boundary for the definition of a specific metaphor. From the second approach, one can learn how metaphors work as a persuasive device within the literary context of the text.

Because metaphors naturally point to meanings beyond themselves, the interpretation of metaphors always sparks debates about methodology.⁴¹

³⁹ U. Eco, *The Role of the Reader* (London: Hutchinson, 1983), p. 68, talks of metonyms which are already codified and are inferential from the very structure of the semantic field.

⁴⁰ D. J. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

⁴¹ J. L. White, *The Apostle of God*, pp. 19-59, produces a useful list of metaphors in Paul but uses them as his basis for Pauline theology.

Methodological debates generally center around the issue of whether metaphors express meanings pragmatically or semantically. D. Davidson labels the whole process of deriving a meaning for any metaphor as ‘cognitive’.⁴² Here the key word is ‘process’ which implies more of a pragmatic approach. The pragmatic approach is more concerned with the ‘use of discourse’ and does not see metaphor as being reducible to a literal paraphrase as a ‘unit of discourse’.⁴³ In countering the simile theory of metaphors (i.e. a metaphor being similar to the object it describes), J. R. Searle poses a question, “How is the hearer supposed to figure them [the semantic fields of metaphor] out?”⁴⁴ Context as an external criterion can easily provide a methodological control for limiting the fields of meaning. Those who define metaphors in terms of similes or comparisons would find some metaphors which act like similes easily explainable.⁴⁵ However, some metaphors do not act like similes and go beyond their comparative functions. For the reader, the various cultural and literary contexts help narrow down the semantic field of a metaphor.⁴⁶ More precisely, cultural context is what S. R. Levin calls the person’s “encyclopedic knowledge” or what G. Lakoff calls the “conceptual system underlying” the person’s language.⁴⁷ In this study, this knowledge is the symbolic universe shared by the speaker/writer and the listener/reader.⁴⁸ Taking the perspective of the listener, Searle’s suggestion seems feasible, but not necessarily as contradictory to the simile theory as he asserts.⁴⁹ “If we can figure out the principles according to which listeners understand metaphorical utterances, we shall be a long way toward understanding how it is possible for speakers to make metaphorical utterances ...”

⁴² Davidson, “What Metaphors Mean” in A. P. Martinich (ed.), *The Philosophy of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 418-426.

⁴³ Kittay, p. 41.

⁴⁴ J. R. Searle, “Metaphor,” p. 100.

⁴⁵ See a psychological defense of the simile theory by G. A. Miller, “Images and models, similes and metaphors” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 357-400.

⁴⁶ For a theorist who includes similes as part of a non-literal comparison, see A. Ortony, “Similarities in similes and metaphors” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, p. 349. Some similes do fit under metaphor without the phrase of comparison.

⁴⁷ S. R. Levin, “Language, concepts and words: Three domains of metaphor” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, p. 116. G. Lakoff, “Contemporary theory of metaphor” in *Metaphor and Thought*, p. 206.

⁴⁸ See J. L. Morgan, “Pragmatics of metaphor” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, p. 131, for the importance of cultural context. See also R. W. Gibbs, Jr., “Process and products in making sense of tropes,” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, p. 253.

⁴⁹ Searle, “Metaphor,” pp. 102-103.

How then does the methodological debate on the meanings of metaphors manifest itself in recent Pauline scholarship? Discussions on how little to how much Paul's symbolic universe gives meanings to Paul's metaphors also tend to be in terms of the struggle between a pragmatic and semantic approach to metaphors. In order to understand the metaphorical use of slavery, it is very important to understand how Paul derived his metaphors. In recent years, a number of studies have examined Paul's own symbolic universe and his narrative world.⁵⁰ Whether one agrees with the anthropological analysis of B. Malina and J. H. Neyrey, their kind of approach brings a new awareness of how important it is to recognize the gulf between the modern and ancient worlds. Paul's symbolic universe shows some words and phrases are categorized differently in his world than the modern western society. This symbolic universe becomes a map with which to navigate the apostle's world.⁵¹ Surprisingly, the *familia* has no prominent place in Neyrey's map of the New Testament symbolic universe. In general, people tend to choose their focus in terms of their own symbolic universe. Scholars such as J. M. G. Barclay, who focus on Paul's 'Judaizing' agitators or else on Paul himself, tend to view the situation from the perspective of the Jewish symbolic universe.⁵² Others, such as S. M. Elliot, derive their symbolic universe from the Greco-Roman world, which is the world of the audience.⁵³ In the light of recent development, the dichotomy is no longer so radical. Instead, there is a balanced combination of both Jewish and gentile

⁵⁰ E.g. F. Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* for slavery.

⁵¹ For instance, Neyrey's *Paul, in Other Words*, pp. 29-30, uses models and 'maps' to synthesize Paul's thought world. Even if one cannot be sure that singular models or maps would do an adequate interpretive job, one can begin creating and being aware of other models and maps within and outside of the world of the Pauline texts. In the case of the present study, there may be some other maps, or models that Paul shows in his text, which are more appropriate than the one Neyrey proposes in his book. His transfer of Mary Douglas' research on witchcraft society into the Gal. 3.1 seems to wrench the text out of the complex world of Greco-Roman magic (pp. 181-206).

⁵² Barclay, "Mirror-reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 31 (1987), pp. 73-93. See also R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Dallas: Word, 1990) and J. A. Fitzmyer, *According to Paul* (New York: Paulist Press, 1993) for Paul's Jewish background. Some allege early Rabbinic tradition, while others take seriously the recent finds at Qumran.

⁵³ For example, Elliot, "Paul and His Gentile Audiences: Mystery-Cult, Anatolian Popular Religiosity, and Paul's Claim of Divine Authority in Galatians," *Listening* (1996), pp. 117-136, chooses to focus on the audience and their non-Christian and non-Jewish religious background. The list of scholars on various Greco-Roman symbolic universe is too numerous to list here.

symbolic universes.⁵⁴ Depending on one's interpretive outlook, every letter contains a degree of each. Approaches which take into consideration the symbolic universe tend to deal with Paul more semantically. Other approaches which focus on the text only in trying to see how Paul used metaphor, would tend to fall into a pragmatic category. This approach takes the minimalist perspective, which makes the text rather than the external background the primary source for defining a metaphor. Combes' *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church* leans towards the pragmatic approach. Since the two poles are not that extreme, the approaches are only tendencies certain hermeneutical solutions seem to express. The present study takes its semantic cue from the symbolic universe of Roman society, while keeping a boundary line through the literary context.

A second type of debate on metaphors address the question of whether metaphors have a literal and then a metaphorical meaning. Generally, the second debate is dependent on whether the authorial intention affects the meaning and what the interpreter means by 'literal' and 'metaphorical'. The answer probably lies somewhere in between these positions. As A. Ortony writes regarding similes and metaphors, "Whether a particular use of language on a particular occasion is literal or non-literal is a question of degree rather than a question of kind."⁵⁵ In other words, 'How literal is the expression?' rather than 'Is it literal or metaphorical?' becomes the question in looking at metaphorical expressions. E. Kittay, in her important work *Metaphor*, uses the same principle to see a relationship between what she calls the 'first-order meaning' and the 'second-order meaning'.⁵⁶ Others use the common labels of 'literal meaning' to describe 'first-order meaning' and 'metaphorical meaning' to describe 'second-order meaning.' Kittay's labels recognize a little of the first in the second. Additionally, Kittay also points out the significance of the time of the utterance

⁵⁴A. E. Harvey, "Forty Strokes Save One: Social Aspects of Judaizing and Apostasy," in A. E. Harvey (ed.) *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study* (London: SPCK, 1985), p. 18, suggests that the Galatians were on the fringes of local synagogues. The involvement gives them an inside look at the Jewish religion before they knew Paul. This hypothesis overturns the absoluteness of a purely gentile symbolic universe.

⁵⁵ Ortony, "Similarity in similes and metaphors" in A. Ortony, (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, p. 350.

⁵⁶ E. Kittay, *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), pp. 40-95.

on the meaning.⁵⁷ In other words, whether one takes a synchronic or diachronic approach can sometimes affect the outcome of whether a word is metaphorical or literal. Some words could have been metaphors as a result of a historical event which actually happened. Therefore, she asks the question, “When does it mean?” as much as “What does it mean?” From the synchronic point of view, the context of the metaphors will give the answer. Her work is a caution against the anachronistic usage of ancient literature for scholars of formative Christianity. Whatever historical period one studies, one must examine whether the cultural symbolic universe can contain a metaphor with its literal meaning. Ultimately, the answer comes from the interpreter’s philosophical predisposition and the author’s rhetorical situation.

How then can the above discussion affect the understanding of slavery and Paul? If one can imagine Paul’s conviction on slavery being his ‘literal’ understanding towards the institution of slavery, then, Paul’s metaphorical usage becomes the ‘less literal’ understanding. Framing the issues in this way, there may be some kind of relationship between Paul’s conviction and metaphor on slavery. In most studies on slavery in Paul, Paul’s metaphors and convictions are kept entirely separate. Garnsey concludes in his study that there is surprisingly little intersection between the two broad usages.⁵⁸ Studies on Philemon and Onesimus or 1 Cor. 7.21 tend to deal with Paul’s conviction and the literal institution of slavery. For instance, N. R. Petersen and, more recently, J. A. Harrill tend to focus on the convictions of Paul on the slave issue.⁵⁹ Studies on how masters treated slaves in formative Christianity are closely connected to

⁵⁷ Kittay., p. 21.

⁵⁸ Garnsey, “Sons, Slaves — and Christians,” p. 120, makes this helpful distinction and rightly points out that the two “intersected surprisingly little”.

⁵⁹ This is not to discount the commands also found in Eph. 6.5-9 and Col. 3.22-25. Typical of studies of Philemon’s background would be J. D. M. Derrett, “The Function of the Epistle to Philemon,” *ZNW* 79 (1988), pp. 63-91. He explores the place of Paul, Onesimus, Philemon in the society. Each according to his background. Petersen’s study is already mentioned. He uses the narrative world of Paul to deal with the problem of slavery as a reality but not necessarily as the metaphorical use of a story. See also J. M. G. Barclay, “Paul, Philemon and Christian Slave-Ownership,” *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 161-186; F. Hahn, “Paulus und der Sklave Onesimus: Ein beachtenswerter Kommentar zum Philemonbrief,” *EvT* 37 (1977), pp. 179-185 and B. M. Rapske, “The Prisoner Paul in the Eyes of Onesimus,” *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 187-203. See more recently J. A. Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1995) on a detailed discussion of 1 Cor. 7.21 and Ignatius’ *Ad Polycarp* 4.3.

Paul's convictions as well.⁶⁰ When one stays outside texts in which slavery is the main issue, such as Galatians, one can see that Paul expressed his feelings on slavery metaphorically in such texts. In other words, scholarship on Paul and slavery tend to go in two directions. On the one hand, studies on Philemon and related issues focus on Paul's own conviction on Christian brothers and sisters who were slaves. On the other hand, studies on Pauline analogies and metaphors of slavery deal with how Paul used slavery as a metaphor to depict other theological truths. The present study falls into the latter category but will also take up the implication on the degree Paul's metaphor and convictions are related.

From the above brief survey, it is apparent that many agree with the idea that every society, including Paul's, has its own symbolic universe with its own rules. Within the symbolic universe, there are also many common concepts. For interpreters to consider a concept as belonging to the ancient world, they must first see how common the concept is. If it is not common, a concept might not have very much metaphorical effect in its rhetorical use. The first criterion in determining whether the concept is in a symbolic universe is commonality. For a concept to become common, its manifestation must be widespread and it must penetrate all levels of society. It must exist in both the literature and the social reality from which Paul told the story of slavery. In Paul's letters and tradition, as well as Jesus' parables, the ethical instruction often involved the slave's role within the *familia*. From the discussion in the previous sections, the common theme in the *Haustafeln* demonstrates that Paul knew something about slavery.⁶¹ W. G. Rollins, in his study on the metaphor of slavery in Rom. 8, shows how writers used servile imageries to communicate their ideas on non-servile subjects (Cic. *Phil.* 8.11.32; *CIL* 11.37).⁶² Therefore, the commonality of slavery in

⁶⁰ Opinions vary from those who think that Christianity was propagated exclusively among the lower class to those who regarded conversion as a phenomenon that filters down from the upper to the lower class. Even if individual cases exist of contact between Christians and slaves for the purpose of conversion, the missionary contacts tended to convert households or influential people, just because the societal structure of the *familia* catered to that type of demographic in conversion. See the brief discussion on these issues by R. Stark, *The Rise of Christianity* (San Francisco: Harper, 1997), pp. 29-30.

⁶¹ Little wonder too is the fact that the slave owning *paterfamilias* plays a role in a study like M. Gielen, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik* (Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1990), pp. 146-157.

⁶² W. G. Rollins, "Greco-Roman Slavery Terminology and the Pauline Metaphors for Salvation," pp. 102-103. Eco, *The Role of the Reader*, p. 68, classifies these as being codified metonyms, which ultimately points to one archetypal human behavior and state of existence. Metaphor means

Roman life, the Pauline tradition and early Christian teachings confirms the possibility of slavery as being indispensable in reconstructing a part of the ancient narrative world, especially in some of Paul's letters.⁶³ In the case of metaphors getting their meaning from a semantic field, Paul's symbolic universe provides the data for such definitions. While the semantic field gives a broad and 'first-order' meaning to Paul's metaphors, the text itself provides the pragmatic understanding of Paul's choice of metaphor. The text thus becomes the controlling device for any definition of any metaphor.

Apart from looking at the metaphors of Paul's world, Paul's usage of metaphors requires some kind of rhetorical analysis. The result of such an analysis should give an idea of why Paul wrote his message in a certain manner. Consequently, different types of rhetorical approaches have become popular among recent interpreters. Many like to use ancient rhetorical handbooks, while others venture into the more modern categories. In the case of Galatians, H-D Betz is a forerunner in popularizing the literary letter as a model for Pauline letters. Without rehashing the arguments on his structure and form of Galatians, it suffices to say that Betz's commentary stirred up many interesting discussions. Betz's work on Galatians is based on a structure that is similar to the apologetic speech found in ancient handbooks. He found sufficient parallels in the rhetorical devices, as in the ancient handbooks. In every section of Galatians, Betz found some parallel in a similar section in an ancient apologetic speech. At first glance, Betz's mountain of evidence is very impressive. However, upon closer scrutiny, there are also many different features in Galatians that do not fit well within Betz's proposed structure. Because of the legal context for which the original

"a figure of comparison shortened to one word." (Cic. *Orat.* 3.38.157). M. McCall, *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison*, pp. 110, 185, 229. Quintilian also coupled metaphor with comparison in *Inst.* 4.1.70. Apparently, there was a Greco-Roman rhetorical convention of considering metaphor as some kind of comparison. *Translatio*, the word for metaphor, is a trope, according to Quintilian, which fits neatly under the umbrella of *similitudo*, which includes both short and long forms of comparatives (*Inst.* 8 chapter 6). Metaphor is the shortest form of comparative, while *similitudo* includes some introductory words (*Inst.* 8.6.8-9).

⁶³ Along with slavery, manumission was similarly common in the Roman Empire. In fact, it was so common that K. Hopkins wrote a chapter in his book called "Why did the Roman free so many slaves?". No book on Greco-Roman slavery is complete without mentioning the institution of manumission. Paul's analogies are no exception. See K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, p. 115. He discusses ancient sources of many cases of mass manumission (*App. B Civ.* 1.100-104; *Dio* 55.26; *Gaius Inst.* 1.42-43). The answer to the question raised in Hopkins' chapter is in the next chapter under the discussion of manumission.

handbook was intended, the difficulty of classifying Paul's letter as one specie or another, based on the ancient handbook, becomes more apparent. As can be seen in many subsequent efforts to classify Pauline letters based on rhetorical handbooks, it is difficult to classify Paul's letters as one specie since some features of other species of ancient speech surface.⁶⁴ However, such difficulties have not deterred scholars from attempting his classification. Since they see the difficulties of Betz's findings but do not want to abandon Betz's approach, scholars have gone in different directions when classifying the rhetorical species of Galatians, based on various rhetorical handbooks. Some find rhetoric in Jewish *topos* as well.⁶⁵ Due to the confusing nature of the whole discussion, every reason for every solution seems to have some legitimacy, which is an indication that the whole approach has reached an impasse. For example, V. M. Smiles wants to add the necessary nuances needed for rhetorical classification and says, "In this study I will take Galatians 1-2 as in part, Paul's *defense* of his apostolate and gospel against claims and accusations of his opponents, through it will be important to recognize that the apostle is by no means merely on the defensive."⁶⁶ Similarly, R. M. Berchman's study, in which he shows that Paul could have flexibly used several species of rhetoric at once within one short verse, has surely shown the desperate state of classical rhetorical analysis.⁶⁷ One

⁶⁴ Betz, *Galatians*, p. 15. F. Vouga, "La construction de l'histoire en Galates 3-4," *ZNW* 75 (1984), pp. 259-269 and "Zur rheorischen Gattung des Galaterbriefes," *ZNW* 79 (1988), pp. 291-292. Vouga makes some bold attempts at finding a Greco-Roman parallel in Demosthenes. B. Witherington, *Grace in Galatia* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 27, 35, in substantial agreement with Betz, postulates a deliberative rhetorical specie. All such efforts seem to miss the point that none of the Pauline letters exist within the social context of the rhetorical handbooks. Nor are Paul's letters intended for the same purpose as the practice of the classical rhetoric. The trouble is that all such classifications have some merits but none seem to fit perfectly. This should already give an indication that this direction of reading is unsatisfactory. Witherington for one, would conveniently label anything that does not fit into the rhetorical outline of the handbooks as 'excursus,' thus bypassing the difficulty of coming up with a neat solution (pp. 34-35).

⁶⁵ E.g. R. G. Hall, "Arguing Like an Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient *Topos* Outside the Greco-Roman Rhetorical Tradition," *NTS* 42 (1996), pp. 434-453.

⁶⁶ V. M. Smiles, *The Gospel and the Law in Galatia* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), p. 14. Emphasis Smiles'.

⁶⁷ R. M. Berchman, "Galatians (1.1-5): Paul and Greco-Roman Rhetoric," in J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (eds.), *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism Volume Three: Judaic and Christian Interpretation of Texts* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1987), pp. 1-15. J. Fairweather, "The Epistle to the Galatians and Classical Rhetoric," *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 (1994) p. 220, tries to categorize Galatians but is unable to find an exact match for Paul's structural layout. J. Smit, "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech," *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 1-26, seems equally untenable as he tries to answer Betz's findings. R. G. Hall, "Arguing Like an Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient *Topos* Outside the Greco-Roman Rhetorical Tradition," *NTS* 42 (1996), pp. 434-453, finds rhetoric in the apocalyptic tradition of Enoch. Though the bold suggestion

obvious problem which arises out of this state of confusion is that the ancient speeches were not set in a religious context. Nor were these speeches personal letters. Therefore, it should be no surprise to find that Paul simply does not fit. How then, can one explain the figures which often crop up in Paul's letters and also have parallels in ancient handbooks? One can only see these figures as being common enough in general rhetorical convention to appear both in the legal context of the handbooks as well as in the non-legal context of the church.

If considering the situation of Paul's rhetoric, one should look at the advantages and limitations of rhetorical analysis. Those who seek to look at Paul as they would at any Greco-Roman rhetoric can easily try to fit Paul into certain species of letter writing. In doing so, these interpreters may ignore the differences between the historical situation of Paul and his contemporaries. Just because parts of Paul resembled bits and pieces of classical rhetoric, one cannot automatically make everything fit inside the classical prescription. Furthermore, scholars often have to ignore the genre differences between Paul and Roman rhetorical works, in order to accomplish their task. In the light of the current confusion, J. T. Reed uses the term 'functional similarities' to describe the similarities between Paul and the classical tradition, thus avoiding any rigid adherence to classical rhetorical handbooks.⁶⁸

1.4. Conclusion

The issues discussed so far fit this study on Galatians in two ways. First, there is the intertextual relationship between Paul's writings and the ancient world. This is not to say that Paul had read all of the relevant material on slavery before penning any of his metaphors on slavery. Because of the societal influence on the events and ideas contained in the ancient texts, the recipients' culture is also found in Paul's text. Second and closely related to the first point, there is the contact between Paul and his surrounding culture. Since Paul was a competent observer of his slave-holding society, it is easy to see how he could borrow from the imagery of slavery. By using primary sources from the Greco-Roman world,

seems farfetched, one can easily see how certain of Paul's topics and literary format did not fit the Greco-Roman convention. Then again, neither did Paul fit neatly into the apocalyptic tradition that Hall proposes.

this study notes where the ideas of Paul and his society intersected and how they interacted. Furthermore, the symbolic universe from the primary sources provides a foundation for Paul's ideas. In approaching Paul's writing through the rhetorical use of metaphor, this study uses fully both the intertextual and intercultural aspects of the metaphor of slavery in Galatians. In his dialogue with Betz's work, W. S. Anderson's conclusion is worth noting. He asserts that, "Paul's manipulation of familiar Hellenistic symbols of popular philosophy, religion, and literature, in this case the paradoxes of slavery and freedom in a world that knew only too well the harsh reality of slavery, illustrates the complex background within which he wrote and understood his experiences."⁶⁹

In addition to the social issues, there is also the issue of the way rhetorical analysis works when it comes to Pauline metaphors on slavery. According to recent criticism of Betz and anyone who follows the classical rhetorical analysis, it is better to use descriptive categories that are not limited to classical rhetoric. It is also appropriate not to limit Galatians to the species of classical rhetoric. By looking at Paul in more general and broad strokes, there is less of a tendency to restrict Paul within the legal framework of the ancient courtroom. In other words, many have concluded that the way to look at Paul's rhetoric is not to fit him inside a classical category, but to recognize Paul's flexible usage for his rhetorical purpose. Therefore, the more descriptive rhetorical analyses seem to yield more benefits. The present study chooses to use recent discussions on metaphors in New Rhetoric to examine the characteristics of Paul's imageries. Such an approach may allow a little more freedom to describe the flow of Galatians, from the perspective of the slave metaphor.

This chapter draws three simple conclusions regarding the theoretical basis for studying the metaphor of slavery in Galatians. First, the kind of slavery with which Paul was familiar was urban. Paul was brought up and educated in a city. His mission was centered around urban areas.⁷⁰ Paul's ministerial activities,

⁶⁸ J. T. Reed, "Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre" in S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht (eds.), *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (JSNTSup., 90; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), p. 322.

⁶⁹ See Anderson's full comment in Betz, *Paul's Concept of Freedom*, p. 15.

⁷⁰ Such a presupposition comes partly out of the Southern Galatian theory which is an issue already mentioned in the introductory chapter. Paul's accounts in his letters do not indicate any other setting other than an urban setting. If one were to take Acts with even a degree of accuracy,

according to his letters and early church traditions in Acts, were primarily along Roman roads (Rom. 16.5; 1 Cor. 16.19; Acts 16.14; 18.1-3, 19-21, etc.).⁷¹ His travel took him through two major routes of Via Egnatia and the Royal Road. These roads made up the spine of Roman urbanization.⁷² Furthermore, the same roads were used to connect trade and military routes, thus creating various important financial and military centers.⁷³ Having traveled these trade routes, Paul could not help but be familiar with the urban slave trade. Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that the slavery with which Paul or his audience was most immediately familiar was the urban, and not the rural, variety. Although the ancient sources had much of a rural flavor to them, the owners of large properties were often involved in city life. Many writers were educated in an urban center such as Rome.⁷⁴ A great number of them pursued the political life in the Capital.⁷⁵ Second, based on Greco-Roman society and conversion patterns of the

Paul's ministry context was most certainly urban. Although the absence of rural account does not exclude the possibility of some kind of rural ministry, one can say with certainty that Paul's ministry was *primarily* urban. Whether Paul was educated in Tarsus or Jerusalem, both cities were also urban centers.

⁷¹ Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, pp. 17-23; R. Chevallier, *Roman Roads* (London: Batsford, 1976), pp. 140-141, has a detailed study of these Roman roads. In matching the roads with Paul's travel from either his letters or Acts, the conversion strategy Paul adopted becomes apparent. Sim. A. J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), pp. 63-64. There is an additional factor of Paul maintaining an urban and mobile network of co-workers throughout these important geographical points. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*, p. 42, proposes that there was no report of conversion in early churches of the rural slaves. This observation is probably correct and should indicate Paul's model as being about the urban *familia* with urban slaves.

⁷² Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, pp. 15-16, shows the homogeneity of language within the urban context, which was conducive to Paul's language skills. This is not to say that it is impossible that Paul spoke some of the local dialects in the villages but there is no evidence of Paul pursuing a rural missionary strategy. Given the multi-ethnic nature of the Roman Empire, it would be extremely difficult and unprofitable for Paul to pursue a primarily rural mission. See N. H. H. Sitwell, *The Roman Roads of Europe* (London: Cassell, 1981), pp. 194-195, for the dense development of towns along the South Galatia portion of Asia Minor. See also pp. 196-200 for a discussion on the whole province of Galatia.

⁷³ For the historical development of the routes Paul traveled, see the discussion in V. W. von Hagen, *The Roads that Lead to Rome* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1967), pp. 130-148. See also L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), R. Chevallier, *Roman Roads*, and N. H. H. Sitwell., *The Roman Roads of Europe*.

⁷⁴ Both the older and younger Senecas come to mind.

⁷⁵ The younger Seneca comes to mind again as he was a close friend of Nero for a time. Livy spent enough time in Rome to be close personal friends with both Augustus and Claudius. Polybius was quite widely traveled and was involved politically in many cities like Corinth, Sardis, and of course Rome. Petronius was possibly part of Nero's court. The famous orator and prolific writer Cicero was widely traveled as well and was involved with Rome to a great degree in his public career. These are just a few sources the present study will employ. All of these writers exhibit a very urban and cosmopolitan mindset.

early Christians, the interpreter must examine the servile metaphor within the boundary lines of the urban *familia*. Furthermore, many parts of Galatians make explicit use of the urban *familia*.⁷⁶ Third, if one analyzes the slave metaphor of Galatians by looking at the rhetorical effects, one can also see how Paul persuaded his audience.

⁷⁶ In a discussion with Dr. Tod Klutz, he suggests that the picture of urban slavery fits the Southern Galatian social context much better.

Chapter Two

IDENTITY SHIFTS OF THE SLAVE IN THE PROCESS OF GRECO- ROMAN SLAVERY:

FROM BONDAGE TO FREEDOM AND OBLIGATIONS- THE SYMBOLIC UNIVERSE OF PAUL'S SOCIETY ON SLAVERY

2.1 Greco-Roman Slavery

2.1.1 The Sources of Slave Acquisition

The sources from which the Romans acquired their slaves were very different from those of their Greek predecessors.¹ This fact became even more apparent by the Principate, which was the time of Paul's ministry. As the Greeks conquered, they enslaved mostly those who were non-Greek. The ethnic difference automatically established the slaves as outsiders. Only in the Roman Republic did such a similar situation exist. Throughout the history of Rome, the Romans acquired their slaves from different sources. Before the Imperial period, Rome was an ever-expanding Republic, which drew its labor force from the conquered people.² War was the one major source of slavery before the time of Paul.³ The rise and fall of slave labor seems proportionate to the expansion of the Roman Republic. K. Hopkins rightly states that, "Mass slavery in Roman Italy was a product of conquest. In just over two hundred years, the Romans conquered the whole of the Mediterranean basin."⁴ In this sense, the Roman proverb, "All slaves are enemies" reflects not only a social reality, but also has a political origin.⁵ With its enormous army, the Roman Republican army removed massive populations, some of which became a substantial labor force.⁶ Writers like Livy

¹ R. Jewett, *Paul the Apostle to America*, pp. 61-62, effectively sums up the difference between Roman and colonial slavery. This difference shows why it is essential to discuss slave acquisition for this study. The issues that cause the difference between Roman and colonial slavery, arise from the means of acquisition and legal status of slaves. Though the colonial slave trade acquired slaves through some of the five sources Jewett mentions, these were not the major sources of slave acquisition.

² This is recorded in Horace *Ep.* 1.16.69 and in a much later *Digest* 1.5.5.1 by Justinian, among numerous other sources. See also Dio Cass. 54.7.6; 54.34.7;

³ For a list of various ethnic groups and geographical origins, see R. H. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, pp. 17-19.

⁴ K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, p. 102.

⁵ See Macrobius' *Sat.* 1.11.13 for this proverb, which probably communicates distrust originally.

⁶ See K. Bradley, "On the Roman Slave Supply and Slavebreeding," p. 45, for a list of writers who discussed slavery including Diodorus, Polybius and Livy. K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, pp. 1-47, is an excellent discussion on the social effects the early conquests had on the Roman economy.

or the earlier Polybius recorded the presence of slave traders who traveled with the military in order to become the mediator between the military and the slave trade (Polybius 14.7.3; Livy 10.17.6).⁷ However, there are some factors which exclude war as a primary source of slave labor in Paul's days.⁸ Internationally, the strength and stability of the Principate military eliminated the necessity for further conquest, thus reducing the slave labor gained from warfare. Nationally, Roman military policing led to the extinction of piracy and brigandage, both of which were major sources of slavery in the former era. However, this labor force was already an essential element of society. So an alternative source had to be identified.⁹

By the time of the *Pax Romana*, the Romans were dealing differently with their subjects. The increasing complexity of Roman law points to this subtle social change. In contrast to the Greeks, the Romans were always more generous in giving citizenship to a large population (Plin. *Ep.* 7.32). As a result of this political move to grant citizenship to non-Romans with Roman loyalty, the Romans could no longer make the ethnic distinction characteristic of Greek slavery. There was an equal chance of enslavement between Romans and non-Romans. A Roman could no longer treat the non-Roman as the 'other' as the Greeks conveniently did. Enslavement of aliens became a subject for the history books, rather than a current practice in Paul's world. However, the population of slaves did not decrease. From the sepulchral evidence in the Imperial period, it is clear that picking up abandoned babies and slave breeding became an important alternative after the cessation of large-scale military operations.¹⁰ As a result of

⁷ See also Cicero *Att.* 89.7.

⁸ Williams, *Paul's Metaphors*, p. 117, notes hints of war captives being slaves in Paul's metaphors but it is uncertain whether the context demands this interpretation in Paul's times. It is not impossible that Paul would have known of the history in which slavery was part of war, just because war was not a regular event in his time.

⁹ P. Garnsey and R. Saller, *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture* (London: Duckworth, 1987), p. 71. The evidence for the cost of slaves is still scanty. See K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, pp. 110ff, who boldly asserts the financial burden of owning slaves. The evidence can go either way.

¹⁰ Garnsey and Saller, pp. 72, 138, show that abandonment was not certain death for a baby in the ancient world because of the assumption of the slavery process. See R. Saller, "Slavery and the Roman Family," in *Classical Slavery*, pp. 70-71. See also K. Bradley, "On the Roman Slave Supply and Slavebreeding," pp. 44, 48. Breeding actually gained some enslaved mothers freedom (Col. *Rust.* 1.8.5, 19). So important was the issue that Pliny the Younger wanted to find out the status of such children if they were free born (*Ep.* 10.65-66). Such an issue possibly affected the province, which Pliny governed.

the economic hardship some families suffered and the preference for male over female children some other families advocated, abandoned babies became a popular source for slaves. Apart from the obvious first generation enslavement pattern from abandoned babies, the issues of slave breeding became even more complicated for the Roman lawmakers. The situation babies were born into directly affected their status. For instance, in a second-century CE tradition of Gaius the law teacher, the law considered babies born to a slave mother as slaves.¹¹ According to this law, the status of the father was irrelevant unless the mother happened to be receiving manumission during her pregnancy from a legal marriage to a free man. Laws stipulating the status of babies were necessary because slaves could also obtain citizenship by means of a marriage with a Roman citizen (Ulpian 3.3). If the slave woman gained freedom prior to the birth of her child, the child was born free because she gained her freedom prior to giving birth. Otherwise, if the baby was born before she gained her freedom, the child was still under slavery, even if the father was a free man. As O. Patterson states so succinctly about the status of freedom as an inheritance, “patrilineal for the free, matrilineal for the slave.”¹²

With the knowledge of the sources of slavery within the period of Paul’s ministry, one can easily reconstruct the personal identity of the slaves in terms of their experience of enslavement. The slave metaphors Paul used for Galatians were probably inspired by household slaves who were born into slavery through abandonment or breeding. Whether Jew or gentile, the human being was born

¹¹ Buckland, p. 398. This is precisely what causes the marriage of a free woman to a slave man to be so repugnant (Tac. *Ann.* 12.12.53). The third-century legal expert, Julius Paulus, confirmed such a sentiment of shame in earlier times (2.20.16-18). Such a woman of shame has not only placed herself in an inferior status, but also gave her offspring a bleak future. By her action, she dishonored her lineage by letting the father’s servile status be passed onto the children. According to records of Paulus and Justinian on the *senatusconsultum Claudianum*, a daughter under the *patria potestas* cohabiting with a slave would become a slave upon her father’s death, probably because her father’s *patria potestas* no longer protected her status (Paulus 2.20.18; Just. *Inst.* 3.12). Such a marriage became illegal because it endangered the freedom of the free population.

¹² Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, p. 139. See also Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 9-11, who discusses the law of servile status being passed through the enslaved women in mixed marriages. P. R. C. Weaver, “The Status of Children in Mixed Marriages,” in *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 148ff, gives some modifications to this trend of lineage. One further example of matrilineal connection is the taking of the mother’s *nomen* and status by the illegitimate children. By illegitimate, the Romans meant those who did not marry according to the law. Such ‘illegal’ marriages made the children ‘bastards’. The laws cut off the children’s lineage from the biological father (Just. *Inst.* 1.10.13). See B. Rawson, “Adult-Child Relationships in Roman

into bondage (Gal. 4.3, 8). Otherwise, there was no need for Christ to redeem those under the same bondage as he was (Gal. 4.4-5). Many Galatian servile imageries also fit the household better than other kinds of slavery, as subsequent discussions in this study indicate. People born in slavery knew of freedom only from second-hand sources, having never experienced freedom themselves. They were in as much a state of ignorance as they were of bondage. The only identity they had was with their mothers, unless the owners manumitted their mothers for breeding them. In such a case, the slaves themselves would rely only on their owners and, possibly, on their equally enslaved wet nurse. The social location of such slaves was on the outside edge of the *familia*. Although they were legally part of the *familia*, they were participants in a servile role only. Neither inheritance nor benefits were possible. The best way to describe their position was that they were legally and professionally obligated to the *familia* but were socially and financially alienated from it.

2.1.2 The Treatment of Slaves

In order to understand how people treated their slaves, it is important to understand first their general attitude towards labor and slaves. Scholars often notice the way Greco-Roman society maintained its servile institution. This is to view slavery from the broadest or most general perspective. Slavery was an intricate and indispensable part of the Greco-Roman society. One needs only to turn to the battery of research on how labor and economy relate to one another to understand the importance of slave labor in Greco-Roman society. Because slave labor was an indispensable part of Greco-Roman life, society created official and unofficial rules governing this institution just like other social institutions. Society itself allowed certain autonomy for some of the slaves, while asserting a brutal control over others who did not abide by its rules. In other words, the strength of Roman policing, or military, gave political sanction for the safety of slave owners (Cic. *Off.* 2.73). After all, the economy and the individual politicians depended on a productive work force that provided labor beyond the narrow confine of the cotton fields of colonial slavery.

Although many slaves were highly skilled and educated, society did not

Society” in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), p. 26.

accord them the freedom to utilize their skills. As many studies show, slaves provided services in the areas that modern people would consider 'white collar'.¹³ For instance, medical practice by slaves dated as far back as the sixth century BCE.¹⁴ The Roman laws even allowed slaves to act as business agents for their masters, to a limited degree.¹⁵ However, skills were not equal to personal and legal freedom. Not only did Roman culture and subculture approve of slavery, the Government provided the political force behind such oppression. The sophistication of Roman slave laws, in content and enforcement, is hardly in doubt. The outsider who was a slave also became a part of this structure, thus perpetuating the phenomenon. Slavery, then, is a cultural construct, reinforced by an increase in the slave population. Under military rule, citizens owned slaves not so much as individual owners but as part of a societal fraternity, which approved of and encouraged such practice.¹⁶ As Z. Yavetz wrote, "Slavery was so natural that the idea of a slaveless world was inconceivable."¹⁷ The best

¹³ A. D. Booth, "The Schooling of Slaves in First-Century Rome," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109 (1979), pp. 11-19. C. A. Forbes, "The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 86 (1955), pp. 321-360. Buckland, p. 7, includes conducting business, medical service, teacher of children, and actor. See Aulus Gellius *NA* 2.18 for the amount of education slaves could have had. Thus, skills did not necessarily determine social status. Rather, the increase in skills drove up the price of a slave. In fact, the true upper class people could rely on the skills of their servants. A. Watson, *Roman Slave Law* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 3, lists works such as general manager, doctor, and craftsman for slaves. The only kind of respectable profession was not to have any profession at all (Cic. *Off.* 1.151). M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, pp. 106-107. Respectable and skilled profession was only for those who fit that middle status. One can consider also the legendary Phaedrus who edited Aesop's Fables. In his prologue to book 3, he not only showed himself to have been a well-educated slave who was transplanted, but he also stated that he had added to Aesop's work his own servile experience (3 prologue line 34). Many skills valued by the Greeks and the modern world would not have ranked highly on the Roman scale. Work such as sculpting and painting were beneath the dignified Roman (Val. Max. 8.14.6; Sen. *Ep.* 88.18; Plin. *NH* 29.17). See R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 115.

¹⁴ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, p. 106. As D. B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation*, p. 11, says, "In the Greco-Roman world, slaves could be found in almost any job that would be occupied by a free person." The emphasis on 'almost' is probably needed. Martin goes on to name numerous jobs in pp. 11-15, with an emphasis on managerial jobs.

¹⁵ Examples of slave's involvement in business for their masters abound. A. Kirschenbaum, *Sons, Slaves and Freedmen in Roman Commerce* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1987), devotes a whole study on just this aspect.

¹⁶ This issue is important, and the latter section on Paul's metaphors will take up the matter further. The corporate personality is nowhere more apparent than in the institution of slavery, both from the perspective of the owners and slaves.

¹⁷ Z. Yavetz, *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Rome* (London: Transaction Publishers, 1991), p. 156. See S. Bartchy, *ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΧΡΗΣΑΙ: First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of First Corinthians 7.21* (SBLDS, 11; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 183. Bartchy either labels Paul a social conservative or a social realist. However, this is assuming that Paul was aware of the possibility of abolition in the modern sense. See J. A. Harrill, "Paul and Slavery: The Problem of

example comes from Trimalchio, the comical protagonist in Petronius' *Satyricon*, a freedman slave-owner, who does not denounce the abuses inflicted upon him as a slave, which speaks much of the deeply entrenched attitude towards slavery.¹⁸ On the contrary, he who was the former slave now manipulates his slaves in exactly the same way his former owner did. Slavery was a vital part of Greco-Roman life because examples like Trimalchio were not unusual.¹⁹ Even though Christianity and other philosophical schools have attempted to give spiritual freedom to those under slavery, there is little or no evidence of these ideological voices advocating societal abolition. Such was the degree to which slavery affected the Greco-Roman world. All members of society were participants within the servile institution.

As most of this study indicates, what literary evidence available is from an aristocratic perspective. Since all aristocrats owned slaves, it is safe to assume that this lofty perspective also penetrated many parts of society. Because of the influence of the Protestant work ethic, the West tends to have a positive attitude

1 Corinthians 7:21," *Biblical Research* 39 (1994), pp. 5-8, for a critique. See J. A. Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1995) for a social-historical formulation that avoids some of these 'modern' labels. See also J. M. G. Barclay, "Paul, Philemon and Christian Slave-Ownership," *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 177-179, for the curious fact that the only two groups which advocated abolition of slavery in antiquity were isolated in the desert. This fact alerts the interpreter that slavery was "everywhere" in Paul's social setting. Barclay also points out the domino effect the manumission of Onesimus might have had on Philemon and the church in his house, if the reason for manumission was religious. Even with manumission being a viable option, to do away with the whole servile institution was impossible and inconceivable. For Paul, there was hardly any difference between household and church context, as the early church combined the two. Such a "revolution" may be a modern interpretation and application of verses such as Gal. 3.28 but was surely not in Paul's mind. N. Elliott, *Liberating Paul* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), p. 31-54, uses the label "social conservatism" to describe certain interpretations of Pauline scholars. His concern may be real and important. To assume that Paul was trying to conserve some tradition is to say that there was a concrete movement seeking to undermine that tradition. This is surely a wrong-headed orientation to slavery, whether one is socially conservative or liberal. Paul intended neither to conserve anything nor to defend against the opponents of slavery, in those places where he was dealing with the servile convention. The label of conservatism is anachronistic at best and reflects more the modern than the Pauline concerns. Just because the socially conservative sometimes use Paul to justify certain conventions, it does not mean that Paul himself fitted such a modern label comfortably.

¹⁸ Even novels such as *Satyricon*, which is without all of the legal quips, the reader/audience could probably relate to this seemingly bizarre and exaggerated world. Whether this makes *Satyricon* a good source is not based on whether it was a "realistisches Sittengemalde der fruhen Kaiserzeit". See H. Petersmann, "Umwelt Sprachsituation und Stilschichten in Petrons 'Satyrica'," *ANRW* 2.32.3 (1985), pp. 1688-1690, who certainly argues for this realistic portrait. Whatever was its influence, the genre of drama lends itself to having a popular audience. See J. P. Sullivan, "Petronius' '*Satyricon*' and its Neronian Context," *ANRW* 2.32.3 (1985), pp. 1666-1686, for argument on whether there was also moral influence of this play on the populace.

¹⁹ Compare Pliny the Younger *Ep.* 3.14.

towards work in general. In addition, within Paul's Jewish circle, the skill to do a certain amount of work was actually a virtue. However, the Romans had the opposite outlook on work. For example, Cicero's moralistic and practical treatise *de Officiis* categorizes different kinds of work. Jobs such as tax-collection, manual labor, or trading on a small scale were all unbecoming to any respectable citizen (*Off.* 1.150).²⁰ Even small trading was left to the slaves or servants (Matt. 25. 14-30; Luke 19.12-27). In earlier Roman law, around 218 BCE, the *lex Claudia de senatoribus* discouraged aristocrats from maritime trading by imposing many restrictions.²¹ Instead of personal involvement, those of Cicero's rank would prefer hiring and managing manual labor to make productive use of their land (*Off.* 151; Matt. 21.33-40). Slaves became the middlemen in large parts of business enterprises. More favorable were the tasks requiring 'brains' or 'contributing' to society (*Off.* 1.151). By citing Terence, Cicero indicated that this line of thinking was within the Greco-Roman tradition (*Off.* 1.150). Apart from giving 'labor' an inferior status in their society, the Romans generally viewed slaves with disdain. Slaves were enemies who could upset society. Gaius Cassius' speech to defend the mass execution of innocent slaves implicated in the murder of the master confirmed Roman fear of slave power (*Tac. Ann.* 14.42-45).²² Slaves as a corporate entity, were not to be trusted and had to be controlled through fear and manipulation (*Plin. Ep.* 3.14.5-6).²³

It is impossible to be exact when dealing with the whole spectrum of how people treated their slaves. Although there is a pool of primary resources to draw from, the available information leaves a lot to speculation. Two premises seem to

²⁰ He describes manual labor as *servitutis*, a form of slavery. One can safely assume that this meant the lowest of the occupational scale. His description of these low jobs is also noteworthy. "*Iam de artificiis et quaestibus, qui liberales habendi, qui sordidi sint, haec fere accepimus.*" (*Off.* 1.150) (Now about trades and other means of occupation, which ones are to be considered becoming to a gentleman, and which ones are vulgar, we have been taught as follows.) The contrast between *liberales* and *sordidi* continues through the passage. *Liberales* could have easily been *patricius* to provide a more direct contrast with *sordidi*. The connotation of the way Cicero went on to discuss the freeborn and his use of *liberalis* indicates that vulgar jobs were reserved ideally for slaves. Any free person, no matter how poor, should ideally avoid those vulgar jobs.

²¹ Kirschenbaum, *Sons, Slaves and Freeman in Roman Commerce*, pp. 31-32n2.

²² Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 137-138. Cassius was dealing with a specific case concerning the *senatus consultum Silanianum* given around 10 CE.

²³ The warning of Pliny the Younger shows that some considered slaves incapable of *iudicio*, sound reason.

govern the basic rule on how slaves were treated.²⁴ First, it depends on how much the owners relied on the slaves. O. Patterson calls this kind of relationship ‘parasitic’, which is not too far from the truth.²⁵ If the owner lacked a certain skill or lacked the ability to fully develop that same skill, then the slave could eventually be the one controlling the task for which he or she was gifted.²⁶ However, skill is not the only relevant issue when looking at the owner’s treatment of the slaves. For example, Columella, the agricultural writer, wrote extensively on how he allowed certain conveniences as an expression of care for his slaves. However, his motive was almost certainly economic. Slavery was an investment. If the slaves were treated with kindness, they would be more efficient because happy slaves were more productive than unhappy ones (*Rust.* 1.8.9; 11.1.21; 12.1.6).²⁷ In other words, kindness towards slaves was not always shown ultimately for the benefit of the slave but for the master.²⁸ Typical of this thinking is work of the younger Seneca on anger. In it, he suggested that one should think twice before punishing a slave with abuse lest one regret any permanent damage to the investment (*De ira* 3.32.1-3).²⁹ In a similar context, before he stated his view on servile investment, he clearly viewed the slave as someone inferior to a normal human being, as he did children and women (*De ira* 3.24.2-3).³⁰ Another economically related issue is the practice of separating slave

²⁴ Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, pp. 177ff, also names race as a factor. However, there is not sufficient evidence to deal with the issue of race because some of the sources quoted were quite sparse. The ethnic issue was probably more Greek than Roman because the Romans freely granted their citizenship to those of other descents.

²⁵ Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, pp. 337-342, especially gives a insightful discussion on how the owner is actually dependent on the slave. See also S. Treggiari, “The Freedmen of Cicero,” *Greece and Rome* 16 (1969), pp. 202ff, on how Cicero treated his more “educated” or “skilled” slaves with much greater respect.

²⁶ Even a foreman was treated better to inspire a sense of loyalty and well-being, thus creating a kind of servile hierarchy (Varro *Rust.* 1.17.5-7).

²⁷ For a description of slaves not cooperating with their masters, see *Rust.* 1.7.6-7 or Cato’s *Ag. Orig.* 2.2; 5.1.

²⁸ If one looks further at the topics he dealt with, there is much more space devoted to plants than slaves. Out of twelve books, he only wrote one book with any kind of focus on slavery. Furthermore, in line with his overall theme on the management of the farm, slaves were only part of the farm ‘property’. Columella was not writing a treatise on how to manage people. Other agricultural writers are Cato and Varro.

²⁹ However, Seneca also advocated humane treatment of slaves in a different treatise without mentioning the investment aspect (*Clem.* 1.18.1-3). Seneca was probably more sensitive to the human quality of slaves than many of his contemporary.

³⁰ However, the slave was also to be treated with benevolence as were free persons (*De vit. beat.* 24.3).

family members.³¹ This was probably most common when the old owner died and the new owner took over the *familia*.³² Slaves were commonly sold, borrowed, inherited and given as gifts, without consideration of their biological family. If one thinks of slaves in economic terms, then it is easy to see how slaves could be treated as commodities.

The second premise that guided the treatment of slaves was the slaves' closeness to the owner.³³ If a slave lived closer to the owner or worked within the immediate proximity of the owner, he or she would adopt much of the owner's culture.³⁴ The geographical advantage would make manumission easier, and vice versa.³⁵ In some cases, certain skills, such as medical practices or writing, were so vital that they became the instruments for developing a close relationship with the owner. In other cases, less skilled labor, such as that of the mine workers, attracted constant physical and mental abuse (Diod. Sic. 5.38.1; 3.12.1-13.3; Lucr. 6.815). However, if the skilled slaves trespassed against their owners, the punishment could be just as severe.³⁶ Perhaps factors like sexual favors also

³¹ K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, p. 53, concludes that selling slaves as whole family units rarely existed, based on the silence in the Egyptian papyri record. There is record on slaves being sold with a part of their families (p. 54). Usually, this kind of sale was composed of a mother and her children. Economically, this makes sense because the mother could also bear more children for the new owner, thus making her valuable.

³² See the exegesis of Bradley, "Roman Slavery and Roman Law," *Historical Reflections* 15 (1988), on Apuleius *Metamorphosis*, p. 490

³³ Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, pp. 174-175. D. J. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*, pp. 42-43, makes the helpful distinction between rural and urban slaves, with the former being geographically more alienated from the owners.

³⁴ K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, p. 103. Buckland, p. 9, talks of the special term *verna* which was a slave born and raised in the owner's household and possibly occupying a more privileged position relationally but not necessarily legally. D. B. Martin uses Landvogt's insight to show that the managerial slave in the household held more power. *Slavery as Salvation*, p. 16. See P. Landvogt, *Epigraphische Untersuchung uber den Oikonomos: Ein Betrag zum hellenistischen Beamtenwesen* (Strasbourg: M. Dumont Schauberg, 1908), pp. 12, 16. What in fact Martin shows is the importance of geographical location in association with power. S. Treggiari, "Domestic Staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian Period," *Social History* 6 (1973), p. 242, counts about twenty three jobs in Trimalchio's household in *Satyricon*. In the imperial household, the number of jobs increase dramatically. With so many people doing so many jobs, the master could not always pay attention to the slaves, even if the slaves were geographically close to the master.

³⁵ Rural slaves seemed to have less personal contact with their masters and were always under the threat of punishment (Matt. 21. 33-41; 25.14-30). Punishment was meted out by the master after a surprised return from his urban dealings. Glancy, "Slaves and Slavery in the Matthean Parables," *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 72-73. However, Paul's metaphors were more urban than rural.

³⁶ K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, pp. 120-137, gives a catalogue of punishments and a whole range of victims of various rulers in Rome. His examples extend from Augustus to Caligula. Buckland, p. 9, demonstrates a linguistic distinction based on training. For instance, there is a natural price difference between a *veterator* (a trained slave) and a *novicius* (an untrained slave). Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 117, 123, presents the failures of the Romans to

played an important role in certain cases.³⁷ If an owner was sexually close to his female slave, the female slave might receive favors in return.³⁸ These kinds of dynamics, and many other possible factors associated with distance, affected the relationship between slaves and owners. In addition to the differences in skills, slaves could use their *peculium* to buy other things. They could even purchase their own personal slave (*vicarii*). However, the control of the *peculium* was still largely the owner's (Gaius *Inst.* 2.86-87; *Dig.* 41.1.10; *Just. Inst.* 2.12).³⁹

There was no bigger advertisement for the wealthy and powerful slave owner than for others to see his slaves owning their own personal slaves. Such purchases, as odd as they may seem, brought honor to the owners in the eye of society. The fact is that such relationships might not have fit the legal statuses of the slaves in reality, but such unofficial transactions probably happened more often than was recorded. A final point is that slaves could be punished in various ways for various reasons. If slaves ran away, even if they returned and renounced of running away, the law still classified them as *fugitivus*, which resulted in punishment.⁴⁰

Apart from the general observation above, no one can discuss slavery without noting exploitation which came in several forms in Paul's time, as a major treatment of slaves. First, there was direct physical exploitation such as prostitution, torture or sexual abuse.⁴¹ Second, there was psychological

curb cruelty in the punishment of slaves. What the law tried to do and what the people did were two different scenarios because the slaves had little access to law enforcement. The later *senatus consultum* under Domitian had to outlaw castration. This severe practice was common enough to demand a legal precedent.

³⁷ For instances of sexual exploitation, see *Martial Spect.* 1.84; 2.33; 3.33; 6.39; 11.70; 12.58, 96.

³⁸ Though the sexual exploitation of slaves was acceptable, such deeds involved shame among those with moralistic persuasions. See Seneca *De ira* 2.28.7.

³⁹ Justinian's *Institutes* comes from J. A. C. Thomas' text, translation, and commentary, *The Institutes of Justinian* (Oxford: North-Holland, 1975), unless otherwise stated. The rest of Roman law come from the translated texts by S. P. Scott, *The Civil Law* (vol. 1 of 17; Cincinnati: The Central Trust, 1973). This includes the Twelve Tables, Institutes of Gaius, Rules of Ulpian, The Opinions of Paulus, and the Constitution of Leo, which is of little use to the present study. Scott also has Justinian's Codes. Buckland, pp. 197, 272, shows that *peculium* was not only given from the master but also by outsiders. It becomes a kind of 'saving account' for the slave.

⁴⁰ Buckland, pp. 267-268. This form of legislation served to make the slaves 'think twice' before making themselves legally liable. Failure to report fugitive slaves within twenty days was also punishable. The society as a whole acted as the guardian of the master.

⁴¹ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, pp. 94-96, stresses physical exploitation because of the abundance of literary evidence, and that the ancient slave owners took for granted the legitimacy of such practices. In practice then, the slave's body was viewed differently in its function than those of the free population. See also Trimalchio's somewhat exaggerated tale of Petronius' *Satyricon* 49, 50-52 etc. for more reasons and ways to abuse slaves.

PAGE

NUMBERING

AS ORIGINAL

the masters' household without having the full right to be household members.

Having discussed the exploitative aspect in the treatment of slaves, there was one area in which slaves were active and full participants. In religion, there were occasions where slaves and ex-slaves did enjoy some power. For example, it was acceptable for a slave to participate in the Imperial religion.⁴⁵ Furthermore, there were other religious cults in which slaves were also participants: O. Patterson names these interclass cults as Jupiter, Juno, and Silvanus.⁴⁶ This is a peculiar situation. K. Hopkins guesses that perhaps the celebration of the divine Augustus was an institution started by slaves and then recognized later by the emperor.⁴⁷ By participating in such religious activities, slaves were able to gain some kind of identity outside of the owners' *familiae*. Even with the narrow area of freedom in religion, the society dictated to the slave which arena allowed slave participation. Roman society acted as the collective owner to limit the movement of slaves.

From the treatment of the slaves, one can easily note their personal identities, which were the direct result of their relationship with the owner. Generally, the owner's wishes governed the welfare of the slave, since the slave was the owner's property.⁴⁸

What then is a slave: a human being or property? Scholars rightly struggle with the mixed signals Greco-Roman literature sends. Varro, in his treatise on agriculture, referred to the slave as an *instrumentum vocale*, a 'thing' which can 'articulate' (*Rust.* 1.17.1).⁴⁹ The tendency to regard the slave as a *res* comes from the legal literature of the time. This contrasts with non-legal literature which better describes the humanity of the slave. The tension then is between viewing the slave as a *res* and as a (full) human being. Legally, the slave was the owner's *res mancipi*, a kind of property of a farm inside Italy, and could thus be part of the

⁴⁵ K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, see chapter 5. Also Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 164.

⁴⁶ J. Vogt, pp. 61-62, names Artemis, Diana, Zeus Eleutherios, Lares and Silvanus. "Religion is a bastion of freedom for slaves ...". Religion in some cases became the common bond for some of the slave revolts against Rome. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, p. 69. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*, p. 52, names numerous other Oriental cults.

⁴⁷ K. Bradley, *Conquerors and Slaves*, p. 212.

⁴⁸ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 46. The *lex Aquilia*, around 287 BCE, includes the injury of slaves in the same class as that of herd animals.

⁴⁹ In Varro's treatise, there is a clear distinction between free and slave labor. The latter was being deprived of its full human quality.

inheritance, passing from one generation to the next.⁵⁰ Furthermore, like ‘things’, owners could use and dispose of slaves by selling them or even abandoning them.⁵¹ Until Claudius’ law on the gift of manumission for abandoned slaves, the owner was allowed to dispose of slaves if the abandonment was to the owner’s advantage (Suet. *Claud.* 25.2).⁵² In some legal literature, the slave fits under the law of things rather than the law of persons (Gaius *Inst.* 2.13).⁵³ Naturally, a slave could be part of the inheritance.⁵⁴ Hence, except for criminal transgression, the owner was responsible for the action of his *res* in civil proceedings.⁵⁵

In the modern mind, it is indeed puzzling to find that slaves can be considered a thing, a *res*, while being human at the same time. Because modification and qualification in Roman law point to a slave’s humanity, the modern interpreter cannot easily ignore the humanity of a slave.⁵⁶ One example is the law governing the financial dealings the slaves might have had.⁵⁷ Personal finances, such as the *peculium*, certainly gave emphasis to the slave’s identity as a

⁵⁰ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 47, 78, quotes Gaius *Inst.* 2.14a. There was a distinction between *res mancipi* and *res nec mancipi*. *Res mancipi* was the agrarian properties inside Italy and *res nec mancipi* was the agrarian properties outside of Italy. Justinian finally abolished this geographical distinction. Slaves were also classified with the farm animals (*Dig.* 9.2.11.1) and equipment (*Dig.* 33.7.12.33). This is a rather old tradition dating from the earliest Roman writers on husbandry (*Cat. Agr. Orig.* 2.7; Varro *Rust.* 1.17.1-2). *Mancipio* can also have a casual usage to describe a slave as a chattel (Sen. *Clem.* 1.18.1).

⁵¹ One can find a clear and concise discussion of the laws pertaining to slaves being stolen or injured as properties in Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 57-66. This confirms that the law was on the owner’s side.

⁵² Buckland, p. 274. The term for the abandoned slaves is *servus pro derelicto*.

⁵³ In Gaius’ *Inst.*, tangible properties, such as a slave, fit under corporeal properties, while other intangibles are under incorporeal properties (Gaius *Inst.* 2.13-14).

⁵⁴ Buckland, p. 252. The slave’s title is *servus hereditarius*.

⁵⁵ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 67-68, quotes Justinian’s *Dig.* 9.4.1-2. The resulting lawsuit is called noxal action. This legislation served three functions: first, it made the owners control their slaves; second, it allowed the offended party to receive fair financial compensation, since a slave could not pay for a lawsuit; and third, it gave the owners some indirect power over their slaves. If the owner was found liable in a lawsuit, he would most likely take the cost out of the slaves’ *peculia*. This would derive the trespassing slaves of their chances of manumission.

⁵⁶ The modern assumption of the dichotomy between the slave as a thing and a human did not exist in the Roman worldview.

⁵⁷ For examples, see Buckland, pp. 202-204. Pure *res* cannot do business nor can it establish savings. Buckland rightly puts these laws in his chapters on “the slave as a man”. See also Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 90, where he give examples of slaves being able to enter into a *spondere*, an oral contract, like any other citizen. One cannot make a contract with a *res*. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, pp. 107-109, shows a number of examples of slaves trading on behalf of their masters. He further states that there were two legal categories of contract and agency in which the humanity of slaves shone through (p. 151). One may also wish to add a third category of morality.

human being.⁵⁸ The best example though comes from the laws on the crimes which masters induced their slaves to commit (Ulpian *Dig.* 15.1.3.12).⁵⁹ Even though the masters commit crime through their slaves (Just. *Inst.* 1.8.1), the slaves' criminal activities were judged on a moral basis, as if they were done by a human being making a choice (*Dig.* 48.3.2; 48.2.5).⁶⁰ According to O. Robinson, the laws in the Principate committed a slave, as much as the free person, by the procedure of *extra ordinem* to formal trial.⁶¹ In a sense, slaves were really a type of an alien. Due to the fact that neither the alien nor the slave had the law on their side, punishment for wrongdoing was equally severe for both (Tac. *Ann.* 1.59.4; Just. *Dig.* 4.4.24.3; 9.2.52.1; 47.10.7.2; 49.14.12; Josephus *BJ* 7.450). In many cases, the punishment for the same offense was greater for the slave than the non-slave. The murder of slaves fitted under the crimes committed against *homo* in the *lex Cornelia*.⁶² In Roman legal classification of 'things', corporeal things include slaves with the label *homo* (Just. *Inst.* 2.2.1-2).⁶³ Furthermore, the free Roman person shared with the slave familial vocabulary such as *maritus*, *uxor*, *filius*, *parentes*, or *pater* which made the slave fully human.⁶⁴ The same ancient author could paradoxically view the slave as both *homo* and *res* (Just. *Inst.* 2.2.1-

⁵⁸ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 95, says, "If much in Roman law and life can be said to dehumanize the slave, the *peculium* did much to humanize him."

⁵⁹ Buckland, pp. 679-680. Though the master was held legally responsible for the coercion of slaves, the slaves were by no means exempted from punishment (*Dig.* 44.7.20). At best, slaves could be tortured until they incriminated their masters, giving rise to the question: why would evidence from a *res* count at all? (Tac. *Ann.* 2.30; 3.14, 67; 4.29; *Dig.* 48.18.1-27) At worst, in more serious cases, they would be punished along with the master. In each case, the slave always received the worst deal from the legal standpoint. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, pp. 27-28, 58, shows the slaves being bribed to transgress against their masters. Information could be bought from slaves, especially in political intrigues.

⁶⁰ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 129. The *senatus consultum Silanianum*, which dates around 10 CE, is especially important in showing the criminal responsibility of slaves. When a master was murdered, the slaves in the household were tortured and then put to death (*Dig.* 29.5.1-34). While this demonstrates a disregard for the slave's rights, it also shows the slave's humanity as a responsible human criminal. The law further granted masters protection from murder plots by their slaves. Thus the law put the responsibility of protection for the masters upon other slaves who refused any part of the murder plot. Watson has a good discussion on this law in pp. 134-138.

⁶¹ O. Robinson, "Slaves and Criminal Law," *Zeitschrift Der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 98 (1981), p. 214. However, one must qualify this by saying that "justice" was often carried out domestically by the master and his torturers.

⁶² Buckland, p. 31. Why indeed did the discussion on the treatment of slaves include the general treatment of *homo* to begin with? See also Justinian's classification of different kinds of men," which includes freeborn, freedmen and slaves (*Inst.* 1.5).

⁶³ Justinian used *homo* directly to describe slaves. Only the context indicates the *homo* to be the slave (*Inst.* 2.2.3).

⁶⁴ Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 153, rightly stresses this lexical point.

2; 2.5.3). Surely, a *homo* is not normally the same as a *res*, if one were to look at this paradox by modern logic.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the Romans took this paradox for granted. With the mixed message of Roman law, one can easily see that any modern interpreter who emphasizes either the *res* or the human quality aspect to the exclusion of the other will surely come under heavy criticism. The human quality shows that the slave and the master did have some kind of relationship, beyond that of an owner and his possession. However, the concept of the slave as a *res* emphasizes the economic rather than relational role of the slave. In this lexical mix of *res*, on the one hand, and *homo*, on the other, in describing a slave, the Romans smoothed over the tension by creating a legal fiction of the slave as both *res* and *homo*. Since the Roman law addressed a slave society, the legal fiction was both necessary and practical. Though terms like *res* and *homo* would seem to be dichotomous to the modern mind, they were merely ways to describe the societal role the slave played. No such dichotomy existed in the Roman mind.⁶⁶

To summarize, from the perspective of a modern interpreter, the best way to describe the treatment of slaves within the legal and social context is through the word 'sub-human' or to use Gayer's term 'Unter-mensch.'⁶⁷ Of course, this is a very general description and does not adequately describe the whole complex dynamic. Nonetheless, as one who was human yet a thing at the same time, the slave was vulnerable to abuses.⁶⁸ Therefore, slaves had a low degree of freedom of movement.⁶⁹ In many cases, there were no experiences of freedom, since

⁶⁵ See also the same usage of *homo* under completely unrelated contexts in Sen. *De ira* 3.12.5 and *De vit. beat.* 24.3.

⁶⁶ See Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*, pp. 13-17, where he points to the works of O. Patterson and M. I. Finley, the two important understandings of what a slave is from. As already discussed, Patterson sees "social death" as slavery, while Finley sees slaves as both a thing and an alienated being. Harrill points out the struggle for definition of a slave. Such struggles are modern rather than classical. Methodologically speaking, if one were to put a modern perspective on the variety of definitions by the Romans, one simply could not come up with a satisfactory solution.

⁶⁷ Gayer, *Die Stellung des Sklaven in den paulinischen Gemeinden und bei Paulus* (Bern: Hebert Lang; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1976), p. 271, uses this term to describe Plato's view of slave.

⁶⁸ O. Robinson, "Slaves and the Criminal Law," p. 222. Abuses such as torture and rape were not curbed until Justinian's time, when these offenses were established as criminal.

⁶⁹ J. Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* (transl. T. Wiedemann; Oxford: Blackwell, 1974), p. 5, assumes that the slaves' life was relatively tolerable simply because there was no revolt in a certain period. However the societal rules and structure made revolt a deviance rather than a norm. A lack of recorded revolt does not automatically demonstrates the lack of oppression.

legally, slaves had no freedom. Such is the picture of how slaves were treated. Paul seems to hold the same consistently negative view of his servile metaphor. The best way to bring out Paul's view is to mention the contrasting use of the terms 'slave' and 'son' in his metaphors. Legally, there was little difference between the son and the slave, "except in ultimate expectations".⁷⁰ Part of the reason could be due to the fact that many slaves, "however freed, would be likely to be descendants of the owner."⁷¹ In their finances, both the son and the slave had a *peculium*. Practically, both worked side by side in many household tasks. However, in comparison to the degree of freedom experienced by a Greco-Roman child, the slaves were much worse off. Although both had obligations, the slaves had much less chance of experiencing the privileges the sons had.

2.1.3. The Identity and Power Shifts from Slavery

Slave names make a good way to study identity shift. Whether born in bondage or not, slaves had a past, as does everybody, from a genealogical perspective. While some slaves had a memory of freedom in their past, those who were born in slavery obviously did not. Birth into slavery completely destroyed any link to a free lineage in the slave's genealogy. However, the process of natal alienation did not stop there: in addition to denying them their lineage, the owners often replaced the slaves' names. The irony of the situation is that rather than being identified with their perceived 'inferior' family, the slaves came to identify with their "superior" owners' families. For those who did not have much connection to their past, their identity was with their only recognizable superior, their masters. Nonetheless, the irony fades when one realizes that this identity shift was the result of the *familia* structure. In fact, the only life slaves knew comprehensively was that of slavery.⁷² It was hard for them to secure their place in society with their apparent social standing. The owners could either sell or expel them any time for any reason.⁷³ Any benefits they could claim would depend on their

⁷⁰ Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 56. Quotation is in Crook's words.

⁷¹ A. Watson, *Rome of the XII Tables* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), p. 93.

⁷² Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 9, comments, "It was not to the master's interest to reveal the truth, and this might justify his silence by reckoning up the cost of maintenance and tacitly promising manumission some day." Thus, the knowledge of manumitting procedure was only available, if one were geographically near the master and if one were to watch other slaves being manumitted.

⁷³ For example, Augustus expelled the gladiators and certain kinds of slaves in times of scarcity (Suet. *Aug.* 42).

masters entirely.⁷⁴

From the time of the ancient Greeks, name changes are identifiable through epigraphic evidence.⁷⁵ Scholars have recognized many slave names because slave names are by nature derogatory. For example, some slaves possessed names indicating their location of origin. Others, had names with a number attached to it to show the birth order. Still others, were given names of the Roman gods. Such gods were probably foreign to some of the slaves. Moreover, slave names lacked the *praenomen* and *nomen* of the regular Roman name.⁷⁶ Hence, slaves often had a singular *cognomen*. Because the *cognomen* often functioned to denote physical, mental, and birth characteristics, they were useful when identifying slaves. Since both the *praenomen* and *nomen* were used to identify family of origin or some genealogical connection, slaves' lack of multiple names indicated alienation from their own society.⁷⁷ Upon manumission, which is the topic of the next section, slaves adopted the *nomen* and sometimes *praenomen* of their masters.⁷⁸ Although there were exceptions, the name was what J. A. Crook calls the "everyday" sign of societal status.⁷⁹

The central issue when discussing slave identity lies in the legal status of

⁷⁴ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, p. 74, points out examples through Plautus' *Persa* that the slaves had little realistic chance in gaining their legal benefits under their masters. The master could revoke and qualify promises at will.

⁷⁵ M. L. Gordon, "The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire," *JRS* 14 (1924), pp. 93-111; L. R. Taylor, "Freedman and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome," *American Journal of Philology* 82 (1961), pp. 113-132. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, p. 55, sees this process as creating a fictive kinship to replace the current identity. "The slave's former name dies with his former self." The difference in the significance of the name change varies from different societies. On ancient Greece, see Y. Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece*, pp. 22-23. See "names, personal, Roman" *OCD*.

⁷⁶ This presupposes that one can detect free/d persons through the *tria nomina*. The *tria nomina* on the other hand does not automatically indicate citizenship, as Junian Latins would already have the *tria nomina*. P. R. C. Weaver, "Children of Junian Latins" in *The Roman Family in Italy*, p. 56. P. R. C. Weaver, "Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)," in *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, p. 184. In fact, according to Suetonius, Claudius was quite strict with foreigners on using Roman names. This one must presume a good number of these foreigners was also slaves (Suet. *Claud.* 40.3).

⁷⁷ Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 210, shows names that denote Thrasean, Arabian, or Dacian origin.

⁷⁸ J. H. Neyrey, *Paul, in Other Words*, pp. 192-194, asserts that the person in Paul's society found personal identity in relationships instead of through mere individualism. Paul's letters and records about his life demonstrate this, though one would probably hesitate to say that individual identity was totally lost in social identity. In the legal sense, the slaves had no father and had to attach himself or herself to the *paterfamilias* after manumission. The social link was still there. After all, it is normal for everyone to belong to some kind of *familia*. B. Rawson, "The Roman Family," pp. 13, 42-43.

⁷⁹ Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 48.

every person in the Roman Empire. Theoretically, every person in Greco-Roman society occupied a very specific legal status. This status determined many issues in life. For instance, with the *senatus consultum Claudianum* in 52 CE, a male slave could not marry the mistress without greatly endangering the couple.⁸⁰ However, a female slave could marry her master. Restrictions such as these severely hindered the propagation of the male slave's family name, thus ultimately eliminating his heritage altogether. This legal specificity shows how clear-cut a person's status was in Roman society. Due to the fact that certain legal procedures were set in place, people were not able to switch status very easily. This difficulty of status change clearly shows the importance of social identity from a legal perspective.

From the perspective of the *familia*, one can summarize the identity shifts of the slave in the following manner. If Paul used slaves born in bondage for his metaphors, then such slaves started their lives with an alienated status. Although it may be possible for them to trace some kind of link to another *familia* (to use a Roman term), they most likely did not know of this link. As far as they were concerned, they had no past. While freeborn men often had the chance to move into powerful positions, such as being *patresfamiliarum* or heirs, the slaves had no such chance. The many marital limitations imposed by the law and society eliminated their chance to build their own *familia* and be in control of their own finances. The obstacles they faced were enormous. Their living condition was that of absolute alienation, both legally and socially. Without manumission, there was definitely no upwardly mobile movement within the *familia*.

2.2 Greco-Roman Manumission

2.2.1 The Practice of Manumission

According to Buckland's estimate, slaves became quite numerous in the Augustan age. Naturally, manumission proportionately became more common.⁸¹ Legal literature gives three examples of manumission. First, manumission by *vindicta* could free a wrongly held slave. Second, manumission by census

⁸⁰ Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 13; Buckland, p. 413, shows this to be explicitly late in Constantine's time. It probably had a much earlier origin that is before Claudius' reign. See P. R. C. Weaver, "The Status of Children in Mixed marriages," in *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 145-169.

⁸¹ Buckland, p. 546, estimates that some citizens would own up to thousands of slaves.

required the owner to enroll the slave on the census list of Roman citizens. Third, manumission by testament could be conditional and always required the cooperation of the state. The issue of manumission is not as clear-cut as some may suppose. In the case of unconditional manumission, liberty came quickly. In most cases, however, conditions of time delayed the reception of freedom. An owner could stipulate that the slaves could gain freedom so long as they belonged to him when he died.⁸² Additionally, a manumission did not necessarily mean that the ex-slave could completely discard his or her former life. In addition to the condition of time, there could be obligations attached to manumission. For example, manumission tax of around five percent called *uicesima libertatis* was instituted around 357 BCE (Livy 7.16.7) and was often paid by the slaves.

Even in the case of manumission, everything worked to the advantage of the owner because of the link slavery forged between the former owner and the freed person. The former owner now became the patron of the freed person. For any freed person, having a powerful patron and being in good social standing went together. Hence, pleasing one's patron was very important for one's well-being. As a reward for post-manumission loyalty, many patrons treated their freedmen with great generosity. Suetonius wrote this on Claudius' benevolent treatment of his favorite freedmen Narcisus and Pallas, "... he permitted them to amass such wealth by plunder, that when he once complained of the low state of his funds, the witty answer was made that he would have enough and to spare, if he were taken into partnership by his two freedmen (*Claud.* 28)."⁸³ Therefore, the freed persons needed their masters.

In reality, there were two basic ways that the former owner controlled the ex-slave. First, the society's code of honor and shame unofficially obligated the ex-slave to serve the former owner in some capacity. Second, the legal obligations of *operae* allowed the former owners to legally draft up a set of tasks and days the freed persons should work for the former owners, who had now become

⁸² Buckland, p. 487.

⁸³ No doubt, such witty remarks are exaggerations but the freedmen were certainly treated well enough to amass a great deal for themselves. See also Plin. *Ep.* 10.11, 104, 106-107, on the importance of having a powerful patron.

patrons.⁸⁴ The extended service could remain as long as the ex-owner was alive. The legal deed could stipulate that the freed person be attached to the ex-owner's family in some way. Furthermore, especially according to the *lex Junia*, the patron and his male children had the right to inherit the property of the informally freed person, if the latter died intestate (Ulpian 29.1, 4).⁸⁵ Other cases could be related to how the freed person's children would fare. Although the freed person's children could have been born legally free, the manumission condition could allow them to be enslaved if necessary to the former master or the heirs.⁸⁶ Under the *lex Papia*, the patron's rights increased to a significant degree. If a freedman died with an estate of a hundred thousand *sesterces* or more, and had less than three heirs, an equal share of the property belonged to the patron (Gaius *Inst.* 3.42). Even the earnings of freed persons were not always at their disposal but could in part belong to the ex-owners household.

Apart from the above restrictions on the freedman, the legal constraints of society further confined the slave in relation to manumission. Three specific laws governed and controlled citizenship and manumission.⁸⁷ First, the *lex Fufia Caninia* governed the proportion of slaves in a single household that could receive postmortem manumission (Just. *Inst.* 1.7; Gaius *Inst.* 1.42-46; Ulpian 1.24).⁸⁸ Second, the *lex Aelia Sentia* legislated a minimum age of thirty for the slave and twenty for the owner before manumission with Roman citizenship could occur.⁸⁹ In a society whose member had a lower life span than those in western societies, thirty was advanced age. According to Bradley's research into sepulchral inscriptions, life expectancy was not likely to be greater than twenty

⁸⁴ See Buckland, p. 487 for examples. Work could include a woman giving birth to a male heir to give the owner another competent male hand.

⁸⁵ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 36. Gaius *Inst.* 3.40. The *lex Julia* even allowed the patron to inherit the property of the freed Latin person. See also Weaver, "Children of Junian Latins," p. 60. Manumission was also a tool to bind as well as to free. The Junian Latin status was abolished in latter times (Just. *Inst.* 1.5.3).

⁸⁶ K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, p. 156. Hopkins attributes the problem of partial freedom to the high price of full freedom, which makes the manumission of an entire family impossible. His chart in p. 166 of the number of slave families separating by manumission is significant. As the prices rose in Delphi in first century BCE, the number of conditional manumissions for children also rose.

⁸⁷ See Bradley, *Masters and Slaves in the Roman Empire*, pp. 87-98.

⁸⁸ For a discussion of *lex Fufia Caninia*, see Buckland, pp. 546-551.

⁸⁹ For a discussion of *lex Aelia Sentia*, see Buckland, pp. 537-546, Just. *Inst.* 1.6, Gaius *Inst.* 1.18, 40, and Dio Cass. 55.13 for a vague reference.

years.⁹⁰ From literary evidence, many lived longer.⁹¹ Whatever was the life expectancy, the fact that twenty year old men commanded Roman armies demonstrates the vast difference in the way modern and ancient people perceive age.⁹² Under the *lex Aelia Sentia* the worst restriction was on a class of slaves called *dediticii*, who were former criminals. Justinian described their state of existence as being *in pessima condicio* (*Inst.* 1.5.3). They were never able to inherit by will, and when they died, their property reverted to their patrons. In their case, there was little freedom to enjoy.⁹³ Third, the *lex Junia* clarified the status between freed people and full Roman citizens. According to some legal sources, freed persons became Roman citizens when they fulfilled three requirements (*Inst.* 1.17; *Ulpian* 3.4). First, they had to be over thirty years old when freed. Second, their owners had to have them in full Roman ownership. Third, their owners had to free them by either *vindicta*, the census or testament. Slaves freed under thirty years old, slaves informally freed and slaves freed by their bonitary owner (one who acquired the right over property when agricultural properties were transferred without the formal ceremony of *mancipatio*) were all classified differently than the *civis*, Roman citizen, under the *lex Junia*.⁹⁴ They would be considered ‘Junian Latins’ (*Suet. Aug.* 47; *Claud.* 19). These Latins had all the rights except for *conubium*: “the right to participate in formal conveyance by ‘mancipation’ and so to own property by full ‘citizen right’, to contract, to have access to the urban praetor’s court, to adopt, and to make and inherit under civil law wills — with the agreed exception that will-making rights were not allowed to Junians.”⁹⁵ This new category became a means of social control over the number of citizenships granted. Furthermore, some areas, such as Alexandria, had local legislation that Alexandrian citizenship preceded Roman citizenship (*Plin. Ep.* 10.6-7, 10). A freed person’s limitation to excel prevented

⁹⁰ Bradley, p. 96n53.

⁹¹ Of course, literary evidence also recorded many who died young. The New Testament shows many of the Christians living to a ripe old age. Even Jesus was ministering at thirty. There is no certainty about the life expectancy of the average person. One can only say that life was probably shorter for the ancient person.

⁹² Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 186.

⁹³ See Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 184.

⁹⁴ For a detailed discussion on *lex Junia*, see Buckland, pp. 533-537, Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 24, 44.

⁹⁵ See Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 44.

many from obtaining equestrian offices through military service.⁹⁶

In addition to the many obligations associated with manumission, the freed person also enjoyed many legal benefits, such as legal protection from many abuses against slaves. In the registration of freed persons, all concerned parties took three steps to ensure the legality of the process.⁹⁷ First, the slave presented himself to be a *civis: censu profitebantur*. Second, the owner showed up to give consent: *consensu domini*. Third, the censor took down the proceedings by inscribing into the public record, thus ensuring the legality of the registration. Thus, freedom was not only experiential, but was also legal, public, societal and official. Freedom was a byproduct of the new legal status.

Informal manumission became a further instrument of financial exploitation that often occurred in master-slave relationships.⁹⁸ For example, the patron expected the freed person to express *obsequium*, a form of legal compliance, by being protective of the patron's honor and not bringing lawsuits against the patron.⁹⁹ Furthermore, the freed person also had to express *officium*, a form of legal duty, by caring for the patron's children, by participating in familial ceremonies, and by giving gifts on special occasions.¹⁰⁰ As F. Danker, in his study *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*, asserts:

In brief, about eight centuries separate Homer and the flowering of Hellenistic Christian communities, yet the cultural phenomenon of interplay

⁹⁶ See also M. I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy* (London: Hogarth, 1985), p. 77, for legal discrimination against the descendants of slaves.

⁹⁷ Buckland, p. 440.

⁹⁸ The case of Modestus in Pliny the Younger *Ep.* 4.10 demonstrates the fluidity of informal manumission. Apparently, Modestus was informally manumitted by the dying words of the master. Pliny was called to investigate whether the freedom should have been granted. Pliny favored freedom with the perspective of treating the intention of the deceased, but apparently, not everyone shared this view (*Ep.* 2.16).

⁹⁹ A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928), pp. 36-44. W. Waldstein, *Operae Libertorum* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1986). Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 40, gives some examples, such as the freed person not being allowed to bring certain lawsuits against the patron. Additionally, the *lex Julia et Papia* stated that the freed woman had no power to either divorce or refuse the marital proposal of the patron. D. B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation*, pp. 47-49, uses various inscriptions with the formula "so-and-so's freedman" as an example of a certain pride or at least unashamed attitude the lower class had of its past. However, *obsequium* as a social convention can easily explain the same formula without resorting to a certain pride in slavery, which goes against much of the Greco-Roman view of slavery. S. N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, "Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (1980), p. 50, name a built in sense of loyalty among other general traits of patron-client relationship,

¹⁰⁰ Kirschenbaum, *Sons, Slaves and Freeman in Roman Commerce*, p. 129.

PAGE

NUMBERING

AS ORIGINAL

slaves. Furthermore, postmortem manumission could display either the wealth or generosity of the owner. According to Persius' satire, postmortem freed persons had to put on a *pileus* or a conical cap at the funeral to show their freedom (3.105).¹⁰⁷ The parade of caps would have demonstrated the former might of the deceased master. In addition, this form of manumission was a way to get minimize the financial loss that resulted from keeping too many unproductive slaves.¹⁰⁸ The next paragraph discusses further the financial or fiscal aspect of manumission. To summarize then, the main reason for postmortem manumission was self-interest.¹⁰⁹ Hopkins himself states, "Masters could afford to be generous with liberty, because they benefited from giving it."¹¹⁰

There is however, one other reason for manumission. At the same point, the slaves' productivity would certainly start to wane, due to the aging process: the older men could not perform manual labor as well as the young men and the reproductive capacity of the female slaves would reach a limit at menopause.¹¹¹ When the slave's output did not warrant the upkeep the owners would think hard about getting rid of the unprofitable element of his investment. Because the abandonment of a slave was complicated, manumission was a better option.¹¹² Before the slaves' value totally disappeared, the owner might either sell them or

¹⁰⁶ O. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, p. 220.

¹⁰⁷ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 34. K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, p. 91, shows that the *lex Fufia* was possibly a form of restriction on this kind of demonstration. By exhibiting how many slaves the dead person had owned, the public saw how wealthy he had been. By flaunting the gratefulness of the freed persons, the public saw the generosity of the deceased owner.

¹⁰⁸ Cato the Elder who advised the sale of the elderly and sick to cut losses (*Cat. Agri. Orig.* 2.7).

¹⁰⁹ K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, pp. 84-86, offers another personal reason which seems to have less to do with Paul's analogy in Galatians. Diachronically, Roman politicians would often offer manumission to slaves who would gather information against their masters (*App. B. Civ.* 1.26; 4.7, 11, 36; *Seut. Aug.* 16.1 etc.). Of course, this fueled mistrust. Perhaps postmortem manumission was the master's way of countering this kind of problem. With such manumission, the master could pay off the slave via inheritance. By the time of Augustus, the relationship between the two parties reached a peace along with the political peace of the Empire.

¹¹⁰ K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, p. 132.

¹¹¹ Even though physical maturity and life expectancy was very different in the condition of the Roman Empire, K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, p. 55n30, shows evidence of the Roman's concept of menopause occurring between forty to fifty.

¹¹² Buckland, p. 549. Claudius' edict, which could date later than Galatians (52 CE?), allowed the abandoned slaves freedom if the owner would *publice* eject them. However, this action might lead to a loss of status for the owner. If owning slaves was one way to show off wealth, abandoning sick slaves would have been a way to demonstrate financial problems. Thus, the option of abandonment would bring shame to the owner and caused his reputation to be tarnished. See *Seut. Claud.* 25.

between people of excellence and those on whom they make their impact finds continuous celebration, with a fairly consistent pattern of themes and diction developing in the last five centuries preceding the reign of Caesar Augustus.¹⁰¹

Such a relationship of reciprocity could often govern the whole of the society (Cic. *Off.* 1.47). All these aforementioned practices formed a patron-client relationship, which made the ex-slave socially dependent on the ex-owner.¹⁰² It is not too great an exaggeration to agree generally with R. MacMullen when he says, "...the master class first defined and then punished freedmen."¹⁰³ In a highly classified society like the Roman one, those who made laws sought to preserve distinctions in rank and status the best they could (Cic. *Planc.* 15; Lib. 48.31; Plin. *Ep.* 8.6, 9.5). As mentioned previously, the economic situation of the ex-slave probably made him or her dependent on the former master, who exploited the situation in order to save money.¹⁰⁴ By relying on the ex-slaves' skills, he saved himself from having to retain a new slave by investing in additional food and housing.

The Delphic inscriptions clearly illustrate the manumission ceremony itself, by six simple steps: first, there was the record of the date of manumission; second, there is the record of the god, whose name guaranteed that the slaves received their freedom; third, the conditional clauses were recorded in case any string was still attached to the manumission; fourth, was the release clause; fifth, there was the guarantee clause, which ensured the full freedom of the

¹⁰¹ F. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982), p. 27. Danker's study only focuses on documents that were political and official but not on freed persons.

¹⁰² Buckland, p. 589. A special kind of manumission illustrates this kind of dependency. Even slaves of a corporate entity such as a town would take the name of that town or the magistrate who freed them. Evidence as early as Varro seems to have mentioned this kind of practice. J. K. Chow, *Patronage and Power* (JSNTSup. 75; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), pp. 31-32, defines the client-patron relationship thus, "The patron gives the client what he needs and in turn gets from the client what he wants." Often, the gift from the patron was tangible, while the return from the client was intangible. The relationship was usually social rather than legal. The means to power was through connection to the right patron. According to Kirschenbaum, *Sons, Slaves and Freeman in Roman Commerce*, p. 129, the patron had three duties: first, he was to provide guardianship (*tutela*) for the client; second, he was to provide sustenance (*alimenta*); third, he was to guarantee justice when vindication was necessary (*vindicatio necis*).

¹⁰³ R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 104.

¹⁰⁴ See K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, pp. 148-149, for his extensive quote on Epictetus *Discourse* 4.1.33 where the slaves' fantasy of freedom gives way to the reality of survival as a impoverished freed person. Whether this was a propaganda to prevent slaves from thirsting for freedom is debatable. There must have been some truth in the portrait.

manumitted; sixth, was the statement recording all the witnesses, including the priest, the freed person, the guarantor, the ex-owner.¹⁰⁵

In summary, there was hardly any event more important for a slave than manumission. As the above picture demonstrates, manumission allowed differing degrees of freedom. Overall, the slave could not get away from his or her obligation to the master, as a result of societal convention. However, although absolute freedom was impossible, a large amount of it certainly was. Because, with manumission, the slaves gained some entry into the inner circle of the *familia*, they acquired a new identity. The slave's name changed to attach him or her to the owner. For those who were lucky, subsequent adoption became the most thorough way of gaining legal access to the inner circle of the *familia*. In the vocabulary of O. Patterson, the slave gained a total social rebirth through adoption.

2.2.2 The Reasons for Manumission

When one looks clearly at the phenomenon of manumission, one can see the reasons for the practice. Postmortem manumission, that is freedom granted after the owner's death, was a popular form of freeing slaves in many society. O. Patterson, in discussing the power relationship aspect of postmortem manumission says, "The mere possibility of postmortem manumission motivated all slaves in a large household, even if eventually only one or two were manumitted."¹⁰⁶ From a societal point of view, Patterson's observation answers K. Hopkins' question as to why the Romans freed so many of their slaves. The implicit or explicit possibility of postmortem manumission was an effective way for owners to ensure the complete loyalty and artificial affection of their slaves. Because the dead master's will was often drawn up in advance, slaves would have tried to be part of the inner circle in the hope that they were considered for postmortem manumission. This virtually guaranteed the owner's control over the

¹⁰⁵ For the form and translation of some samples, see K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, pp. 142-143. See also Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, pp. 179-180, where he details the ceremony of manumission *inter vivos*, i.e. during the time the owner was still alive. This could be achieved by manumission *vindicta*. "An *assertor libertatis* claimed that the slave was free; the master made no protest; the lictor of the magistrate - who might be consult praetor, proconsul, *praefectus Aegypti* - laid a wand - *festuca* - upon the slave's head, who was then declared free. At some point of the ceremony the master slapped the slave's cheek, and turned him round,, serving to impress the ceremony on the slave's memory, the turning round indicating his changed status."

allow their manumission. In such circumstances, those skilled in areas other than manual labor and reproduction were better off because their labor did not depend on their youth and the owners would view them as more economically viable.

There was another non-financial reason for the usage and codification of manumission laws during the Principate. Although the stability of the *Pax Romana* was enforced by military power, the slave 'war' of 70 BCE was still fresh in the historical records.¹¹³ Furthermore, cases of localized unrest and murder by slaves still occurred, even after the officially recorded slave wars.¹¹⁴ Hence, for the safety of the Empire, the Roman Government had to take other social precautions to ensure political stability.¹¹⁵ Making manumission and the granting of citizenship written laws clearly showed that the power resided in the owners, and this ensured the obedience of the slaves. Any law written in favor of the slave was as much for the benefit of the whole society as for the individual slave. This apparent laxity was, in reality, a clever device for political control and a guarantee of long-term peace. To summarize, economics was not the only factor in the codification of the manumission laws, political manipulation also played a major part.

For the slave, the best situation following an unconditional manumission was adoption (Ulpian 22.7). To appreciate the full privileges of adoption, it is necessary to understand the important role the nuclear family played in the inheriting process. One example, which illustrates Roman hierarchy in cases of succession, comes from the intestacy law in the Twelve Tables.¹¹⁶ If the *paterfamilias* died intestate, the law allowed three classes of persons to become heir, as listed here in descending order, from the most to the least privileged. The first to succeed were the *sui heredes* or the deceased's sons, grandchildren by the sons, or a wife married *cum manu*. The second to succeed, after the *sui heredes*,

¹¹³ The peace was hard won. K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 4, gives a figure of ten percent of the population serving in the military in order to accomplish the conquest in the two centuries before the common era.

¹¹⁴ K. Bradley, *Masters and Slaves in the Roman Empire*, p. 113, describes in detail cases of murders of owners by their slaves. See Pliny *Ep.* 3.14; 8.14 and Tacitus *Ann.* 14.42-45.

¹¹⁵ For instance, many of those who recorded the slave rebellions lived in the first century CE: Livy lived from 59BCE to 17 CE; Appian was born at the end of the first century CE; and Plutarch was born before 50 CE and died after 120 CE. These dates are based on *OCD*.

¹¹⁶ R. P. Saller, "Roman Heirship Strategies," in R. P. Saller and I. Kertzer (eds.), *The Family in Italy: from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven: Yale, 1991), p. 31, provides the concise summary.

was the *proximus agnatus*, the closest relative linked by males. The third to succeed were the *gentiles*, who were clansmen. It is easy to see that all three classes were within the inner circle of the *familia* and mostly connected with the nuclear family. With adoption, the slave was pulled within this inner circle not by birth, but by the will of the *paterfamilias*. The adoption law is such that slaves could inherit if their masters were still alive when they were manumitted (Just. *Inst.* 2.14.1). In fact, contrary to many reasons for modern adoption, Greco-Roman adoption was mainly for reasons of succession and transmission. Succession was especially important in politics and properties.¹¹⁷ Literary sources indicate that adoption was frequently practiced by the elite. One popular reason among aristocrats for legal succession was the lack of male heir to carry on the duty of the *paterfamilias*.¹¹⁸ Among the emperors within 14 to 200 CE, only Claudius, Vespasian and Marcus Aurelius were survived by natural heirs.¹¹⁹ This is not to say that the commoners did not practice adoption, but it was probably more common among the upper echelons of the society. Watson even goes as far as saying, "To judge from the legal texts, it was by no means uncommon for a Roman citizen to appoint someone else's slave as his heir or leave him a legacy."¹²⁰ Freedman adoption was probably the result of a combination of the master's affection and the ex-slaves loyalty.¹²¹ In fact, as a result of being legally but loosely included in the nuclear family and taking on the owner's name, the ex-slave automatically gained the owner's free status (Just. *Inst.* 1.11.12). Slaves who looked after their aged masters might reap the benefit of adoption, especially when the master had no natural male heir.¹²² However, women could not preserve the family name, thus denying them the possibility of adoption. Hence,

¹¹⁷ See M. Corbier, "Divorce and Adoption as Familial Strategies," in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, p. 63.

¹¹⁸ M. Corbier, "Divorce and Adoption as Familial Strategies," pp. 66-67. After all, sterility itself caused the absence of a male heir. A Roman with daughters were equal to having no heir in the legal sense and concubines still lacked the legitimacy needed for succession. Adoption demonstrates how the law intruded on familial matters.

¹¹⁹ B. Rawson, "The Roman Family," p. 12.

¹²⁰ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 110.

¹²¹ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, pp. 190-199, shows that adoption can occur within the immediate family. All such legislation clearly dealt more with the property rights and ownership rather than slaves and master. This study does not concern itself with these issues.

¹²² Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 202, states, "Adoption appears to have had a similar origin, as a device securing the continuance of the *familia*, its property and its *sacra* (the family cult)," thus emphasizing the importance of men in the *familia*.

slave adoption was a specific form of adult male adoption restricted on to male. It was adult because official manumission occurred at the age of thirty.¹²³ It was male because the *familia* required a *paterfamilias*.

There are some characteristics one must note regarding adoption so as not to confuse the modern with the Greco-Roman practice.¹²⁴ First, Greco-Roman adoption was a purely male activity, with the emphasis on the legal *potestas* of the *paterfamilias*.¹²⁵ In fact, later efforts to curb the *patria potestas* indicate the *pater*'s earlier abuse of the power.¹²⁶ Not only did this great legal power lead to an individual's control over others, the Roman legal delineation made *patria potestas* an institution.¹²⁷ Second, the adopting party did not have to be married.¹²⁸ Third, adoption legalities focused on the welfare of the adopter's property much more than the well being of the adoptee.¹²⁹ Fourth, people preferred to adopt relatives.

In addition to noting the characteristics of adoption, the law created three steps in the adoption process of being in a new *familia*.¹³⁰ The status change can equally apply to a freedman being adopted into his master's nuclear family. The freedman whose former slave status kept him at the outer edge of the *familia* was adopted as if he was in the inner circle. First, the adopted person was taken from the former *familia* and relocated to the new *familia* of the new *paterfamilias*.¹³¹

¹²³ In the case of adoption of minors, which is not applicable to freedman adoption, a *tutela* was responsible for the child until adulthood. Because a *tutela* was responsible for a woman for life, the male child had a greater advantage than the adult woman did. In this legal convention, the male heir became much more valuable than any woman in the nuclear family. Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 173.

¹²⁴ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 115.

¹²⁵ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 178. Roman laws contain too little discussion on the son's rights to ascertain of any consent he may have had.

¹²⁶ For more on *patria potestas*, see M. Gielen, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik*, pp. 146-157.

¹²⁷ Gielen, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik*, p. 146, states that the institution is "im Interesse von Familie und Haus verantwortlich und nicht egoistisch handelte." This description of the institution fits the picture painted by Roman laws.

¹²⁸ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 159. Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, consistently defines the *pater* as the father which is somewhat misleading and anachronistic. The modern mind probably sees the *pater* in terms of the modern nuclear family.

¹²⁹ Gardner, *Family*, p. 204. This is not to suggest that the whole process was purely for the benefit of the adopter. This is probably why the practice of passing the adoptive son back and forth, into and out of the *potestas* of the same person, was unacceptable.

¹³⁰ Gardner, *Family*, pp. 117-118, gives the details on which the following discussion was built. See M. Corbier, "Divorce and Adoption as Familial Strategies," pp. 67-68.

¹³¹ In fact, if the adopting *paterfamilias* decided to emancipate the adopted person, the ties had been severed so that the newly emancipated would have trouble getting his former rights back with the former *familia* when the former *pater* died.

Second, the new *paterfamilias* made a new will incorporating the adopted person. This entitled him to receive new rights as well as obligations under the adopting *pater*. Even though the new *pater* was not necessarily married or competent, the adoptee must learn to cope.¹³² Third, the new adoptee could enjoy the same rights as the natural heirs. According to Roman laws, “To act as heir is to act as owner: indeed, the ancients speak of heirs as owners.” (Just. *Inst.* 2.19.7) For the newly adopted slave, this was a rapid reversal of fortune which brought new rights and privileges. The slave was no longer tied to the master in a degrading way, but in some sense became equal to him and had legal claim over the allotted estate. As is apparent from the data thus far, the institution of adoption leaned towards the legal rather than the relational and the social rather than the private.¹³³

There were two kinds of adoption, after manumission (Aulus Gellius *NA* 5.19.1-3; Gaius *Inst.* 1.98; Ulpian 8.2-5).¹³⁴ First, there was public adoption, known as the *arrogatio* which was authorized by the people.¹³⁵ Second, there was private adoption, known as the *adoptio*, which was by the order of the magistrate.¹³⁶ Since public adoption was a bureaucratic inconvenience, private adoption, performed locally, was a preference. Once adopted, the adoptee changed his name to adhere to the new *familia*. This signifies the person’s identity shifting towards the new *pater* and nuclear family. Though the ancients did not use language like ‘nuclear family,’ they apparently described relationships

¹³² Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 149. The factor of age is considered here because a *paterfamilias* by practice was the oldest surviving male descendant of the household. See B. Rawson, “The Roman Family,” pp. 7ff.

¹³³ Gardner, *Family*, p. 123, shows the severity of punishing adultery as a socially threatening crime rather than merely a personal matter.

¹³⁴ Gardner, *Family*, pp. 10-15, thoroughly discusses the adoption procedures. See M. Kurylowicz, M., “‘Adoptio Plena’ und ‘Minus Plena’,” *Labeo* 25 (1979), pp. 163-182. Kurylowicz discusses the later Justinian reform, bringing out the social issues and ambiguities of previous administrations.

¹³⁵ The imperial authority, which represented the people, took care of *arrogatio*. Aulus Gellius recorded the preparation of *arrogatio* this way (*NA* 5.19.6). First, an investigation took place to ensure that the adopting person could not bear children of his own (Ulpian 8.6). Then, the pontiff provided legal precautions to ensure the property rights of the person being adopted.

¹³⁶ Aulus Gellius summarized the final court procedures of *arrogatio* this way (*NA* 5.19.1-4, 9). First, the court administered the adoption through a thrice-repeated sale. Then, declaration before the people took place. This was called *arrogatio*. *Arrogatio* describes the process of adoption for a person independent of his *familia*. This person was *sui iuris*, according to Roman law. The magistrate took care of *adoptio*. *Adoptio* was for the person dependent on a *familia*. The dependency could include being a slave. This person is *alieni iuris* according to the Roman laws. See Just. *Inst.* 1.11.1 and Gaius *Inst.* 1.98-100).

in similar terms. As in the case of the modern nuclear family, hierarchy of age mattered for adoption. Hence, an older person could not be adopted by a younger person. The reason given was, “*adoptio enim naturam imitatur et pro monstro est ut maior sit filius quam pater* (Just. Inst. 1.11.4).” This stipulation was the Roman way of maintaining a sense of ‘normality’ in a ‘father and son’ relationship. When the law speaks of “*naturam imitatur*,” it is no doubt referring to the natural birth order resulting in hierarchy in the family in which the *pater* exercised parental authority over his *filius*. While there was name change in both slavery and adoption, the former signified ownership, and the latter, belonging. Therefore, name change through adoption starkly contrasts against the name change through slavery. Even though the function of name change is still up for debate among scholars of Roman inscriptions, the benefits of name change were undeniable.¹³⁷

The privileges of manumission and subsequent adoption, were a result of the good will of the master. Though the modern mind might consider the manipulative practices of some owners inhumane, the slave probably disregarded these, considering any kind of free identity precious. For the slaves, the privileges of freedom and inheritance were incredibly kind gifts. Considering that manumission was never owners’ obligation, it is not hard to see why so many freed persons remembered their former masters with flattering epitaphs because the freedman was now a ‘real’ member of the *familia*. Countless inscriptions were found with the freed persons’ names on them. The common theme of acknowledging former masters and mistresses runs through most of them. Such a notion may seem outrageous to the modern way of thinking, since absolute freedom is taken so much for granted in the modern west. However, if one thinks of ancient society’s view of slaves being less than fully human, freedom introduced a form of rebirth as a human.¹³⁸ The slave’s dead social status had taken a turn for the infinitely better in the legal, social and, occasionally, financial sense. One needs only to refer to Phaedrus’ story in Aesop’s Fables understood

¹³⁷ For various interpretations of epigraphic name change, see Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, pp. 133-136.

¹³⁸ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, p. 97 quotes E. Levy, “Libertas and Civitas,” *ZRG* 78, p. 145, by saying that manumission turns a slave from “an object to a subject of

the feelings of a former slave who valued freedom even above a decent life under the master's roof (3.7.1-27).¹³⁹ This is why Pliny the Younger allowed slaves to make requests for freedom at their deathbeds (*Ep.* 8.16.1-2).¹⁴⁰ Pliny's provision should have affected the freedom of the offspring.

2.2.3 The Identity Shift from Manumission

Ideally, manumission not only freed slaves from their owners, but also freed the slaves from the future possibility of being owned in the Greco-Roman society.¹⁴¹ Since Rome was a patron-client society, the official freedom carried with it the client's obligation to his patron. The patron-client foundation of the Roman society is illustrated well by Dionysius of Halicarnassus who recorded the myth of how Romulus entrusted each plebeian to a patron, to grant legal and financial protection (2.9.1; 2.10.1).¹⁴² In many slave societies, the patron-client relationship, which existed between freed persons and the former slave owners, was the direct result of manumission.¹⁴³ The Roman society was no exception. In fact, the friendship could have been so well developed that the ex-slave continued to serve the master in some capacity. In many cases, the freed person worked in the same capacity for the master as before manumission because relocation was not an option. Apart from psychological appreciation of the master, financial, kinship and legal issues were important factors for the link between former slaves and their owners. If a person was freed while his or her kin was still enslaved under another household, this freed person could not really become independent

rights." In a milder case, the slave could be changed from being viewed as a naturally inferior being to almost being on equal plane with an average human being (*Sen. De ira* 3.24.2).

¹³⁹ This is not to say that all freed persons felt the same, but at least Phaedrus showed an awareness of freedom as something of great value.

¹⁴⁰ Though this legal fiction seems cruel to the modern interpreter, Pliny already felt that he was being too soft and humane (*Ep.* 8.16.3). Pliny also seems to have expressed an appreciation of the subjugated foreigner as one who had a glorious past in history (*Ep.* 8.24.1-7).

¹⁴¹ Buckland, p. 438. One must qualify the comment with the word "ideally" because of the classification of the Greco-Roman societal ranking of free persons, freed persons and slaves.

¹⁴² Watson, *Rome of the XII Tables*, pp. 98-99.

¹⁴³ D. B. Martin, *Slavery As Salvation*, pp. 22-30, emphasizes Christ as the patron who redeemed and became the *current* master of Paul, but there is a negative side to this analogy. The description of a patron-client relationship also seems to point to the manipulation of power and of control over the freed person by the *former* master and not of the person exercising good will. This main feature of the patron-client relationship does not seem to illustrate Martin's point very well. The existence of a patron-client relationship is illustrated through official inscriptions. See J. Nicols, "Tabulae Patronatus: A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community" in *ANRW* 2.13 (1980) pp. 533-561, for an evaluation of relationships between patron and a client community. The inscriptions in bronze tablets show the names of those in a

so quickly. Relocation cost money that could be better spent in gaining freedom for the enslaved kin. If the aspiration of the freed person was to provide some help for the enslaved family members elsewhere, then they needed their former owner as much as before manumission to provide steady income. Some others, who were less confined, took advantage of their freed status and relocated, but the cost of relocation limited the number of ex-slaves who could enjoy such freedom. The only difference was that the legal status of the slave had changed. Thus far, then, the shift is more personal and relational in terms of the slave-master relationship.

In viewing the relational aspect of manumission, it appears that many social forces acted against the freed person who had to integrate with society.¹⁴⁴ Sometimes, freed persons were despised because of their servile background (Plin. *Ep.* 2.6.1-5).¹⁴⁵ Even if Roman citizenship was inherited upon freedom, societal prejudices and legal stipulations hindered full enjoyment of 'first-class' citizenship.¹⁴⁶ Augustus' conservative inclination led to tough legal shackles on the upward mobility of even rich freed persons.¹⁴⁷ Wealth had its limitations in a person's upward mobility. Even though the more liberal policies of granting

community that were under a certain patron. This official convention gave rise to a series of patron-client relationships in Paul's society.

¹⁴⁴ Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 179, quotes Dionysius of Halicarnassus 4.23 etc. on how the dignity of the Roman citizenship was ruined by manumission to undeserving slaves. Although Barrow might be correct in noting that it was not always the best types who were granted citizenship, Dionysius' comments were more representative of the attitude prevalent among many of the elite. This attitude made freed persons' lives difficult, even after receiving their citizenship. Dionysius was not alone in his conservative attitude, see Suet. *Aug.* 40.3 for Augustus' preference of giving a tax break over citizenship to freed persons. The general attitude of the elite was to maintain the superiority of Romans by restricting citizenship. Persius, the satirist, questioned both the slave's moral character and his or her worthiness to receive citizenship (5.76). Considering his somewhat sheltered life under the care of his female relatives, Persius' opinion probably best represented a great part of the societal prejudice. However, Pliny the Younger seems to favor the social advantages of giving citizenship more liberally, namely populating the town with citizens (*Ep.* 7.32).

¹⁴⁵ Pliny's letter is a curious one. In it, he made an analogy referring to freed persons as those in the lower class of the society. Even though he advocated the generous treatment of freed persons, one cannot help but notice his condescending tone, which reflects not only the attitude of Pliny but also that of his society.

¹⁴⁶ M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, pp. 143-144, reveals the official mistreatment of the poor under debt bondage after Augustus' era. Roman citizenship was not always a safeguard against all kinds of abuses normally reserved for the 'other' in society. Furthermore, Roman society, with its legal nuances, contrasts more sharply with Greece, which theoretically allowed the freed persons to be wherever they wanted.

¹⁴⁷ See M. L. Gordon, "The Freedman's Son in Municipal Life" *JRS* 21 (1931), pp. 65-77. She surveys the epigraphic evidence and suggests that only the wealthy freedman's son had a chance. Wealth was, apparently, the only way up.

citizenship to Junian Latins favored those who were excessively wealthy, there were not so many such Latins.¹⁴⁸ Also, there was a certain societal suspicion of the character of the freed person. Such a prejudicial attitude could have been founded in the fact that some of the slaves were freed because they were accomplices to their bosses' criminal activities. Thus, their moral standing was put in question.¹⁴⁹ Although this kind of prejudice was often unfounded, it did not make life easy for law-abiding freed persons. Furthermore, other prejudices could have arisen from the philosophical view regarding the natural inferiority of slaves. For instance, Augustus wanted to preserve the purity of the senatorial rank by forbidding marriage with freed women (Just. *Dig.* 23.2.44). As in the case of Phaedrus the legendary freedman of Augustus who edited and composed Aesop's Fables books three to five, many well-educated freed persons were still ostracized from the lives they felt they deserved (3 epilogue 35; 4.7.1-25).¹⁵⁰ Having discussed all the obstacles presented to the freed person, the only way in which he or she was fully able to enjoy civil rights was through adoption.¹⁵¹

To sum up the identity shifts the slave experienced within the institution of manumission, freedom made the slave a "somebody" from a "nobody" (Just. *Inst.* 1.5). The freed person was no longer considered a *res* and could not be legally treated as such in the *familia*. Those who gained citizenship and adoption were

¹⁴⁸ According to the avenue opened by *lex Visellia* in 24 CE, they could also acquire citizenship by serving six years in the night watch of Rome (Ulpian 3.5). In his edict, Claudius also granted citizenship to the Latins who built a ship that could hold ten thousand measures of grain and had transported grain to Rome for six years (Ulpian 3.6).

¹⁴⁹ Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire*, p. 89. Dion. Hal. 4.24.1-8. Some, such as Pliny the Younger, might consider the nature of the slave as flawed (*Ep.* 3.14.5). Freed persons who were heirs to the estate could also try to speed up the death of their patrons by murder (Plin. *Ep.* 7.6.8-10). Although Pliny favored the defendant in *Ep.* 7.6, murder was not an unthinkable option.

¹⁵⁰ In his story about his hero Simonides, Phaedrus seems to point to himself having all that he needed within himself (4.23-26). "*Homo doctus in se semper divitias habet.*" / "A man of learning always has riches within himself." (4.23.1). For another example of a freeborn whose father was a slave, one needs to look no further than Horace who had to wear the shame of his family. See G. Highet, "Libertino Patre Natus" *American Journal of Philology* 94 (1973), pp. 268-281.

¹⁵¹ However, inheritance resulting from adoption could also be nullified through the Roman laws of emancipation, which cut off the heir who fell out of favor. See J. Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life, Family and Familia in Roman Law and Family*, pp. 6-113, for a detailed discussion on the laws on emancipation. The technical distinction between Greco-Roman manumission and emancipation is that the former applied to slaves, while the latter applied to free persons. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Community*, pp. 60-61 and I. A. H. Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, pp. 39-40, mix the two words together applying them equally to slave manumission. This is a mistake which originates from mixing first-century vocabulary with nineteenth-century usage.

now protected by the law. The law was no longer against them but was now for them. Their skills were no longer for the owners' benefit only but were now available for personal gain.

2.3 Greco-Roman Re-enslavement

2.3.1 The Practice of Re-enslavement

There is not much written on 're-enslavement'. The term, is actually used for convenience to label a certain social situation resembling slavery. Two particular cases are pertinent to the current study. If a slave had run away and gained temporary freedom, when he was recaptured, brand marks were sometimes put on him to make sure that he would never be able to run away without easily being spotted.¹⁵² Because of the shame associated with slavery, the brand marks created great social problems for the slaves if they were eventually manumitted. Wherever they went, people could easily note their former status. Social advancement in this case would be out of the question. The Roman laws of *nexum* or debt bondage seems to imply yet another form of re-enslavement. The earliest description of the enforcement of this institution is in the Twelve Tables, Table 6.1. This record was probably so brief because the whole institution of *nexum* was abandoned by 313 BCE.¹⁵³ This early law decrees that the interest for unpaid debts was one hundred percent. This kind of institution propagated financial oppression. There was a debate over whether the debtor could be enslaved to the creditor. Varro apparently thought not.¹⁵⁴ The mere fact that there was any debate on interpretation of the law indicates that some people chose to enforce debt repayment by slavery, whether the law sanction it or not.

In later law codes, there are different categories of debts, which put the debtor under various contractual obligations (Just. *Inst.* 3.14). The one which made the debtor most vulnerable was *mutuum*, which denotes a debt that was consumable or monetary (Gaius 3.90; Just. *Inst.* 3.14.1-2).¹⁵⁵ Although money was not consumable, it could be spent. Because the debtor had to spend the money borrowed, there was little guarantee of monetary repayment. If there was

¹⁵² Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, pp. 58-59, shows the identity function of brand marks but only runaway slaves seems to have been marked in the Roman society.

¹⁵³ Watson, *Rome of the XII Tables*, p. 111.

¹⁵⁴ Watson, *Rome of the XII Tables*, p. 112.

a default, then the debtor had to repay in terms of labor (Livy 8.28.2). Originally, the debt bondage was a protective measure against the debtor's properties being divided up further, thus plunging him into financial ruin or putting him in the dire legal situation of an *iudicatus*.¹⁵⁶ Nevertheless, the punishment for debt bondage was often cruel in real life. In the stories Jesus told, debt problems are commonplace. One particular story on debt bondage indicates that debt could land the debtor in prison until the debt was repaid (Lk. 12.59). Worse yet, another parable on debt repayment reveals that some slaves who failed to pay their debts were subjected to torture (Matt. 18.34). The problem arose when the *nexus*, the person under debt, became a debt laborer. Legally he or she agreed to remain his or her own master, or *sui iuris*, in making the contract to work off the debt. *Sui iuris* could not have anyone advocate on his or her behalf, as a patron would advocate for a client. In such a case, there was little guarantee that the labor load would correlate with the debt itself. Furthermore, there is also an indication that a *paterfamilias* could repay his own debt, by using his son in *nexum* to work that debt.¹⁵⁷ Finally, if the freed person defaulted on the conditions of the manumission contract, the former owner could put that person into slavery again.

How often people practiced these forms of re-enslavement is unknown, but many sources indicate re-enslavement did exist to one degree or another. The experience of freedom must have made re-enslavement that much more painful. The slaves not only lost the protection of their patron, but also reverted to the point at which they had first started. All their hard work towards manumission had been wasted. The whole cycle had to start all over again. The slaves now became outsiders who had to serve another *familia* to try to regain freedom. Furthermore, though the slaves might have had some property while working off the monetary debt, there was no guarantee that the law would fully protect his rights. If the slave had started a *familia* or even a family while being a freed person, the situation of re-enslavement would jeopardize the whole effort.

¹⁵⁵ Falling under *mutum* would be goods that could be consumed as well such as wine, oil, corn, or currencies that could be spent such as money, bronze, silver or gold (Just. *Inst.* 3.14).

¹⁵⁶ Watson, *Rome of the XII Tables*, p. 116.

¹⁵⁷ Watson, p. 119. A similar practice of selling a son to profit for labor was also in the writing of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.27.3).

2.3.2 The Reasons for Re-enslavement

It is not hard to see the two reasons for re-enslavement: debt and violation of manumission agreement. Strictly speaking, debt bondage is not re-enslavement. It is a kind of oppression that was legally endorsed with and matched the oppression of slavery. Although the freed person had changed status, financial hardship made it difficult to enjoy the newly gained freedom. In seeking protection of personal property through debt bondage, the debtor still could not avoid personal oppression. From the vantage point of the debtor, long-term advantage was theoretically possible. However, the reality of the situation rarely shows any advantage whatsoever. From the above assessment, the debtor suffered similar fate as the slave in many situations. Violation of the manumission agreement could also put the freed person into bondage. Thus, something as simple as not fulfilling one's *operae* could result in punitive re-enslavement.¹⁵⁸ Even though the *Lex Aelia Sentia* forbade outright re-enslavement, its various modifications made it meaningless. All such re-enslavement were legal in nature. The debt or default was all defined by Roman law or contract agreement. The law was on the side of the creditor.

2.3.3 The Identity and Power Shifts from Re-enslavement

Originally, when freed persons were manumitted properly, they were protected by the law, through citizenship. Freed persons were in control of their own lives. Their identities were only linked socially to their former owner, as a result of belonging to his *familia*. However, with debt bondage, the freed persons lose that control of their own lives at the bidding of their new boss. Their financial security was in jeopardy. Facing outrageous interest rates, any freed person would find the transition very difficult and became vulnerable to exploitation. Their freedom to move about geographically and socially was severely limited.

2.4 The Identity and Power Shifts in Greco-Roman Process of Slavery

There are different kinds of power, in dealing with the process of slavery. To quote Patterson, "Power relationships differ from one another not only in degree, but also in kind."¹⁵⁹ If the slave knew how to manipulate the system by adhering to social rules, there were still only limited number of ways to advance.

¹⁵⁸ J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 52.

¹⁵⁹ Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, p. 1.

Advancement, however, was only superficial. In reality, as a result of the intricate legal constraints, the slave's rights and power were very much limited. Even with some protective measures in the legal system, it is doubtful that slaves had easy access to legal help. Ultimately, the owner controlled the amount and the kind of power available to the slave. The societal fraternity of slave ownership put further limitations on the slave's place in society. No matter how much power the slave seems to exercise, he or she was always replaceable. In terms of kinship, even the youngest child of the nuclear family was more powerful than the slave was because the child was not as dispensable as the slave. The irony is that the Romans depended on the same but at the same time saw individual slaves as dispensable.

From the above discussion, one can see the irony and tension associated with the slave's power within the *familia*. All the power the slave exercised while being under ownership was unofficial. No amount of skill could guarantee the slave's place within the *familia*. Upon manumission, the limitless power the master had over the slave dissolved. The degree of autonomy increased with freedom. Although freed persons were socially inferior, they were under legal protection and were much better able to bring lawsuits against their patron for any violation. This is an important feature of manumission. Upon manumission, the realization that he or she was a full human opened a brand new world for the freed person. As the freed person gained the necessary skills and intelligence for living a free life, the fetters of his or her past would slowly disappear and a new life would slowly emerge. Social rebirth did not just come from a manumission contract, but also realized through a lifetime process. However, if the freed persons were not prudent with managing their finances, they could fall back into ruin. In the worst case, the re-enslaved person would fall into complete ruin and lose all legal rights. All the hard-earned power was lost. Therefore, the freed person would avoid re-enslavement at all cost.

Re-enslavement and adoption move in opposite directions on the social ladder. While re-enslavement involved degradation of personal identity, adoption involved elevation of personal identity. To prevent re-enslavement from occurring, the freed person should have as much *peculium* as possible upon manumission. However, there was no guarantee that the master would allow for

the whole sum of the *peculium* to depart with the freed person. In some cases, the freed person would have to use a good amount of the hard-earned *peculium* to pay for the manumission tax or to repay the owner the manumission price and, possibly, upkeep during enslavement (Ulpian *Dig.* 33.8.8.5). The best financial guarantee for a slave was to be adopted as an heir to a good family fortune. Adoption into an aristocratic family allowed the best social movement for the freed person. No wonder many of the aristocrats were quite jealous of the freed persons from Caesar's household. This upward mobility led to security for the slave and his descendants for generations to come. Furthermore, the freed man would now be able to start his own *familia* under patronage of the former owner's *familia*.

Chapter Three

THE APOLOGETIC USAGE OF THE SERVILE METAPHOR IN GALATIANS:

3.1 Paul's Self Description in Gal. 1.1, 10

3.1.1 Introductory Issues in Gal. 1.1, 10

Five issues deserve clarification in thinking about the slave metaphor in Gal. 1.1,10. Some of these issues can address the interpretive choices in the following sections. The first issue involves Gal. 1.1 which constitutes part of the preface of the letter. There are various theories as to what the function of the preface of a Pauline letter is. For instance, D. Cook sees the preface as setting the thematic tone for the rest of the letter.¹ R. N. Longenecker, while not dwelling on the preface, agrees with Cook's opinion and states that Paul was "highlighting, at the very beginning, the central themes of his letter."² This is an epistolographic and literary issue. Without going into a full survey of this large issue, it suffices to see that every verse from Gal. 1.1-5 contains a glimpse of the major themes of Galatians.³ There is even a hint of eschatological thought in relation to God's salvation history in Gal. 1.4, which proves to be an important concept later in Gal. 3-4.⁴ This eschatological theme not only proves to be important for later chapters, but it is also central to understanding the way Paul describes himself in Gal. 1.1, 10. Gal. 1.1, then, forms part of a very important preface, which can serve as a program for a good part of the letter. Its function is to illuminate the meaning of Gal. 1.10 and ultimately the interpretation of the surrounding context.

The second issue that deserves clarification is the question of how Gal. 1.10 relates to the surrounding material in Gal. 1. Martyn links Gal. 1.10 with Gal. 1.11 because he believes that it fits the rhetoric better. He perceives a contrast between the ministry of Paul's agitators, on the one hand, in Gal. 1.6-9 and, on

¹ See D. Cook, "The Prescript As Programme in Galatians," *JTS* 43 (1992), pp. 511-519, for a convincing argument for taking the prescript of Galatians as the interpretive paradigm for the rest of the letter.

² R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 2.

³ Verses 1-2 contain the writer and recipients, as is typical of letters. Verse 3 starts a formulaic statement with verses 4-5 containing 'something extra'. That extra attachment deals with later theme of redemption in God's salvation history.

⁴ D. Cook, p. 514, quotes A. Fridrichesen in classifying Paul as an 'eschatological' person called to a particular place at specific time for a special mission.

the other, the ministry of Paul in Gal. 1.11ff.⁵ However, Paul's ministry seems to be in constant contrast to that of his agitators throughout Gal. 1.6-10. The portrait of the agitators is often juxtaposed with Paul's self description at the beginning part of the letter (Gal. 1.7-8). Therefore, there is no reason to see Gal. 1.10 as the introduction of Gal. 1.11ff. Other interpreters include Gal. 1.10 with 1.6-9 because of the linkage of γάρ at the beginning of 1.10.⁶ In the light of the connection Paul established within Gal. 1.6-10, both by the γάρ and by the constant contrast, it is better to link Gal. 1.10 with 1.6-9. That said, the transitional force Martyn points out is legitimate as there are connecting points in the following verses as well.⁷ The discussion in the next sections will point out the connections as they reinforce the metaphor in Gal. 1.10.

The third issue that deserves clarification is closely related to the second issue. If Gal. 1.10 functions as a transition between Gal. 1.6-9 and 1.11ff, why are Gal. 1.1 and 1.10 related in this analysis? After all, the two verses are mere sentences apart. If Paul linked Gal. 1.10 to the preface, then Gal. 1.10 functions in more than one way. There are two justifications for relating Gal. 1.1 and 10. First, not only are the same themes repeated within the two verses, but also the words 'human', 'God', 'Christ' are all repeated and contrasted in a very similar manner. The order of the contrasts is also roughly the same. In both verses, Paul starts out with human beings or human and ends with either God or Christ. Overall, the two verses are also roughly referring to Paul's office and integrity. Second, Gal. 1.10 is unusually placed. Given the fact that Gal.1.10 is already in the main body of the letter, it is hard to imagine it being related so closely to the first sentence of the preface; however, it appears to be so. The rebuke and curse in Gal. 1.6-9 ends with a repetition of Paul's credentials. In Gal. 1.6-9, Paul deals indirectly with his opponents, while launching a full frontal assault on the Galatians, only to mention again his own mission at 1.10. Rather than making some fantastic structural link between Gal. 1.1 and 10, the easiest way to understand the odd placement of 1.10 is to combine it with 1.1. In Gal. 1.10 Paul addresses the same issues that occur throughout Gal. 1-2.

⁵ Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 139.

⁶ E.g. NASB; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 12.

⁷ Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 136, takes this view by cautiously considering this as a transition statement.

The fourth issue that requires attention is the way Gal. 1.10 discusses Paul's position. The verse itself causes some confusion among certain scholars. B. Witherington views the ἥ in Gal. 1.10 as copulative rather than disjunctive, thus implying that Paul was both trying to please humans through rhetoric and God through ministry.⁸ According to Witherington's view, the translation of Gal. 1.10 would be something like this, "For am I now seeking the favor of humans and of God? And am I striving to please humans? If I were still trying to please humans [only?], I would not be a bond-slave of Christ." This translation of the second part of the verse makes little sense because in it pleasing humans seems to be a direct contrast with, and not the same as, being a bond-slave of Christ.⁹ Paul seems to have preferred 'pleasing humans' to mean the same as 'not being a bond-slave of Christ'. Alternatively, one can take the second ἥ in Gal. 1.10 as disjunctive, with the first ἥ being copulative. The translation then becomes: For am I now seeking the favor of humans and of God, or am I striving to please humans [only]? If I were still trying to please humans, I would not be a bond-slave of Christ. However, the two "ἥ" being so closely related to each other prohibits the second translation from being a valid one. Both renderings of the rhetorical questions are unusual in the light of Paul's statement about himself in Gal. 1.1. If Paul had wanted to please humans, he would not have pronounced the curse twice in Gal. 1.8-9. The common disjunctive still holds for this verse.¹⁰ Also confusing is the way Paul called himself the 'bond-slave of Christ'. Similar language in 1 Cor. 9 prompted Martin to write *Slavery as Salvation*. Some of his ideas are helpful to gaining an understanding of Paul's words here. Furthermore, the combination of using Gal. 1.1 and 1.10 along with the eschatological theme in Gal. 1.4 may provide some answers to the third issue, as the discussion below will show.

The fifth issue, which is related to the third issue, addresses the question of the meaning of πείθω in Gal. 1.10 in the light of what Paul did. The meaning of πείθω addresses the question of how Gal. 1.10 contributes to Paul's argument. A

⁸ Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, p. 85.

⁹ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), pp. 394-396. The second-class condition of the answer seems to indicate that at no time was Paul trying to please humans, thus rejecting the fact that he tried to 'persuade' humans and God at the same time. The next paragraph deals with the translation of "persuade".

number of commentators have noticed that *πείθω* was used by Paul as a synonym for practicing rhetoric, when the context deals with human wisdom as opposed to God's truth (1 Cor. 2.4).¹¹ In the present tense, Paul only used it here and 2 Cor. 5.11. This makes the meaning of the slave metaphor in Gal. 1.10 richer still. One must distinguish here between the negative 'sophistic' rhetoric despised by the Romans and the general practice of rhetoric in literary or oral communication. Paul was referring to the former. Being a slave or bondservant of Christ is the opposite of *ἀνθρώπους πείθω*. If *ἀνθρώπους πείθω* means to practice rhetoric, or worse yet sophistry, then Paul's slavery to Christ is the opposite of that. In 2 Cor. 5.11, Paul thought of persuasion as an instrument for truth as something positive. The main goal of rhetoric is persuasion through pleasing speech. This is why many commentators and Bible translators understand it to mean 'to please'.¹²

Here, Paul was trying to defend his own motives for his ministry, as he set himself up as the prototype of Christ's faithful servant.¹³ Paul was neither trying to defend himself against the accusation of magical persuasion of the gods nor was he trying to persuade God but was seeking to either please humans or God.¹⁴ In addition to the issues already mentioned in the last paragraphs, the context of the passage demands that there are two antithetical pairs of rhetorical questions. If the antithesis is taken out of the first rhetorical question, the parallel ceases to exist. The common interpretation of either seeking approval of God or human still holds.¹⁵

3.1.2 Literary Context of the Gal. 1.1, 10 Metaphor

Having looked at the exegetical issues related to Gal. 1.1,10, it is important to see how these two verses create a slave metaphor. Since it is impossible to take Paul as a literal Greco-Roman slave because he was able to move about freely without constraint, it is appropriate to think that the slavery Paul was referring to was a different kind of slavery to that of the Greco-Roman's. The *phoros*, then, plainly

¹⁰ E.g. R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 18, Betz, *Galatians*, p. 55, NASB, NIV etc.

¹¹ Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 145; Betz, *Galatians*, p. 54n103.

¹² Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 46; RSV etc.

¹³ It is hard to say whether Paul was trying to set himself up as a positive example while casting a polemical stone at his agitators as pleasing humans. In the light of the verses following, it is probably more likely that Paul was defending himself and Gal. 1.10 acts as a transition to a defense.

¹⁴ See Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 140 and Betz, *Galatians*, p. 55n106.

¹⁵ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 18; Burton, *Galatians*, p. 30. So NIV, NASB, NRSV.

shows Paul to be a slave. Forthcoming discussion in section 3.1.3 may add to an understanding of the kind of slavery Paul referred to. Thus, it is sufficient to note here that the slave idea is a metaphor in Gal. 1.1, 10.

Considerable debates have flooded the scholarly arena regarding the rhetorical function of Galatians, and more specifically, Gal. 1-2. These debates are inspired by the autobiographical section of these two chapters of Galatians. No student of Galatians can overlook the uniqueness of these two chapters which provide a rare glimpse into Paul's early life. These two chapters cause those interested in the literary aspect of Galatians to think about the rhetorical function of Paul's autobiographical sketch. From scholarly discussions, the consensus recognizes that ancient authors often shaped their autobiographical information according to their rhetorical purpose (Quin. 4.2.40; *Her.* 1.9.16).¹⁶

From the discussions on classical rhetoric, there is a tendency to classify Paul's rhetorical purposes in three categories: polemical, didactic or apologetic. Which of the three does Gal. 1-2 belong to? From the context of Gal. 1-2, there is strong evidence that the first two chapters are apologetic.¹⁷ Indeed, the apologetic tone appears right from the start. If one suspects that Gal. 1.1a is apologetic, the defensive tone of Gal. 1.10 confirms that suspicion.¹⁸ B. R. Gaventa also notes that Gal. 1.10b could be contrasted with the Galatians

¹⁶ R. G. Hall, "Historical Inference and Rhetorical Effect," in D. F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry* (JSNTSup, 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), pp. 310-311. Hall notes plausibility as the major editing criterion for autobiographical narration in a letter. However, it is probably equally important to see plausibility in terms of the argument of the letter itself.

¹⁷ This interpretive instinct dominates many commentaries. One only needs to look at how interpreters divide the book to see this. B. R. Gaventa, "Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as a Paradigm," *NovT* 28 (1986), p. 313, differs by stating, "Paul employs events out of his past, ... to urge that same exclusive claim on Christians in Galatia." This then, meets "the overall exhortative goal of this letter."

¹⁸ Gal. 1.10 seems a bit abrupt by its "emotional tone" in comparison with the preceding verses which causes confusion among many commentators. That is probably why Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 136, starts a new section at Gal. 1.10. Some interpreters claim apologetic while others see Paul's personal example in the main thrust of Gal. 1.10. For a survey of opinions, see R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 18. G. Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 112-121, downplays the apologetic expressions of Paul's autobiography. Following Lyons' lead, G. W. Hansen, "A Paradigm of the Apocalypse: The Gospel in the Light of Epistolary Analysis," in L. A. Jervis and P. Richardson, *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans* (FS R. N. Longenecker; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), p. 199, tries to see Paul's story functioning in a similar manner to Abraham's. Hansen wants to see Paul's story as a conversion testimony. The apologetics cannot be excluded even if the personal paradigm and conversion testimony is true. Right from the beginning, (Gal. 1.1), Paul's authority is in question. The assumption of apologetics fits perfectly such a rhetorical situation.

themselves who were pleasing human beings.¹⁹ Paul's reversal of conviction in Gal. 1.11ff, according to Gaventa, is the model for the Galatians themselves.²⁰ While her idea is plausible, it is hard to claim that the Galatians were equally zealous for the Law as Paul's former self was in Gal. 1.11ff. The Galatians seem more confused than zealous for the teaching of the agitators. Nevertheless, Gaventa's observation of the 'reversal' of Paul's conversion remains true. In fact, the two following verses also repeat some of the same words to remind the audience of Paul's apologetic purpose.

In the context of Gal. 1.1-10, Gal. 1.1 is not directly relevant to Paul's argument, unless Gal. 1.10 is taken into account. The two verses seem to echo one another. For the most part, Paul's focus in Gal. 1.1-10 is on the gospel, but there is also a strong hint of defense for his own apostleship in Gal. 1.1, 10.²¹ Otherwise, why is there a need to repeat the content of Gal. 1.1 in 1.10? However, Gaventa states, "[what is not important is] Paul's own credibility but 'freedom in Christ Jesus' (2.4) and proclamation among the Gentiles (2.7-9)."²² Contrary to Gaventa's claim, Paul's credibility is as important as the gospel because it affects how this gospel is received which is why the apologetic is more of a means rather than an end. Apologetic and personal example are mutually complementary and not exclusive. Within Gal. 1.1-10, verses 1 and 10 stand out in creating a thematically parallel structure. Both depict the person of Paul, while the verses in between are about the gospel. Paul quite possibly used Gal. 1.10 as a reminder of Gal. 1.1a. Much of the argument is similar to that of Gal. 1.1a, with the addition of Paul's claim that he was the δούλος of Christ. The thrice-repeated ἀνθρώπ- provides the contrast against τὸν θεόν and Χριστοῦ. Here, Paul equated seeking the favor of humans with pleasing humans, and seeking the favor of God with serving Christ. The phrasing in Gal. 1.10 indicates that the idea of pleasing humans, ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, is diametrically opposed to being a slave of Christ, Χριστοῦ δούλος.

¹⁹ B. R. Gaventa, "Galatians 1 and 2," p. 314.

²⁰ Gaventa, pp. 314-316.

²¹ It is hard to agree with Sumney, "*Servants of Satan*", "*False Brothers*" and *Other Opponents of Paul*, p. 157, that the agitators did not question or undermine Paul's authority at all. On the contrary, if the explicit claim of Gal. 6.17 is taken seriously, Paul certainly perceived a trespass or at least a questioning of his authority.

In looking for parallels, the reader probably expects Paul to use pleasing God in contrast to pleasing humans. The missing parallelism is hidden in or, better yet, replaced by the strong emphasis on the Lordship of Christ over Paul's mission. The narrower frame for the metaphorical picture Paul painted is in Gal. 1.1-10 with Paul being the subject described. In Gal. 1.10, two opposite categories describe people: the servant or slave of Christ with which Paul classifies himself, and the opposite ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον with which Paul classifies his opponents. Because of the parallel structure of this verse, there is a contrasting relationship between being a slave of Christ and ἀνθρώπους πείθω. Basically, there are two parallel sets of contrast. Ἀνθρώπους πείθω contrasts with τὸν θεόν [πείθω], while ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον contrasts with Χριστοῦ δοῦλος. Based on the context of his rebuke in Gal. 1.6-9, there are two kinds of gospel. There is the gospel of Christ (Gal. 1.7) and there is the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον. The implications, which become clear in Gal. 6.12, are that Paul's agitators were trying to please humans and their actions were ἀνάθεμα. Therefore, the idea of pleasing humans may have something to do with the content of the proclamation or the message.

Apart from the structural parallelism between Gal. 1.1 and 1.10, the passage consistently applies the slave metaphor by the use of the image of the prophet in Gal. 1.15. This brings to mind the relationship between the slave/servant of God and the classical biblical prophet or national heroes (Gen. 26.24; Ex. 14.13; Nu. 12.7; Jgs. 2.8; 2 S. 3.18; 2 K. 9.7; 2 Ch. 32.16 Isa. 45.4; Ezk. 28.25 etc.).²³

²² Gaventa, "Galatians 1 and 2," p. 317. To be fair, Gaventa does see a defense in some of Gal. 1 and 2 (pp. 319-320). She mainly sees the section as having exhortative power.

²³ So G. Sass, "Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus," *ZNW* 40 (1941), pp. 30-31, and G. Ebeling, *The Truth of the Gospel* (trans. D. Green; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), p. 9. Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, pp. 78-82, points out the traditional two meanings of self-enslavement in Paul. First, Paul could find the parallel with the Hebrew prophets. Second, as D. B. Martin claims, Paul could use the imagery of the manager slave in the Greco-Roman world. Combes' criticism of the interpretation of Paul using a title to bring honor to himself is unjustified. His rationale is that Paul deemed the believers as slaves, thereby causing confusion between his self-description and the description of Christian believers. Paul used similar words to describe both but both did not mean the same thing. In the case of Gal. 1.10 and its subsequent context, one has to link the prophetic language with Paul's special place in slavery. In the case of the overall apologetics, this authoritative metaphor is certainly remarkable from his ordinary assessment of the believer. Though this might be a minor point, Paul only used the 'title' to describe himself and not the believers. Combes uses many examples of slavery of the believers to Christ but fails to come up with a similar title Χριστοῦ δοῦλος or δοῦλος Χριστοῦ as a description for general believers. The peculiar fact indicates the difference between Paul's self-understanding and his understanding of other believers.

Paul's wording sounds like a description of biblical prophets. This aspect of the religious relationship between God and his servant/slave refers to the authority of the master being exercised through the agency of his slave. Gal. 1.15-16 is especially emphatic in bringing out, on the one hand, the importance of the divine authority Paul received, and on the other, the eschatological position Paul occupied. This passage notably contains prophetic allusions to Jer. 1.5 and Isa. 49. 1,5.²⁴ By linking this allusion further with the formulaic introduction of the theme in 1.1b-5, one can see the eschatological aspect that connects Paul's ministry with the new age of the Messiah.²⁵ At different junctures of Israel's history, important people have served as prophets (e.g. Dt. 18.15-22; 34.10-12; T. Lev. 5.1-2; 1 En. 81; Jub. 23.32; Mk. 9.12-13; Lk. 7.16-28; Jn. 1.21): Jesus served God as the prophet and Messiah in the new age, and Paul saw himself as the continuity of a similar prophetic ministry in the formation of the church (Gal. 1.1a). Paul here assumed a dual role of both apostle (Gal. 1.1) and prophet, within his scheme of realized eschatology (Gal. 1.1b-5).²⁶ With this prophetic echo, Gal. 1.1 and 1.10 provide the preparatory stage to Paul's argument on his own authority and role in bringing about changes in the new age.²⁷ Because his message depended entirely on the integrity of his person, Paul was eager to give a detailed account of his dealings with Jerusalem.

3.1.3 Cultural Context of the Gal. 1.1, 10 Metaphor

When one looks at the background to the slave motif in Gal. 1.1,10, there is clear evidence of an individual being an agent of the master. Based on Old Testament teachings, the prophetic office is often an equivalent of being God's servant. As a

²⁴ See K. O. Sandnes, *Paul - One of the Prophets?* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990) and F. Mussner, *Galaterbrief* (HThK, 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1977), pp. 81-82.

²⁵ Besides an obvious allusion to the prophetic passages in Gal. 1.15, the special prophetic word ἀποκάλυψις and its cognates have repeated themselves throughout the early parts of Paul's narrative (Gal. 2.2). There is every reason to see the linkage between Paul's prophetic portrait and the revelation associated with it.

²⁶ D. Cook, p. 514. The echoes are not just repetition but they bring out three different aspects of Paul's position and ministry. First, Gal. 1.12 shows that Jesus was revealed to Paul. Second, if one were to take ἐν to be instrumental, Gal. 1.16 shows that Jesus was also revealed through Paul to others. Third, Gal. 2.2 shows Paul to be a further recipient of divine revelation as in the prophetic sense.

²⁷ It is futile to speculate as does R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "Sacred Violence and the Curse of the Law (Gal. 3.31): The Death of Christ as a Sacrificial Travesty," *NTS* 36 (1990), p. 100, on the possibility of self-doubt in Paul in the pre-conversion days. No one can be sure of Paul's spiritual and psychological state from his writings. G. S. Duncan, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatian*

result of the combined development of Israelite laws and tradition on slavery, and the specific theological relationship between God and His people, the title of being a slave to God was conferred on individuals who contributed significantly to Israel's religious history. In Israel's history, this title of honor was conferred upon its patriarch Abraham (Gen. 26.24), its national leaders, Moses and David (Num. 12.8; 2 Sam. 3.18), its prophet, Elijah (1 Kgs. 18.36), and even a foreign ruler, Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. 25.9).

In addition to individuals being God's slaves in the Old Testament, corporate Israel was often considered to be God's servant (Lev. 25.42). This religious relationship is in contrast with slavery in Egypt (Dt. 15.15). In the context of Dt. 15, Israel who was originally the slaves of Israel had been redeemed by God who became her new master. Hence, God allowed Israel to continue enslaving Jews only on a voluntary basis (Dt. 15.16-17). The theological context of redemption from Egypt is in juxtaposition with the practice of Jew being slave to Jew. The writer of Dt. 15 maintained a tension between the literal and metaphorical usage of slavery and redemption. The text may be communicating more than legal stipulations. Dt. 15 makes a connection between voluntary slavery and Israel's new role under the divine 'master' YHWH. The reason given for voluntary slavery is *כִּי אֱהָבָה וְאָחֵב בְּיָדְךָ* (Dt. 15.16). Whether the idea of slavery is applied to individual Jews or corporate Israel, the title of honor came with the power to make divinely ordained changes in this world.

According to the evidence in Greco-Roman writings, being a servant of a god is not exclusively Jewish, but also Roman. To be a slave to a god or goddess was to be the agent of divine work. In essence, such a person was not living a drastically different life as a slave to that in his former existence, but now could legally act as the master's agent. Whatever one makes of the parable of the 'shrewd' steward in Lk. 16.5, the steward, who was most likely a freed person or even a slave, was certainly acting on behalf of the master. As previously stated, when the master granted manumission to the slave in the Greco-Roman *familia*, the slave would continue working in the same household due to various personal reasons. In other words, many freed persons continued doing the same tasks and

(London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934), p. 20, insists that Gal. 1.10 connects better with Gal. 1.1-9. However, it is hard to deny the connection with the verses following.

living in the same household. One needs to look no further than Cicero's relationship with his beloved freedman Tiro to see how a good relationship between the patron and client could result in a continuation of employment and residence in the patron's house (*Fam.* 16). Furthermore, the reciprocal relationship characteristic of Roman society often describes the human-divine relationship, in the Greco-Roman tradition (*Sen. Ben.* 2.30.2-2; *Cic. Planc.* 80; *Philo Plant.* 126-131; Pausanias 1.40-2-3). Often, service was a result of gratitude for divine deliverance (*Philo Spec. leg.* 1.195, 283).²⁸ Gratitude expressed in reciprocal deeds was an important ingredient in maintaining relationships between the client and the patron. Such an expression was natural and was within the call of duty of the client. In other words, the client's services were not something extra, but rather a natural reaction. No self-respecting Roman would think otherwise (*Cic. Off.* 1.47).

Because of the patron-client relationship, many freed persons were still identified with the household from which they were manumitted. A large number of tombstones and letters testify to this fact. One needs to look no further than Paul's own letters to see how the master's household had social control over its members and those associated with them, whether formally or informally (*Rom.* 16.11; *Philemon* 2).²⁹

3.1.4 Meaning of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 1.1, 10

Paul's description of himself as a slave may seem like hyperbole to the modern reader.³⁰ Nevertheless, his idea was not too distant from that of his Greco-Roman counterparts. Gal. 1.10 deals partly with Paul's total devotion to Jesus and God which resulted from his gratitude for receiving his new revelation. It is important at this point to see why Paul considered himself a voluntary slave to Jesus. There

²⁸ One only needs to look at the number of votive gifts found in ancient sites to realize this fact. For a catalogue of votive body parts, see F. T. van Straten, "Gifts for the Gods" in H. S. Versnel (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), pp. 105-151.

²⁹ Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*, p. 45, claims "Chloe's people" to be slaves (1 Cor. 1.11). One cannot discount the possibility of these being freed persons.

³⁰ See H. W. Pleket, "Religious History as the History of Mentality" in H. S. Versnel (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship* pp. 166-171. Pleket presents a list of epigraphic evidence on someone being a δούλος of a god or goddess. Such a social and religious convention of gratitude seems normal enough among the commoners. Along with the predominant image of Jesus as Lord in Paul, the imagery of being both a freedman and a slave to Christ fits perfectly the Greco-Roman religious vocabulary.

are three interpretive options, based on Greco-Roman and Jewish background: first, Paul could have become a voluntary slave out of a sense of patronage to Jesus; second, Paul could have been repaying a debt as a voluntary slave would in his day; third, Paul could have felt that he was God's eschatological prophet. D. B. Martin rightly notices that the concept of being Christ's slave was common in the early church.³¹ However, it is hard to justify his claim regarding the pervasiveness of the upwardly mobile slave. Though the idea of competition with certain opposing forces is there in the Pauline text, the competition for authority lies elsewhere (Gal. 1.1, 6-9; 5.12; 6.12), and slavery did not result in salvation. One can even concede that there are occurrences of managerial slaves in the New Testament, but this is far from representative of the entire tradition of the early church in relation to slavery to Christ.³² In Paul's immediate context, there seems to be no indication of forced re-enslavement. Therefore, the title he used for himself is that of religious piety both in the Greco-Roman and Jewish world.

Perhaps the whole concept of being Christ's slave is more obvious than the subtle sociological thesis of Martin implies. One of the most common designations for Jesus in the early church, especially in Paul, is the word 'Lord'.³³ The mere fact that Jesus was called 'Lord' and that the words Lord and Jesus were used interchangeably points to either the patron-client or the master-slave relationship. The background to this could have been Greco-Roman, but not necessarily in the way Martin suggests. It is more than likely that the Christian community saw itself as a client-community to the Lord Jesus.³⁴ Another

³¹ Martin, *Slavery as Salvation*, p. 52. See also critique by M. Harris, *Slave of Christ* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1999).

³² Martin, *Slavery*, p. 52, uses Matt. 21.33-41 to justify his claim that Paul was an upwardly mobile slave. However, the gist of Matt. 21.33-41 is not about being a slave to Christ. He also uses Acts 16.17 as an example; however, the contrast there for Luke is not sociological, but theological (p.53). The contrast is about being a slave to the Pythian god or to the most high God. The conflict is between the forces of evil and good. There is no explicit definition of the meaning of being the 'servant of God/slave of God'. One can grant that the title denotes an agency through which God worked, namely the apostleship of Paul. Thus, the most one can say is that the "servant of God" is a title of apostolic authority. However, Martin is going too far here in seeing an explicit allusion to the managerial slave that is upwardly motivated. Being faithful is a good sign of a managerial slave, but not necessarily good for personal upward mobility in the Greco-Roman sense.

³³ For an example, see *New Docs.* 2 (1982), p. 54n5, which shows the Christian epitaph of "slave of God" in Ankara.

³⁴ J. Nicols, "*Tabulae Patronatus: A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community*," pp. 533-561, shows that an entire community could be a client community under a

possible cause is the parallel between the Lordship of God with Israel in the Old Testament and the Lordship of Christ with the church in the New Testament, which denotes a covenant relationship. However, Paul's description of the church in Galatians is not a parallel to the Israel of old. Furthermore, Paul's description of himself implies that he occupied a special place above his fellow believers. There is no suggestion in Galatians of a patron-client obligation put on Paul by Jesus. Rather, the text uses the language of commission for a special mission. At the same time, Paul's metaphor is about a radical dedication to a master who has the right to demand absolute obedience. Paul's additional comment about his ministerial profession provides an introduction to the next verses as well as a conclusion to Gal. 1.1 and it addresses the charge that Paul was pleasing humans by advocating an 'easier' gospel for the gentiles. Gal. 1.10 not only echoes the earlier Gal. 1.1a but also introduces an additional metaphor which explains what Gal. 1.1 meant to Paul.

Because Gal. 1.10 sheds light on Gal. 1.1, it is important to understand the slave metaphor clearly in Gal. 1.10. So, if Paul was not practicing rhetoric to please humans, what exactly does Gal. 1.10 reveal about Paul's ministry? The context of Gal. 1.6-9 is related to Paul's gospel message and ministry. The message reveals both the aim and the character of the messenger. Paul used rhetoric to please Christ by converting gentiles, but not with an aim to make them happy. Therefore, the exact meaning of enslavement to Christ is that Paul's ministry, or his words, were under the direct control of Christ. His mission was to become the prophet of Christ's new age. Although he saw himself in a 'prophetic' role, "Paul was not a prophet in the sense that Jeremiah was, and he could not appeal in the same way to the verdict of coming days; but he could in another fashion make the fulfillment of his message the criterion of its validity."³⁵ As he saw Jesus as the fulfillment of God's promise, Paul completely re-evaluated his beliefs. He dedicated his every word, and, ultimately, his entire ministry to Christ's cause.

patron. Of course, Nicols' source is recorded tablets and probably not all client-communities were recorded.

³⁵ F. F. Bruce, "Further Thoughts on Paul's Autobiography," in E. E. Ellis and E. Grasser (eds.), *Jesus und Paulus* (FS W. G. Kummel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).

3.1.5 Rhetorical Function of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 1.1, 10

By invoking the divine, Paul sought to place his own authority beyond argument. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca categorize this kind of allusion as an argument from authority, which is a common form of argumentation in Gal. 1-2, and is a common strategy of Gal. 1.1 and 1.10.³⁶ The obvious implication of Paul's strategy is that he dedicated the early portion of Galatians to apologetics.³⁷ As a result of looking at the literary context, it is clear that the verses surrounding the allusion in Gal. 1.15 are also important. When the agitators accused Paul of being a false prophet, Paul used the prophetic language from the Old Testament to counter such rumors.³⁸ What is certain is that Paul's choice of vocabulary in relation to being a slave to Christ denotes power rather than weakness. Therefore, the slave imagery in Gal. 1.10 was a powerful rather than a subservient one, where the legal and social conventions of slavery merge with religion.

What then is the exact rhetorical function of the slave metaphor in Gal. 1.10? There are two possible answers to his question. First, Paul could have been directly identifying with Christ.³⁹ This first possibility of metaphorical identification usually comes in the form of identification with a known metaphor. Such identification can serve as a starting point for the argument that follows.⁴⁰ Second, Paul could have been using hyperbolic imagery to show his definite allegiance to Christ.⁴¹ Hyperbolic usage happens when an author wants to use exaggeration to bring out an important and unusual idea. Here hyperbolic

³⁶ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, pp. 305-310.

³⁷ Contra J. D. Hester, "The Presence of Epideictic in Galatians 1-2" in D. F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry* (JSNTSup. 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), pp.296-307, who claims the autobiographical section to be an example of epideictic rhetoric. He draws this conclusion from the epilogue of Gal. 2.15-21, thereafter classifying it as a chreia elaboration. However, as 'exemplary' as Gal. 2.15-21 is for any Galatian, nowhere in Gal. 1-2 did Paul "explicitly" exhort the Galatians to be like him in Gal. 1-2. Hester argues that the comparison in Gal. 2.1-14 shows Paul's integrity, which should lead to an interpretation of an apologetic nature. Hester's claim that the letter is epideictic or blaming in nature is not relevant in Gal. 1-2, except perhaps in the introduction. Much of the evidence is implicit and relies on forms in rhetorical handbooks. R. G. Hall's claim is probably correct, "The goal of narration is not to instruct but to persuade (Quint. 4.2.21)." See R. G. Hall, "Historical Inference and Rhetorical Effect: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2" in *Persuasive Artistry*, p. 310. Paul was not so much blaming or instructing but was persuading his audience to take his side through his defenses.

³⁸ So K. O. Sandnes, *Paul - One of the Prophets?*, pp. 56, 58; 66-68. In addition to invoking the divine, Paul also used a disclosure formula ἠκούσατε in Gal. 1.13 as a reminder of the Galatians' previous knowledge about Paul's call.

³⁹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402.

⁴⁰ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca., p. 402.

⁴¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 403.

imagery acts as a vehicle or *phoros* to carry the theme of commitment in Paul's message. The surrounding context also provides a contrast to this hyperbolic imagery to show to whom Paul's life and ministry was committed. Apart from the unusual metaphor in Gal. 1.10 itself, the verses immediately following also point to the message this hyperbole was carrying, describing the prophetic office under which Paul ministered. Since Paul's usage of personal slavery is rare in comparison to other usages of slave metaphors, hyperbolic imagery could have been a vehicle for his apologetics. The metaphor then ultimately was not just about commitment, as the context indicates; it uses the theme of commitment to talk about the real message, which is Paul's apologetic for his mission. To use the terminology of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, the fusion of slavery and the theme of commitment create an apologetic message. The theme here is Paul's commitment to his Lord, and the *phoros* is the commitment of a slave to the master. The backing for Paul's authority comes from the power he gains as a result of his obedience to his master/Lord. He was both a powerful and obedient slave with the unique authority of Christ. The abruptness of going back to talk about himself in Gal. 1.10 highlights the importance of his ministerial allegiance. Because of the possible rarity of this metaphor in application to Paul, one can see how Paul strategically placed the hyperbolic metaphor to highlight his role in the early church mission. Apart from its logical effect and placement, the hyperbolic usage here has an emotive effect.

Several factors decide whether Paul was using a hyperbolic or an identification metaphor. First, one has to decide whether Paul was saying something incredibly unusual in Gal. 1.10. For his usage to be unusual, it has to be beyond Paul's normal usage of the slave metaphor. The only other clear usage is 1 Cor. 9. This does not necessarily make Paul's metaphor impossible, but it certainly makes it unusual. Second, one must decide whether Paul's usage introduces any of the subsequent ideas. If the subsequent ideas are not linked with Paul's metaphor, one can discount the possibility of a hyperbolic metaphor as a metaphoric category in Gal. 1.10.

Within the literary structure of Gal. 1.6-10, there is a pattern of binary thinking. This thinking comes in terms of good versus bad, acceptable versus unacceptable, blessing versus curse, and divine versus human. In seeking to

defend his own actions, Paul portrayed his agitators as bad, unacceptable, cursed and groveling human-pleasers. Paul's dichotomies culminate in his slave metaphor in Gal. 1.10. The function of Gal. 1.10 is to sum up the binary thinking of Gal. 1.6-10. Here Paul was not only presenting himself as the bond-slave of Christ, but he was also defending his honor against a possible attack on the intention of his mission. To Paul, the agitators were defaming him. Worse yet, Paul portrayed these Law-keepers in latter chapters as exploiters of the Galatians (Gal. 6.12-13).⁴² In the context of Paul's attack of the agitators in Gal. 1.6-9, Paul's self-portrait in Gal. 1.10 is no doubt polemical. Thus, the polemical function of such a metaphor is never far away, whether one sees Paul as using himself as an example or not.⁴³

The evidence inside and outside the text seems to allow for both polemics and apologetics. Paul used an identification metaphor not only to relate loosely to his apologetic statement in Gal. 1.1, but also to summarize Gal. 1.6-10, and to introduce the verses following. Since Gal. 1.10 has an introductory function, it acts as a hyperbolic metaphor to draw attention to the kind of mission Paul was conducting. Whether the usage of the slave metaphor in Gal. 1.10 resembles the Hebrew or Greco-Roman ideals or not, it certainly fits the subsequent passage. As the Old Testament background demonstrates, the verses with prophetic allusion work well with the slave metaphors of Gal. 1.10. Therefore, the rhetorical function of the identification metaphor is to demonstrate Paul's identity with his master, Jesus, as well as drawing attention to his divinely ordained mission in the subsequent passage (Gal. 1.11-16). It is clear from Paul's rhetorical usage of the metaphor, that undermining Paul's authority is the same as trespassing against his "Lord Jesus" and going against God's will (Gal. 1.3).

⁴² This is not suggesting that there is a unified code of Law by the first century. However, people actively carried on debates on both the written and oral Torah. Opinions were diverse but all practicing Jews agreed on the importance of Law-keeping. See P. A. Alexander, "Jewish law in the time of Jesus: towards a clarification of the problem," in B. Lindars (ed.), *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (Cambridge: James Clark & Co. 1988), pp. 44-58.

⁴³ Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, p. 114, proposes that Paul used himself as a paradigm of one living under grace. Based on the surrounding concepts, one can hardly see Paul as an example of grace. His consultation trips are not about living as one under grace but one under scrutiny of the mother church. Theologically, there is no doubt that Paul probably saw himself as the paradigm of God's grace but this does not seem to be the function of his discussion at the end of Gal. 1. It is possible that Paul was presenting himself as a paradigm of the supreme missionary.

3.2 Paul's Self Description in Gal. 6.17

3.2.1 Introductory Issues in Gal. 6.17

There are two broad issues which need to be considered when it comes to the metaphor of Gal. 6.17: the function of the last section of the letter, and the function as well as the meaning of Gal. 6.17. First, because Gal. 6.17 is at the end of the letter, one needs to consider the function of the ending of Paul's letters. In ancient letter writing, the postscript is often added by the author to indicate his personal involvement in the letter writing, even though letters were often dictated. J. A. D. Weima's *Neglected Endings* explores the function of an ending in a Pauline letter and points out the importance of such a study.⁴⁴ He cites Pauline examples to prove his point. Similarly, there is a functional coherence in Gal. 6.12-18. If E. R. Richards and Weima are correct, then Gal. 6.12-18 is a summary of the major ideas of the letter, and thus form the frame for the expression in Gal. 6.17 with Paul being the subject.⁴⁵ R. N. Longenecker sees Gal. 6.17 as a concluding personal remark in the same way 5.12 is to 5.1-11.⁴⁶ Whether it is personal or not, the whole epilogue is a summary, such as is often found in the conclusion of some ancient letters.⁴⁷ If Paul's letter is personal, then it is logical to conclude that this remark is personal. Its possible link with the metaphor of Gal. 1.10 shows a thematic consistency.

There is yet another issue one must deal with in order to understand the possible metaphor of Gal. 6.17. The 'marks' in Gal. 6.17 can be interpreted variously. Taken at face value, the metaphor seems to show someone under re-enslavement. Since there is no indication of branding or tattoo in Paul's letters, one must take this kind of saying to be a metaphor pointing to something else. This is where the confusion lies because re-enslavement with a brand mark is a sign of shame and not honor. Yet, Paul used that language to describe himself. Thus, one puzzling aspect would be the function of such a meaning. Did it give

⁴⁴ J. A. D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (JSNTSup, 101; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

⁴⁵ E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 42; Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), p. 90. Sim. G. A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), p. 151. See also Weima, *Neglected Endings* and O. Roller, *Δασ Φορμυλαρ δερ Παυλινισχηεν Βριεφε: Ειν Βειτραγ ζυρ Λεηρ πομ Αντικεν Βριεφ* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933).

⁴⁶ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 299.

Paul honor or shame?

Another problem comes when one looks at whether Paul was talking about some real mark or metaphorical suffering which connects him to the service of Christ. One clue may be how Paul probably used *βαστάζω* and *ἐν τῷ σώματί μου* in his letters. Here the question becomes whether Paul had physical marks which the Galatians viewed as the proof of his suffering for Christ. Another alternative would be some kind of chronic illness which afflicted Paul, at his writing to indicate his suffering for Christ (e.g. 2 Cor. 12.7-10?).

One final issue is the function of Gal. 6.17. Was Paul defending himself or portraying himself as a paradigm of Christian service? As in Gal. 1-2, if only the context can tell, the two are entirely exclusive of each other. The meaning can give some indication of what Paul meant, but not necessarily what he aimed to achieve. The solution to these questions will affect the outcome of the meaning of Gal. 6.17.

3.2.2 Literary Context of the Gal. 6.17 Metaphor

As the previous discussion points out, Gal. 6.17 is a concluding remark in a summary section, and hence, the question arises, what exactly does Gal. 6.17 summarize? The postscript serves to remind the audience of what has been said. In this summary, Paul provided a contrast between his agitators' position (Gal. 6.12-13) and his own position (Gal. 6.14). Then, he formulated ideas for the Galatians to apply (Gal. 6.15-16). In the light of the summary function of Gal. 6, Gal. 6.17 seems very abrupt. The connection is not immediately clear between Gal. 6.17 and the previous verses. Within the content of the summary in Gal. 6, the ideas in 6.17 do not fit well. Prior to Gal. 6.17, Paul had just finished talking about circumcision in his summary, and concluded with the rule of living: circumcision should mean nothing for the Galatians, the new creation was the essence of God's work. That said, Paul very likely considered his mark of slavery to be much more important than the agitators' circumcision.⁴⁸ Before the writing of the letter to the Galatians, the agitators' claim was that Paul's marks were a disapproval from God while their doctrine of circumcision was supreme which is why Paul warned against defaming his character in Gal. 6.17. Therefore, Gal.

⁴⁷ G. J. Bahr, "The Subscriptions in the Pauline Letters," *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 27-41.

⁴⁸ Duncan, p. 193.

6.17 corresponds with the apologetic tone at the beginning of the letter. The reason why some interpreters may want to fully classify Galatians as an apologetic letter is because its prescript and postscript certainly give that impression. The question remains, “Did Paul’s body actually show some kind of marks from Christ?” This is not an easy question to answer, as subsequent discussions show.

3.2.3 Cultural Context of the Gal. 6.17 Metaphor

If Paul was giving an indication of his own authoritative position as the powerful slave of Christ, the details in Gal. 6.17 seem irreconcilable because of the general disgrace of the imagery he used. What can one make of τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, in the light of the pride Paul felt in his authority from his master in Gal. 1.1 and 10? Under the *lex Aelia Sentia* in 4 CE, branded slaves, rightly or wrongly, carried the mark as the lowest status symbol among the free people.⁴⁹ Additional information from Martial’s Epigrams confirms the prevalence of this practice (2.29; 3.21; 8.75; 10.56). No one can easily give a satisfactory answer other than the fact that Paul could sometimes be prone to overstate his hyperbole in his rhetoric.⁵⁰ C. P. Jones is helpful in regarding Paul’s marks as a metaphorical description of his own ill treatment at the hand of persecutors.⁵¹ Furthermore, Jones makes a case from Petronius (*Sat.* 103.1-5; 105.11-106.1, a Latin source), Herodas (5.65f-67, 77-79, a Greek source) and many other sources for thinking about τὰ στίγματα, or any of the cognates of ‘stigma’, in terms of tattooing rather than branding. Others have suggested religious tattooing.⁵² On the balance of evidence in terms of the cultural usage of this word, the meaning of τὰ στίγματα must involve slavery. In the light of Paul’s claim in Gal. 1.10, the slave metaphor is not an unreasonable assumption. Usage of such a word conjures up imagery of slavery, even though the possible physical suffering is in view. Whatever physical suffering the word is describing, both tattooing and branding on slaves were forms of degrading punishment in Paul’s time (Val. Max. 6.8.7; Mart. 3.21; Cass. Dio 47.10.4-5). The ‘barbarians’ often practiced tattooing for decoration,

⁴⁹ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 118. C. P. Jones, “*Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*,” *JRS* 77 (1987), p. 139-155.

⁵⁰ Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, p. 454.

⁵¹ C. P. Jones, “*Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*,” p. 150.

⁵² Betz, *Galatians*, p. 324n126.

and for identification of slaves. For the Romans, tattooing was definitely for penal purposes, especially for runaway slaves (Quint. 7.4.14). Because Paul did not explain himself, the Galatians must have known about these marks from seeing Paul's illness on the initial mission (Gal. 4.13-14).⁵³ This was probably one of those times when he mixed his metaphor from that of honor to that of shame, without the necessary explanation or harmonization. Thus, there is no precise and specific answer to the exact meaning of the metaphor of servile markings.⁵⁴ However, the fusion of the *phoros* and theme certainly makes this remark a metaphor. The theme of Paul's physical suffering is analogous to the *phoros* of the slave's branding or tattoo. While the world sees this as shame, Paul consider it an honor for the sake of Christ.

3.2.4 Meaning of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 6.17

While some meanings are quite clear when it comes to looking at Paul's description of himself as God's slave, Gal. 6.17 seems odd. Based on the fact that Paul's reference to himself is often a defense against a perceived attack on his character (e.g. Gal. 1.10ff; 5.11), Gal. 6.17 is more than likely an apologetic summary. However, the description itself does not seem to make sense from either a cultural or an apologetic point of view. Some interpretations are more likely than others. For instance, legally speaking, the slave was never able to gain freedom unless the new owner decided to set him or her free. Whether Paul's hyperbole is consistent with his idea of honor or not, there is little doubt regarding his claim to be a slave of God or of Jesus (Gal. 1.10). The interpretive problem among scholars is whether the marks were something physical, mental, spiritual or a combination of the three.⁵⁵ J. D. Hester even considers this verse exemplary of Paul's dedication, although whether Paul presented himself as a

⁵³ It is methodologically healthy and necessary to ask with J. P. Sampley, "From Text to Thought World: The Route to Paul's Ways," J. M. Bassler (ed.), *Pauline Theology* (vol. 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), p. 11, "Within an argument, what can be made of Paul's reference to what the readers already know?" The answer here is that Paul assumed a certain knowledge from his audience, thus causing his reference to the marks to sound obscure to the modern reader.

⁵⁴ In this instance, Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, p. 14, is correct in his thesis that some religious metaphors, such as self-slavery, are not applicable to the institution of slavery.

⁵⁵ For the spiritual interpretation, see Betz, *Galatians*, p. 324. For the physical interpretation, see Burton, *Galatians*, pp. 360-361; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 225 etc.

paradigm to follow here or not is an entirely different matter.⁵⁶

The above suggestion speculates on the possibility of real marks on Paul. However, there is no way to substantiate or deny this meaning. Some arguments for seeing the marks as real are as follows. First, in the context of Galatians, Paul did mention his own physical shortcomings in one of his arguments (Gal. 4.14). Second, although Betz dismisses a physical explanation, the modifier ἐν τῷ σώματί μου seems to confirm some real marks on Paul's body. His explanation is a general "troubles of all sorts."⁵⁷ The only problem is whether the Galatians were able to know about such an extensive list of suffering at the reception of the letter. If it is this general, would it serve as any kind of summary for the conclusion of the letter? The answer is most certainly negative. The exact phrase only occurs one more time in Paul's letter to the Philippians 1.20. There, the phrase seems to indicate physical existence or a physical state. Third, in the light of the argument in the epilogue of Galatians, the placement of Gal. 6.17 is suggestive. H. G. Schütz states, "There may also be an implicit contrast between these marks and the marks left by circumcision."⁵⁸ If there is a straightforward contrast with physical circumcision (Gal. 6.12-13, 15), Paul's marks should also be physical. Such an explanation must be dismissed for its literary inconsistency. Fourth, the present tense βαστάζω also seems to indicate that the scars were permanent and visible. Looking briefly at the way Paul used βαστάζω in his letters, the following meanings surface: bearing burden (Gal. 6.2, 5; Rom. 15.1);

⁵⁶ Hester, "The Presence of Epideictic in Galatians 1-2", p. 306. This claim goes against Paul's own words which are a blunt refutation of people who 'cause trouble' for him. Was Paul indirectly telling the troublemakers, who, according to Hester, were 'within' the Galatian congregation, to imitate his marks of Christ? This is just one of the many problems Hester's theory faces. Contrary to Hester's claims, Gal. 4.12 cannot be the 'catch-all' exhortation for the whole letter.

⁵⁷ Betz, *Galatians*, p. 324, gives the unlikely explanation "troubles of all sorts stemming from his 'suffering with Christ' during his missionary campaign" He quotes Gal. 1.23; 4.29; 5.11 and 6.12 as proof. Rhetorically speaking, Paul chose to use the powerful rather than the weak elements of the slave analogy. Things like opponents and events do not appear in the metaphor. Instead, the focus is on a visible sign through physical scars. Paul assumed the Galatians had knowledge of these weaker elements. One must also question the ability of the Galatians to understand Betz's spiritualized explanation. Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, p. 454, sees this as "Asiatic-style rhetoric which was more given to display and hyperbolic language." Although there is definitely dedicatory language here, as Witherington proposes, the issue is whether the description also refers to physical marks. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors*, p. 114n45 affirms that the bodily language suggests physical marks.

⁵⁸ Schütz, "Body," *NIDNTT* CD-ROM. Schütz goes even further to suggest that Gal. 2.20 is related. This is not certain, although it is not impossible.

bearing of judgment (Gal. 5.10); supporting of one tree branch for another (Rom. 11.18). In Galatians, the word is associated with something heavy or severe. Whatever these marks were, they were not something light and joyful but were burdensome. Fifth, Paul assumed the knowledge of his marks for both his audience and possibly his agitators prior to the reception of the letter to the Galatians.⁵⁹ Paul probably showed the Galatians these marks in his initial mission to them. All five explanations seem to make sense. Thus, the possibility of some kind of physical mark must be part of the interpretation of Gal. 6.17. If the marks were physical, the metaphorical sense of being enslaved to Jesus is still very much alive. One can either translate the genitive of τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ as ‘brand-marks for belonging to Jesus’ or ‘brand-marks because of Jesus (implying the gospel of Jesus)’. Either or both can be the meaning of the metaphor. The term for the marks remains servile. This weakness was at least as well known as any of Paul’s apologetic claims in Gal. 1 and 2. Hence, Paul took these known events or physical traits and put forth his own interpretation through servile language, thereby creating a slave metaphor. Therefore, Paul was the slave of Christ, but because of this honored position he had to suffer shame in the full view of the world. This shame came in the form of the permanent marks of physical abuse. Martyn dramatically calls these scars “apocalyptic battle wounds”.⁶⁰ To the non-believer, this metaphor connotes shame. To the Galatians, this metaphor demonstrates the legitimacy of Paul’s apostleship.

3.2.5 Rhetorical Function of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 6.17

Having looked at some of the reasons why Paul meant his marks for the sake of Christ to be physical, one wonders what his rhetorical purpose was with this metaphor, which could have been a form of hyperbole.⁶¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca suggests that sometimes the author would place the literal and metaphorical meanings alongside of each other, especially in the usage of dead metaphors.⁶² In Gal. 6.17, Paul gave a commonly known fact an uncommon twist, by putting a literal physical phenomenon alongside a metaphorical label,

⁵⁹ J. P. Sampley, “From Text to Thought World: The Route to Paul’s Ways,” p. 11, stresses the audience’s knowledge as a vital component in Pauline interpretation.

⁶⁰ Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 568n71.

⁶¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 403.

⁶² Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 406.

thus clearly defending his position. Did the agitators point to Paul's suffering as a divine punishment? Did they use Paul's physical scars as indicators of his illegitimacy? The emphatic ἐγὼ in Gal. 6.17 certainly makes Paul's statement a boast of either his dedication or authority in the gentile mission. Whether Paul was responding to some rumors or was merely creating a dramatic image, no one knows. The re-definition of a physical trait has created a fusion of images. Such a fusion converts something shameful into something honorable. That is Paul's last word on his authority. Within the context, the oddity of Gal. 6.17 provides a direct contrast with the circumcision of his agitators. Because the metaphor seems out of place, the contrast with the preceding topic of circumcision is that much starker.

Gal. 1.1 and 6.17 might possibly form an *inclusio*. As the discussion of Gal. 1.1 shows, Paul was defending himself. The same argument works if Gal. 1.1 and 1.10 are linked as they are done earlier in this study. If Gal. 1.1 and 6.17 form an *inclusio*, Paul is very likely defending himself in Gal. 6.17. However, if one were to take Gal. 1.1 and 10 as exemplary only, then one must also take Gal. 6.17 as exemplary. After all, the structures of the argument in both Gal. 1.6-10 and 6.12-17 are the same. Paul introduces his argument with polemics (Gal. 1.6-9; 6.12-13) before putting himself forward as the contrasting example with either the Galatians or the agitators (Gal. 1.10; 6.14, 17). Either way, from the placement of Gal. 6.17, Paul was using his physical marks as one more reminder to the Galatians of his own authority. Since his audience seems to have an understanding of Paul's marks, Paul was not trying to convince them into believing that he had these marks. Rather, he was arguing his case based on their knowledge of the marks.⁶³ When he used this metaphor, he conjured up an image of his physical presence. This metaphor serves to remind Paul's audience of their experience with him when they first encountered the gospel. The first encounter of Paul's preaching probably prompted the audience to ask him about his marks. Therefore, they were familiar with these when they heard the letter. Paul only had to add a theological explanation about them in his letter to deliver one more blow to his agitators' claim. By allowing such a radical or even exaggerated

⁶³ See J. P. Sampley, "From Text to Thought World: The Route to Paul's Ways," p. 11, for audience knowledge.

influence from his physical marks, Paul left his audience in no doubt that his authority came from God.

Chapter Four
THE POLEMICAL USAGE OF THE SERVILE METAPHOR IN
GALATIANS

4.1 Paul's Attack on the Agitators in Gal. 2.4

4.1.1 Introductory Issues in Gal. 2.4

In general, the argument in Gal. 2 follows the same path as Gal. 1. The difference is that the staccato pace of Gal. 1 grinds to a halt in Gal. 2. The series of ἔπειτα's in Gal. 1. 18, 21 end with the ἔπειτα in Gal. 2.1. These ἔπειτα's indicate the pace of Paul's narrative. Here the narrative pace stands still until 2.11. While Gal. 1.18 and 21 gives a glimpse of the activities Paul pursued before his public event in Jerusalem, Gal. 2.1 slows down the pace to allow the listener to focus on a story vital to the argument of Galatians. In comparison with the quick flashes of Gal. 1, Gal. 2 gives some important details on the Jerusalem event. One such detail is in Gal. 2.4, which has many special points of interest that the following sections will discuss. First, Gal. 2.4 does not seem to fit the narrative which can easily continue smoothly through Gal. 2.5. Second, Gal. 2.4 itself makes little grammatical sense as it is incomplete. Third, the previous mention of Titus is the only one in Galatians. Fourth, καταδουλώσουσιν can convey either middle or active voice in enslavement. Were the agitators trying to enslave Paul's companion to themselves or someone else? Fifth, were these people active inside or outside of the church?

4.1.2 Literary Context of the Gal. 2.4 Metaphor

As the discussion below shows, Gal. 2.4 is a passing remark. However, no one can overlook the rhetorical bluntness in Paul's polemics. The remark is in contrast to literal enslavement. Paul could not have just meant to say that the Jerusalem agitators were Roman slave traders who intended to kidnap the gentiles for the slave market. The Pauline topic here does not discuss the slave trade, which makes the remark even more extraordinary and compels one to note the metaphorical intent of this remark. Nevertheless, the sinister meaning of Roman slave kidnapers makes a forceful impact on Paul's metaphor, as the subsequent cultural discussion will show. The Jerusalem episode in Gal. 2, within Paul's autobiographical section, is very central to his argument. Paul coupled this episode with the subsequent Antioch incident to deal with two different aspects of

the Galatian problem. Between the two events, the Jerusalem event seems even more closely related to the Galatian problem because the Galatians were probably struggling with circumcision more than they were with food.¹ This makes the Jerusalem event important. In the middle of it comes the description of the situation. More importantly, if Paul's statements in Gal. 1.6-10 have any hint of polemics in them, the attack in Gal. 2.4 is much more certain and explicit. Here, there are two descriptions: first, Paul discussed their action; and second, Paul dealt with the motive behind their action.

Gal. 2 talks about Paul's trip to Jerusalem following a revelation. Whatever the revelation God made to Paul was, the resulting event caused a confrontation between Paul's party and the opposing party. There are several important features to this affair. First, there is no certainty that the opposing party was originally in the church. Paul seems to describe them as outsiders (Gal. 2.4).² Second, the Titus situation was probably already well-known because there is not much elaboration on it in Gal. 2. Paul seems to have assumed that the Galatian audience had knowledge of Titus. Titus' name probably conjured up images of non-circumcision among the early church. Since there has been no interest in the present study in this area and therefore no historical reconstruction, one has to look at the way Paul described this event as a guide to understanding its rhetorical significance. In keeping with the theme of validating his ministry in Gal. 1, Paul started the Jerusalem event with his gospel, which to him was the main reason for

¹ S. M. Elliot, "Paul and His Gentile Audiences: Mystery-Cult, Anatolian Popular Religiosity, and Paul's Claim of Divine Authority in Galatians," *Listening* (1996), pp. 126-127, wants to locate the audience within the castration of the Magna Mater cult. She suggests the appeal of circumcision comes from the practice of the *galli* and Paul's claim for divine authority somehow counters the practice. See also M. J. Vermaseren, *Cybele and Attis: The Myth and the Cult* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), pp. 96-97. This is possible, but the associated knowledge of the audience was from a Jewish source as a result of all of the Old Testament themes involved. No matter what one speculates to be psychologically appealing to the Galatians, the main thrust of the letter contains Jewish regulations on circumcision. For the significance of circumcision, see S. McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), pp. 79-82.

² Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 460, seems quite certain that the Jerusalem church housed the opposing party in Gal. 2. However, the language of Paul is far from certain, unless Paul meant that these opponents sneaked into an inner circle of leadership meeting. Whether the Jerusalem church housed the Galatian agitators is a different issue. Martyn assumes that Paul's solitary resistance of the agitators as a sign of tolerance by the Jerusalem authority in allowing Jewish interference with the gentile mission in Antioch. However, the agitators could have claimed that authority without Paul being able to access information about their claims. In the days before telecommunication, whatever one perceived become the reality. In such confrontational situations, it is impossible to check facts first before acting. In Paul's description of Peter, Peter seemed to 'know better' but

the visit. This makes the entrance of Titus all the more extraordinary. In the middle of the account, Paul brought in Titus, and even more dramatically, he brought in the opposing party.³ Neither character receives any preparatory remark, but both are there to contribute to Paul's discussion about his gospel. The way Paul talked about this situation makes the sequence of events end at Gal. 2.3. The verses in Gal. 2.4-5 appear to be a parenthetical comment on Gal. 2.3 or the whole of Gal. 2.1-3. Either way, because of its incomplete syntax, Martyn calls the anacoluthon in Gal. 2.4 a 'grammatical shipwreck'.⁴ Perhaps Paul originally intended to provide a quick comment here to clarify his point. It is even possible that Gal. 2.3 is a separate event, though the possibility is slim. R. Y. K. Fung suggests that the reference in Gal. 2.4 is the Antioch incident.⁵ However, because the adversative $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ in Gal. 2.3 seems to link to the previous two verses, one can safely say that the sequence of events occurs within the same Jerusalem visit.⁶ However, where do the Titus event and the issue of circumcision fit into Paul's dialogue on his gospel? Given the above observations on Titus and the agitators, the content of Gal. 2.3-5 must illustrate the gist of Paul's gospel. The connection of the $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ in Gal. 2.3 points to this contextual relationship.

Whatever the actual reason for Paul's visit to Jerusalem was, Paul presented his account as a dialogue about the gospel. At the end of the Titus story, he concluded with 'the truth of the gospel' before he continued with his comment on Jerusalem (Gal. 2.5). The whole Titus episode is about how Paul related the gospel to his argument on circumcision.⁷ Therefore, the main concern here is

acted out of weakness. Paul originally perceived Peter to have been supportive of the Law-free mission.

³ This is not the place to discuss whether Titus might have been possibly circumcised. A minor textual variance here can indicate that Titus was circumcised as a concession. Besides the scarcity of the textual attestation, any concession at this point substantially weakens Paul's argument. See C. K. Barrett, *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1985), p. 112n12 and J. C. O'Neil, *The Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1972), pp. 34-36.

⁴ Martyn, *Galatians*, p., 195.

⁵ Fung, *Galatians*, p. 93.

⁶ Sim. Betz, *Galatians*, p. 89.

⁷ It is important to see this issue in the light of the diversity of Jewish opinion on gentile circumcision. J. J. Collins, "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century" in J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (eds.), *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christian, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1987), p. 166. In Jewish propaganda literature, there is little mention of requiring gentiles to be circumcised to be in

Christian freedom from circumcision. Paul's agitators in the Jerusalem event were the ones who sought to enslave the Galatians. They were the ones who went against the gospel discussed in the Jerusalem visit. That is why Paul presented them as people of falsehood. The logic of the argument in Gal. 2.1-5 is as follows. Paul's gospel is mainly about freedom. When one tries to limit this freedom, the main truth of the gospel is compromised. When the gospel is compromised, then two things happens: first, the believer is enslaved (Gal. 2.5); and second, the truth no longer remains with the believer (Gal. 2.6). Paul's concern over the truth of the gospel caused him to attack the agitators because of the possible danger of their position. Furthermore, if their attack were successful, Paul's mission would surely be in vain (Gal. 2.2).

4.1.3 Cultural Context of the Gal. 2.4 Metaphor

The cultural situation that best illustrates the metaphor of Gal. 2.4 is the one in which persons freed from slavery were kidnapped by slave traders. Throughout Roman history, the slave trade was an active and thriving business (Polybius 14.7.3; Livy 10.17.6; Cicero *Att.* 89.7; *Leg. Man.* 11.32). During the more turbulent times, kidnapping was one source of slaves. Paul's audience could have had such a historical fact in its memory as a result of history and legends. Furthermore, records in the Principate do not indicate that the *Pax Romana* stamped out this crime completely. Curious tales of missing persons hint of a sinister activity related to kidnapping and slavery (Plin. *Ep.* 6.25).⁸ The mere fact that *Lex Fabia*, or the associated law of *plagium*, was needed shows the need to discourage this serious crime. Paul's word κατασκοπήσαι smacks of the underhandedness of a slave trader who would lie in wait for an opportunity to kidnap an innocent freed person. Since Roman law has a very definite idea of the importance of a free status, such action would be a grave trespass with dire legal consequences. The action of these ψευδαδέλφους was equally illegal and underhanded, and deserving the harshest punishment.

In a study of 1 Tim. 1.10, J. A. Harrill points out more facts relating to slave

Judaism. The agitators in Jerusalem and Galatia were probably reacting to this form of "Hellenistic" tendency among some Jewish believers. Because he knew that there were theological implications, Paul's reaction is the other extreme. No one has gone that far to attack circumcision in the way Paul did.

⁸ J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 59.

dealers and their moral character in the Greco-Roman context. It is helpful to sum up Harrill's article here to see how Paul degraded his agitators. In general, the slave traders were of questionable character. They were frequently linked with all sorts of crimes against society and its gods (Plat. *Leg.* 12.944B; Aristophanes *Nub.* 352 etc.).⁹ Although they had legal sanction to do their trade, they were far from socially acceptable. In dramas, they were the social joke. Their negative portrayal in the theaters made it clear that they were the disgrace society wanted to turn a blind eye to. The commonness of this *topos* and Paul's usage of it, says something about the views of Paul and his society. Furthermore, the slave traders were commonly kidnappers who corrupted the youth (Isoc. *Antid.* 89-91).¹⁰ The irony of the legal sanction is that some of the slave trading activities were underhanded and in serious violation of the law (Strabo 14.5.2). Citizen kidnapping was a dire crime 'against the law of the nations.'¹¹ Indeed, not only was kidnapping a violation of Roman law, it was also a violation of the Old Testament Law (Philo *Leg.* 4.13). Therefore, not only were Paul's agitators immoral and unspiritual, they may have been doing something illegal as well. In addition to their problems with the law, slave traders were also a dishonest group of people. In order to profit from their merchandise, they would often hide defects like disease or mental problems (*Dig.* 21.1.37; 21.2.32 etc.).¹² Such problems were often disguised by fine clothing, and other ploys were used as cover (Sen. *Ep.* 80.9; *Life of Aesop* 21-22).¹³ For such people, dishonesty and greed were the order of the day. The sexual exploitation of slave boys also prompted many practices of beautification of these youths. In such cases, the moral character of these slave traders is also in question. Their role of societal corrupter is undeniable.

What then, were these traders doing in Jerusalem according to Paul? An obvious feature of the job of a slave trader is to trade the slave off to some willing owner. The ownership of the captured slaves did not stop at the trader's hands. Based on context, R. N. Longenecker rightly suggests that the one who is the

⁹ J. A. Harrill, "The Vice of Slave Dealers in Greco-Roman Society: the Use of a Topos in 1 Timothy 1:10," *JBL* 118 (1999), p. 99.

¹⁰ Harrill, p. 100.

¹¹ Harrill, p. 102.

¹² Harrill, p. 104.

ultimate owner is the Law.¹⁴

Another confirmation about the character of the Jerusalem agitators comes in the text. The usage of οἵτινες is telling. R. N. Longenecker puts it best, “It was a common practice for writers of Koine Greek to use ὅστις in the nominative singular, or οἵτινες (as here) in the nominative plural, to take the place of the simple relative pronoun ὅς, and so to emphasize a characteristic quality by which a preceding statement is to be confirmed (cf. Jn. 8.53; Acts 7. 53; Eph. 4.19 etc.).”¹⁵ According to this syntactical assessment, the emphasis then falls on ψευδαδέλφους. These metaphorical traders whom Paul considered to be ψευδαδελφοί, were in fact claiming the legitimacy of the Christian brotherhood and Paul saw it as his duty to expose their characters. These were not αδελφοί, although they claimed to be. Their gospel and character illustrate their standing as ψευδ-αδελφοί.

4.1. 4 Meaning of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 2.4

The portrait of the agitators in Gal. 2.4 is straightforward. The general *phoros* is the slave trade. The theme is about the enslaving power of circumcision over the gentile. The *phoros* makes the analogy of being re-enslaved by slave traders. Even though re-enslavement was a legal activity in Paul’s time, the dark shadow Paul drew over the agitators shows that there was something illegal about re-enslavement in Jerusalem. Thus, the one aspect of the re-enslavement *phoros* Paul used was the illegal slave trade. What did the illegal slave trade have to do with circumcision? For Paul, circumcision was not a necessary burden for the gentiles to bear because this exclusively Jewish requirement was contrary to his gentile mission and gospel. Therefore, Paul saw it as his duty to counter against any religious advocacy of circumcision. Gal. 2.4 describes the dark motives and actions of the agitators in Jerusalem. To force a gentile to be circumcised is similar to keeping someone in bondage illegally. The vehicle, which delivers the theme of religious re-enslavement, is the image of the slave trader who did his work illegally and the freedom of Titus becomes Paul’s historical precedent for gentile freedom in Jerusalem. A larger topic is the freedom of the Galatians. The

¹³ Harrill, p. 106.

¹⁴ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 52.

¹⁵ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 51.

whole metaphorical construct supports Paul's polemic against the Galatian situation. Paul compared the agitators' action with that of kidnappers, whose crime spread a form of spiritual bondage. Here, one must distinguish between legal and illegal forms of slavery from a societal perspective. Paul does not seem to condemn slavery *per se* because legal forms of slavery certainly existed under Roman law. However, re-enslaving someone without going through the proper procedures was illegal. The agitators acted like slave traders who had no right to re-enslave freedmen. Those agitators at the Jerusalem visit went against the principles established by the gospel in trying to disturb the peace of the gentiles.

A further conclusion needs to be made on who the slave masters were. As pointed out earlier, there is a remote possibility that any re-enslavement was to the agitators. After all, in the metaphor, the agitators were more similar to the middlemen than the final owner. Moreover, the topic of circumcision indicated that the agitators were not the slave masters. More than likely, the agitators sought to bring the gentiles back under the 'law' of circumcision or indeed the Law of Moses. Therefore, the Law is the symbolic master in the Gal. 2.4 metaphor which is a theme also consistent with that of Galatians.

4.1.5 Polemical Function of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 2.4

From the passage, it is not hard to see how Paul established his metaphor in Gal. 2.4. As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca point out, an author can create a metaphor by using verbs which remind the audience of a certain person or thing.¹⁶ Though Paul did not directly call the agitators kidnappers or slave traders, his choice of words in Gal. 2.4 confirms his attack on the agitators' character and motives. In making this metaphor part of his autobiographical sketch, Paul was essentially making clear that there were only two kinds of people: those who were with him and those who were against him.

Taking the whole letter into consideration, this metaphor is no less important than any other description of the agitators. Although the metaphor seems to occur in passing, it stands apart from the otherwise non-dramatic narrative.¹⁷ One can

¹⁶ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 402.

¹⁷ Although the comment here on the non-dramatic narrative seems somewhat subjective, the regularity of the narrative and the absence of any slave metaphor contribute to the 'orderliness' of the account. The presence of the agitators or 'false brothers' does not surface until the dramatic description of Gal. 2.4. Note also the regularity of the rhythmic *Επειτα in Gal. 1.18 and 2.1,

see that this metaphor acts as a precursor to Paul's later polemics against the agitators in Galatia. Paul exposed both the actions and motives of the Jerusalem agitators, and he did the same with the Galatian agitators. As Betz states, "It should also be clear that whatever Paul says about his opponents in Jerusalem applies to his present opposition in Galatia."¹⁸ As Paul condemned the 'spies' in Jerusalem, he condemned the Galatian agitators, first for their action (Gal. 6.12) and then for their motives (Gal. 6.12-13). Therefore, the story and the metaphor in the Jerusalem episode are not merely functioning as history but pave the way for later treatment of the Galatian situation in the letter.¹⁹

When one looks at the metaphor of Gal. 2.4, one must appreciate the rhetorical genius of Paul in using a slave metaphor in the Jerusalem situation. As stated in the earlier part of this study, many scholars agree that one of the major functions of a metaphor is to point towards a meaning beyond itself. That is to say that the metaphor acts as an authorial signpost. The slave metaphor in Gal. 2.4 is not just about slavery, but is about a misdeed in Jerusalem. What is ingenious in Gal. 2.4 is not so much that Paul used a slave metaphor, but where he places it within the entire letter. As discussed earlier, the story is not just history; it casts a direct light on the Galatian situation. Thus, Paul's account of the Jerusalem story becomes the story of the Galatians as well. Both parties dealt with the same issues. Just as the Jerusalem story was a symbolic reflection of the Galatian story, the illegal slave traders in the slave metaphor of Gal. 2.4 typifies the Galatian agitators. By describing the agitators in both the Jerusalem and Galatian stories in a similar manner, Paul made full use of the 'sign post' function of the metaphor to point beyond itself. He not only pointed out the motive and

which separates the various accounts. Such a syntactical rhythm only heightens the sudden arrival of the false brothers.

¹⁸ Betz, *Galatians*, p. 90. See also P. E. Koptak, "Rhetorical Identification in Paul's Autobiographical Narrative: Galatians 1.13-2.14," *JSNT* 40 (1990), pp. 104-105, for what he calls a rhetorical identification between the agitators in Jerusalem and Galatia. Koptak's model puts the autobiographical account alongside the Galatian situation and notes the parallels. This is a reasonable model to use when looking at the sections on Jerusalem and Antioch. Sim. V. M. Smiles, *The Gospel and the Law in Galatia* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), p. 10. The rhetorical connection between the Jerusalem and Galatian situations seems to be the only satisfactory explanation for the necessary details in the Jerusalem episode for the Galatians.

¹⁹ In fact, one may doubt whether 'history' as a genre is a fair description of the whole autobiographical section. Sim. R. N. Longenecker, "A Realized Hope, a New Commitment, and a Developed Proclamation: Paul and Jesus," in R. N. Longenecker, *The Road from Damascus: The*

nature of his Jerusalem opponents, he used them to point to the Galatian agitators. Therefore, the slave metaphor here has a typological function, that is to discredit anyone who stands in opposition to Paul's theological position.

4.2 Paul's Attack on the Agitators in Gal. 4.30

4.2.1 Introductory Issues in Gal. 4.30

Gal. 4.30 functions in three different ways in Paul's letter: one, it acts as part of a greater argument in Gal. 3-4; two, it is part of a very popular Old Testament story; and three, it falls within the concluding remarks at the end of the Sarah-Hagar story. The following paragraphs look at the introductory issues relating to the function of Gal. 4.30. From the themes of the three main metaphors in Gal. 3 and 4, one can see Paul's progression of thoughts within the context of God's promise to Abraham. Three thoughts stand out in terms of the identity of the Galatians. First, in Gal. 3.23-29, Paul argued that the function of the Law was to take care of those who worshipped Israel's God until Christ came, so that the believers could be justified by faith. When Christ came, the faith which enabled justification was made complete. The faith comes through redemption from the guardianship of the Law (Gal. 4.5). When Christ and the accompanying faith came, the status of the minor would change to that of an adult. Thus, the end of Gal. 3 is about the maturation of God's plan resulting in the status change for God's children. Second, at the beginning of Gal. 4, Paul talked again about periods before and after Christ. This time, Paul added emphases of freedom as opposed to slavery (Gal. 4.7). More discussions of the metaphors relating to Gal. 3-4 are in the next chapter. Third, the message of Gal. 4.21-5.1 is of two kinds of birth via two different means. There is the fleshly birth, which is enslaving (Gal. 4.23-25), and there is the heavenly birth which results in freedom based on a divine promise (Gal. 4.26-28). Paul's progression of thoughts proceeds along these lines. The universal scope of baptism confirms the gentile Christians as part of God's plan (Gal. 3.27), and the sending of the Spirit validates their adoption (Gal. 4.4). God not only adopted them as adult children but also delivered them from bondage (Gal. 4.5-7). Because the gentiles belong to Christ, gentiles are included in God's promise, thus making them Abraham's offspring(s)

(Gal. 3.29; 4.28). In this case, the function of the Spirit is the opposite of the enslaving Law (Gal. 4.23, 29). Implicitly, the reception of the Spirit means freedom.

Gal. 4.30 is also part of a very large story which Paul borrowed from the Old Testament. The following observations arise from Paul's introduction of the story. First, Paul used the formula τί λέγει ἡ γραφή to introduce Gal. 4.30 as his Old Testament proof text. Hence, it functions as proof of biblical disapproval of the agitators. In case the agitators were still there at the authorship of this letter, it may also function as a command to throw out the agitators when used in conjunction with its imperative ἔκβαλε. Since the verse is in the context of the Sarah-Hagar story, it can show that the story is more than a mere lesson about the Galatians' place in God's plan, but that it may call for a certain action. Second, this story proves that whoever is under the Law is thrown out of the Abrahamic covenant. Gal. 4.30 is at least a partial application of the whole of Gal. 4.21-31.

The above two observations also lead to a debate on the nature of Paul's story. Ἀλληγορούμενα is the word Paul uses to describe what he was doing with the story. The question arises, could the Galatian listener, who probably had little to no background in the Old Testament, make sense of the story? There is a remote possibility that no knowledge was needed, since Paul redefined the names and terms based on his own typology. It may be simpler to say that the current Jerusalem is condemned and Paul's community was the new Jerusalem, instead of going through all the elaborate descriptions? Moreover, Isaac in Gal. 4.28 is undefined. Instead Paul used the phrase, κατὰ Ἰσαάκ, as if the Galatians knew exactly who Isaac was and what κατὰ Ἰσαάκ meant. Furthermore, using Isaac seems strange since it is unlikely that the Galatians would aspire to be just like Isaac. Clearly a certain amount of knowledge was assumed of the audience. Examples below from Josephus and Philo show the possible midrashic tradition of Sarah-Hagar among Jewish intellectuals, and lead one to the conclusion that part of this story came from Paul or the agitators.²⁰ Josephus and Philo are useful case studies because of their extensive treatment of the Sarah-Hagar story.

²⁰ Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, p. 169, states that the methodology of mirror reading is important in places where Paul clearly redefined terms. "We may legitimately suppose that in

Although Paul did not go as far as Philo in his typological scheme, Abrahamic themes in Josephus and Philo often show partial parallels with the Galatian situation. Themes such as the honor of Abraham and his descendants, along with the polemics against a typological Hagar are common to Paul and Philo. Whether the story was from Paul or the Galatian agitators, Paul clearly perceived abuse of the story by the agitators. Paul's purpose is thus primarily not didactic, but polemical and correctional.

What does Paul mean by ἄτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα? Since the word ἀλληγορούμενα is a New Testament *hapax*, biblical scholars do not dwell on it. J. B. Lightfoot provides two possible definitions: first, Paul could mean to speak in an allegory; and second, Paul could be interpreting a story allegorically.²¹ Lightfoot vouches for the second sense, which actually may not fully define what Paul was doing since Greco-Roman allegorical interpretations mostly used myths.²² Due to the fact that Paul never denied the historicity of the Abraham story, Lincoln classifies the story as a midrash.²³ Although midrash was probably already a practice among Jewish intellectuals, this story does not typify a midrash either.²⁴ Paul's usage of the story probably fits somewhere in between the classifications of Lightfoot and Lincoln. However one chooses to define Paul's literary task, Paul was reinterpreting a historical Jewish story for the purpose of his argument. The most detailed discussion of the word ἀλληγορούμενα comes from E. D. Burton.²⁵ As a result of comparing Paul's method of "allegory" with writers such as Philo, Plutarch and Longinus, Burton's interpretation of Gal. 4.24 as typology is correct.²⁶ Based on his literary environment, Paul's interpretive method has similarities with Greco-Roman

redefining he is correcting the opponents' definitions." See J. M. G. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 31 (1987) pp. 73-93.

²¹ Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 180.

²² Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 180.

²³ A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 16.

²⁴ J. Neusner, *A Midrash Reader* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), p. 3, states, "The word 'Midrash' is generally used in three senses [:] a compilation of scriptural exegeses; an exegesis of Scripture; or a particular mode of scriptural interpretation ..." All this is based on existing Jewish traditions. At best, Paul's story fits the third sense but there is scanty evidence that such a tradition was already established.

²⁵ E. D. Burton, *Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980), pp. 254-257.

interpretation as far as typology goes but it is not an exact parallel. Typology requires that there is exact historical parallel in the type and antetype. However, Gal. 4.24-27 goes beyond typological parallel from a historical story by equating Hagar to the totally unrelated Mt. Sinai. Therefore, Paul uses both method of typology and allegory, without discounting the historicity or truth of the Sarah-Hagar account. Martyn accurately observes Paul's mixed methodology. He does not rigidly label Paul's tale as an 'allegory' but claims that Paul was simply applying a historical story to his present situation.²⁷ Thus, the shift of past to present orientation in Gal. 4.23 and 24 provides the clue. The allegory is not a strict stereotype that is common in the literature of Paul's time. Then again, Paul was just borrowing an ancient story as an illustration to his point. There is no need to interpret the whole story allegorically.

The Sarah-Hagar story itself was variously used in the Jewish traditions and also could be found in some non-biblical Jewish literature. The word ἀλληγορούμενα is unique because this was the only noun usage in the New Testament of the present participle to refer to Old Testament.²⁸ By such a usage, it is clear that the story was probably being used variously and continuously in the time of Paul. While Paul was assigning specific meanings to the characters in this ancient Jewish tale, his usage was not as free as Philo's allegorical interpretive method. According to D. M. Smith, "Paul's interest is much more historical and less philosophical or mystical, than Philo's."²⁹ However, both men used typology and both felt negatively about Hagar and her son. Both Paul and Philo used the story polemically, but both used polemics differently. Below is more discussion on how Paul used the story as compared to some of his Jewish contemporaries. In such a comparison, one can see easily that Paul's interpretation was derived from his Jewish framework. Drawing from a similar framework, Paul's agitators could also easily use portions of this story differently. Paul's writing was probably merely a response to a certain Jewish tradition or

²⁶ See *LSJM*. For some this allegory is typological, see Oepke, A., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (THKNT; Berlin: Evangelische, 1973). For others, it deserves to be interpreted allegorically. See Burton, pp. 253-257.

²⁷ Martyn, *Galatian*, p. 453.

²⁸ Burton, *Galatians*, p. 256.

²⁹ D. M. Smith, "The Pauline literature," in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (ed.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, pp. 278.

teaching propagated by his agitators. After all, Paul usually used Abraham's story to argue for his Law-free missions, without any reference to Sarah or Hagar (e.g. Rom. 4; Gal. 3).

Fourth and finally, Gal. 4.17 shows that the agitators were trying to convince the Galatians that there were requirements for gentile salvation apart from Paul's original preaching. The obvious requirement was circumcision (Gal. 6.12-13). What exactly were the agitators trying to exclude the Galatians from? Paul did not answer this question explicitly; however, J. B. Lightfoot argues that they were being excluded from Christ while R. N. Longenecker asserts that they were alienated from other believers, and Martyn believes it is related to the Abrahamic covenant.³⁰ Within the context of Gal. 3-4, the second and third possibilities are more appealing. The importance of being within a fellowship of believers was emphasized in this letter. Gal. 2.11-21 indicates that Peter caused disharmony between Jewish and gentile believers. The gentiles were excluded from fellowship with Paul because the agitators were saying that Paul preached circumcision (Gal. 5.11), and to be within Paul's fellowship the gentiles had to be circumcised. In Paul's absence, the agitators would carry out the rites. Since fellowship in early Christianity was through the *familia*, not being in a fellowship meant not belonging. Moreover, since the new community was heir to God's promise, to be outside it was to be excluded from the promise. The closer context of Gal. 3-4 seems to indicate that the Abrahamic promise was the issue.³¹ The mention of the two sons in the story certainly deals with this promise. Therefore, what Paul was saying was that the agitators were excluding the Galatians from God's promise to Abraham because God's promise was not based on circumcision but on faith. However, the claim of the agitators was that the Galatians needed to receive circumcision because Abraham's heir Isaac did. How then did Paul counter such a claim?

³⁰ Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 177; Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 194. The word is mainly defined by BAGD as related to fellowship. Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 423. Sim. A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, p. 16; G. W. Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, p. 146.

³¹ S. C. Keesmaat, *Paul and his Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition* (JSNTSup, 181; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), p. 174; N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), p. 153. However, the assertion of Keesmaat and Wright depend on the title Christ, rather than Jesus Christ or Christ Jesus in Gal. 3.16. This is probably sound, but the weight of interpretation should not rest so heavily on a few verses. The context was clearly Abrahamic.

Finally, Gal. 4.30 seems ideally placed to enable a natural flow from the allegory into a decisive application. The sudden appearance of the imperative is important in changing the tone of the passage. Although there is another imperative in Gal. 4.27 that seems equally intriguing, the typological re-creation of the story is not complete until Gal. 4.30, when all the types and anti-types have fall into place. Therefore, rhetorically, Gal. 4.30 can be labeled as the start of Paul's concluding remarks regarding the Sarah-Hagar story. There are more discussions on this issue in the following sections.

4.2.2 Literary Context of the Gal. 4.30 Metaphor

The interpretive issues discussed above indicate that Gal. 4.21-31 is a reinterpretation of the Genesis story. Since this episode is a part of Abraham's story and it is talked about extensively, one must take seriously Paul's usage of it. Comparing the Sarah-Hagar story to the rest of the Pauline corpus, its usage is unique, which makes Gal. 4.21-31 significant. In the Pauline corpus, this story is the longest reinterpretation of the Old Testament. Before looking at the metaphor in Gal. 4.30, one must understand the story and its function in Galatians and Jewish history. Since Paul made it clear that he only used the historical Sarah and Hagar to create an 'allegory', it is not hard to see all the characters as contributing to the metaphorical expression of Gal. 4.30.³² Gal. 4.29 prepares the audience for the metaphorical use of Gen. 21.10 in the next verse. Then Gal. 4.30-31 goes on to elaborate on that application and alerts the audience to the meaning of the story as it applies to them. Gal. 4.30-31 is where the theme and *phoros* fuse together, while Gal. 4.29 acts like the funnel for the fusion.³³ In

³² Perleman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 403, define allegory as consisting of all the elements of a metaphor without any contact between the elements. The absence of fusion is seen throughout the story until Gal. 4.29-31 when Paul applied his story.

³³ Who then do the third person pronouns in Gal. 4.29 represent? Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 445, sees the opposition as the agitators persecuting Paul himself. Since the two sons are corporate representatives of two groups of people, that is the people of promise and the people out of the covenant, it is better to see the third person pronouns as referring to the agitators and the Galatians. After all, the Galatians were born of the Spirit (Gal. 3.2-3; 4.6). There may be confusion here as well about whether these agitators were the slave woman (Gal. 4.30) or the son of the slave woman. The typology seems to indicate that the earthly Jerusalem (church?) is the slave woman and her children are the 'son' (Gal. 4.25). The next verse calls for expulsion of both. This may be because the agitators claimed authority from the Jerusalem church. Although Paul considered them to be the 'son' born of the flesh and they themselves relied heavily on 'fleshly' works, their claim gave them a close association with the slave woman whom Paul considered to be the earthly Jerusalem (church?). Thus, Paul called for rejection of both in Gal. 4.30. Paul was

other words, the characters, Sarah, Hagar, Isaac, and Ishmael function beyond mere Old Testament history in Paul's story.

Another way to look at the literary importance of this story is to consider its placement at the end of a very large section. Many traditional interpreters have divided the chapters at 5.1 or 5.2. Paul's polemical tone almost completely changes after 5.1. Gal. 4.21-31 comes right at the climax of Paul's argument before his discussion on how to live freely in Christ. While Paul made certain small appeals to the Galatians based on friendship in Gal. 4.12-20, one can easily read Gal. 4.21-5.1 as a continuity of what is said in Gal. 3.23-4.11. The analogy deepens in Gal. 4.21-5.1 with a differing emphasis. While the verses in Gal. 3.23-4.11 refer mostly to the power of the Law, Gal. 4.21-5.1 teaches the consequence of either being under freedom or under the Law. Gal. 4.30 is also vital in the light of its placement at the end of both Paul's story and theological argument. While it may be too much to say that Gal. 4.30 represents the argument of the whole passage, Paul's command in Gal. 4.30 is indispensable to that argument.

One final way to estimate the importance of Gal. 4.30 is to analyze it according to the audience's knowledge. If the Galatians had never heard of the Sarah-Hagar story, it was only an excursus or insertion in Paul's argument. However, if the Galatians did have some knowledge of the story from either Paul or the agitators, it serves as a correction to Galatian misunderstandings. The second option seems to have more merit, but it depends on finding some traditions on Sarah and Hagar in Jewish circles. The next section will discuss the way in which some Jewish intellectuals used this story.

Why then did Paul call for such drastic action in Gal. 4.30? The section of Gal. 1-2 established Paul's credibility. Since Paul saw his own mission as being divinely ordained, whatever got in his way would be obstructing God's work. In Gal. 3, a hint of Paul's ill feelings towards the Galatian agitators is already apparent. In Gal. 3.1, he described their action as ἐβάσκανεν, and in Gal. 4.17, Paul further exposed the agitators' action and motives much as in Gal. 2.4-5. In each of these verses, Paul's charge is very serious. In Gal. 4.30, it is clear that

not trying to make his allegory fit every detail but the Galatian situation is consistent enough to see where Paul was going with the argument.

because of the perceived seriousness of their actions, which were on only endangering Paul's work, but also jeopardizing God's plan for the gentiles, Paul wanted the agitators, and possibly, their followers to be dealt with (i.e. "τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς").

4.2.3 Cultural Context of the Gal. 4.30 Metaphor

Since Paul told the Sarah-Hagar story to the Galatians, the understanding of both Jewish and Roman contexts is important. One has to consider the similarity between Jewish and Greco-Roman backgrounds in the fundamentals of Paul's story in order to see how the story fits comfortably within both milieus. The Jewish background came from the familiar episode in Gen. 16. During Paul's time, Jewish interpreters emphasized different elements of the Sarah-Hagar story. In Josephus' *Antiquities*, the only mention of Hagar at the beginning of the Sarah-Hagar story is in reference to the fact that she was a woman of Egyptian descent (*AJ* 1.10.4). Going beyond the Old Testament story, Josephus added that God had told Sarah to use this woman to beget an heir, since Josephus was also eager to preserve the righteousness of Sarah, the great matriarch, in the later exile of Hagar and Ishmael (*AJ* 1.12.3). His emphasis on Sarah's original love for Ishmael was also an addition to the Old Testament account. The whole episode communicates more about Josephus' uneasiness. Having failed to mention Hagar in Gen. 16, but giving her a lesser title, appropriate to her gentile descent, Josephus inevitably made her inferior to Sarah. Furthermore, Josephus tried to eliminate Abraham's culpability by making God the responsible party. By implication, the superiority of Abraham and his legitimate heir is highlighted as much as the inferiority of Hagar, the slave woman, and her illegitimate heir. Not only was the patriarchal, but also the matriarchal line emphasized. One can easily see the importance of being legitimately born of the correct matriarchal line in Josephus. To ensure a consistent ritualistic superiority of Isaac over Ishmael, Josephus followed the Old Testament in granting prominence to the chronological difference of circumcision between Isaac and Ishmael (*AJ* 1.10.5). Overall, Josephus gave Abraham great prominence.

While Josephus made an interpretation based on the literal story line in

Genesis, Philo took another approach.³⁴ In his allegorical interpretation, Philo assigned value to both women and their sons (*Leg. All.* 3.244-245). Following the story in Genesis, Philo naturally assigned higher value to Sarah and Isaac than he did to Hagar and Ishmael. In Philo's story, Abraham, as a typical pilgrim on the road to wisdom, takes the lower route first through Hagar who symbolizes the school of lower learning (*Leg. All.* 3.244-245; *Cher.* 2). This lower learning is the stepping stone to greater wisdom. In his other book, lower learning clearly points towards the sophistic education typified in Ishmael (*Cher.* 3). Philo followed some of his Greco-Roman counterparts in trying to eradicate sophistry from the educational search for wisdom. In the same way God allowed Hagar to be cast out, Abraham also had to leave behind the elementary and move on to greater virtues in the form of Sarah and all that she represented. In fact, Sarah is the voice of wisdom or, better yet, the voice of the Almighty. One can easily see Philo's typological interpretation assigning intellectual value to all that both women represented. Instead of staying with the Old Testament theme of the promise and covenant, Philo used the story as an illustration of his educational philosophy.³⁵

Apart from Josephus and Philo, other later writers in formative Judaism also talked in some detail about the two women. The problem of using such material for Pauline background is that Paul considerably predates the rabbis. R. N. Longenecker points out that there is one place in the Qumran writings where some light can be shed on this story.³⁶ In 1 QM 2.13, Ishmael is the progenitor of the 'Sons of Darkness.' This so-called War Scroll apparently takes a negative attitude towards Hagar's lineage. There is also a possibility of Ishmael being linked with king Aretas of Nabatea (Josephus *AJ* 14.19-21). Paul had a similar idea to link Hagar to Mt. Sinai, which is in Arabia, the area of Nabatea. So this may indicate common knowledge among Jewish writers of typological linkage

³⁴ While W. D. Davies may be right in stating, "every Jew of the Diaspora was not a Philo and it is not known how far Hellenistic philosophical ideas did influence all Greek-speaking Jews," Philo was an educated Jew like Paul and Josephus. This may contribute to seeing how a Jewish education contributed to his views of Sarah and Hagar. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1962), p. 12.

³⁵ See Y. Amir, "The Transference of Greek Allegories to Biblical Motifs in Philo," in F. E. Greenspahn *et al* (eds.), *Nourished with Peace* (FS S. Sandmel; Chico: Scholars Press, 1984), pp. 15-25. Amir demonstrates similar themes and techniques between Philo and Greek allegorical exegetes of the Homeric epics.

between a name and a geographical location. Admittedly, the usage of this story was not common in the literary remains of Paul's time, but there is enough evidence to see some parallel with Jewish intellectual circles.³⁷

How then did the story function in the Jewish tradition? In one way, it functioned in a similar manner to the Greco-Roman ideal of the *familia*. In a sense, it is similar to the conversion pattern in the New Testament (Jn. 5.52; Acts 16.14-15; 16.31-34; 1 Cor. 1.16; Phil. 4.22) where the Greco-Roman *familia* occupied a vital role. Both the Old Testament and New Testament faiths were practiced within the *familia* (Gen. 18.19; Ex. 12.3; Lev. 16.17; Josh. 2.18; 6.23-25 etc.). In general, the household provided a religious boundary mark. One was either 'in' or 'out'. Hagar was on the outside. Paul retained the basic premise of the covenant and promise of the original plot, similar to that of Josephus. This was a reasonable story for Paul to borrow to make his point. Philo used the Sarah-Hagar story in a very different way from Paul and Josephus. Philo borrowed it to illustrate his philosophy and polemics against the sophistic ideal, thus freely assigning value to ideas that had nothing to do with Jewish covenants.

In section 2.1.3 of this study, it was stated that slaves in general were natively alienated. Greek vocabulary describing woman slaves date as far back as the fifth century BCE.³⁸ The word παιδίσκη which was used in ancient times, is used in the New Testament (Gal. 4.22; Acts 16.16). In fact, the usage in Acts 16.16 indicates the slave woman as an instrument for her master's financial gain.³⁹ Many slaves were abandoned infants from the lower class, and therefore, their original pedigree was poor. In the Greco-Roman laws, they specifically were

³⁶ Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 205.

³⁷ Longenecker, *Galatians*, pp. 200-206, brings out other rabbinic examples. The following are the characteristics of rabbinic interpretation of the story. First, Hagar's slave status made her inferior to Sarah (*Pirqe R. El.* 30; *Tg. Onq.* Gen. 16.2; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen. 21.14;). Second, Ishmaelites are slave traders who bought Joseph, thus making them equally guilty as the treacherous brothers (*Eccl. Rab.* 10.7). Third, Hagar's gentile root made her an idolater (*Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen. 16.1; *Tg. Neof.* Gen. 16.5; *Gen. Rab.* 45.1; *Pirqe R. El.* 30). Fourth, likewise, Ishmael's gentile root also made him a man of wickedness and idolatry (*Num. Rab.* 11.2; *Ex. Rab.* 1.1; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen. 21.9; *Num. Rab.* 2.13; *Lev. Rab.* 36.5). Fifth, the Ishmaelites were not heirs to the promise (*Pirqe R. El.* 31; *Pirqe R.* 48.2). Sixth, the Ismaelites could typify gentiles who were not biologically linked to the covenant (Jub. 15.28-32). In Paul's story, at least some of these themes surface while others are implied.

³⁸ See L. H. Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), p. 96. He cites the fifth century orator Lysias (1.12; 13.67), a third century papyrus (*P. Cairo Zenon* 142) and Josephus (*Ant.* 18.2.4.40).

³⁹ This fact is helpfully pointed out to me by Dr. Tod Klutz during my defense.

considered illegitimate.⁴⁰ Furthermore, although Roman marriages were not always monogamous in practice, monogamy within marriage was the law. As Gaius later wrote, “The same woman cannot be married to two men, nor the same man have two wives.” (*Inst.* 1.63). In general, concubinage was an ambiguous institution that did not interest the Romans very much. Legally speaking, concubinage was permissible, if the situation did not involve adultery.⁴¹ Socially, “the spread of concubinage, particularly following Augustus’ ban on marriage by soldiers, helped to make the institution more acceptable.”⁴² However, the legislation on legacy in the *Digest* indicates that there were problems with concubines getting their fair share of the inheritance. This is probably because they were most likely of a lowly origin or had been prostitutes (*Just. Dig.* 25.7.3). There were cases of women of higher status being concubines to lower class men.⁴³ For whatever reason this relationship took place, the men could adversely affect the women’s social status. To make matters worse, the sexual relationship between a master and the slave was of little legal interest until his slave was granted freedom. The sexual habits of slaves were of little interest to the ancient law.⁴⁴ As J. Gardner comments, “Illegitimate children belonged to no *familia*; they had no *paterfamilias* ... for at least the first century of the Empire illegitimate children had no expectations of inheriting from anyone. They had no legally recognized fathers.”⁴⁵

As presented in the previous discussions, the pattern of slave breeding in the patrilineal line provided freedom, while that in the matrilineal line resulted in slavery (Gaius *Inst.* 1.56-57). This leads to any illegitimate children in Paul’s

⁴⁰ This is different from the way many societies viewed illegitimacy as being born out of wedlock. In the Greco-Roman system, slave’s families received scant recognition, which automatically caused the children to be illegitimate. Underlying all of this is the illegitimacy of the slave’s marriage (Gaius *Inst.* 1.57a). In Ulpian, the definition of illegitimacy seems to indicate a child out of wedlock. However, the intention of Ulpian’s writing on this issue has to do with the definition of a master (Ulpian 4.1-2). Ulpian just simplified the law to make it look like the modern definition, but the status of legitimacy was clearly tied to the freedom of the person.

⁴¹ See Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, pp. 101-102, for discussions. Whether one can decide an arrangement was adultery has to do with the wife’s approval. The wife could always negate her agreement to prosecute the concubine.

⁴² Borkowski, *Textbook on Roman Law*, p. 124.

⁴³ J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 102.

⁴⁴ K. R. Bradley, “Roman Slavery and Roman Law,” p. 486, points out that incestuous relationships were only of interest when the slave became freed. Otherwise, the breeding of slaves did not always have to adhere to this moral standard.

⁴⁵ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 252.

analogies being put in a much-degraded position. Slaves born to bondage and subsequently freed would have no paternal lineage.⁴⁶ Alternatively and more precisely, as B. Rawson states, “Legitimate children belonged to their father's family and bore his family name. Illegitimate children belonged to their mother's family and bore her family name.”⁴⁷ As Ulpian puts it plainly, in yet another way, “When legal marriage takes place, the children always follow the father, but if it does not take place, they follow the condition of the mother” (Ulpian 5.8).

Unless they were taken into adoption and put under the *potestas* of the *paterfamilias*, these illegitimate children had little financial future.⁴⁸ Apparently, the agitators were slaves and their children were not adopted into the *familia*.⁴⁹ Due to the fact that women occupied a very lowly position in the Greco-Roman world, and no woman, slave or free, was a candidate for adoption, the agitators, who were symbolized in Hagar, would find themselves in an equally desperate state.⁵⁰ Their children would suffer the same fate.⁵¹ For the *lex Minicia* from the Republican laws (90 BCE) required the illegitimate children to follow the status of their mother, regardless of the father's status, and the slave women's children

⁴⁶ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 180.

⁴⁷ B. Rawson, “The Roman Family,” in Rawson, “The Roman Family,” in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, p. 8. J. Vogt, pp. 105-112. Furthermore, the wet nurse raising a Roman child also had few legal rights under the *paterfamilias*. Such wet nurses were known to be given freedom and properties as a reward for their faithful service (Cic. *Amic.* 74; Plin. *Ep.* 6.3, Sen. *Ep.* 60.1). However, the status of the children was often grim. Paul did not entertain the possibility of freedom for the slave woman and her children because that would have rendered his metaphor useless to his argument.

⁴⁸ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, pp. 214-215. The Romans had very strict inheritance laws, as is illustrated in the *lex Cincia* of 204 BCE. This law limited gifts between the blood relatives up to the second cousins. The *lex Falcidia* in 40 BCE stated that at least a quarter of the estate had to go to the heirs.

⁴⁹ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 229. This is not to say that Paul advocated the abuse of illegitimate children. Protection for illegitimate children did not come into legal legislation until Hadrian.

⁵⁰ Women were not allowed into the adoptive scheme because they were deemed incapable of dealing with the intricacies of property management. Any power exercised by women was overseen by a male guardian. See J. A. Cook, “Feminine Inadequacy and the *Senatusconsultum Velleianum*” in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 83-92. Perhaps the only exception would be the Vestal Virgins who were endowed with property by the state (Livy 1.20.3). Paul's analogy did not have this exception in mind.

⁵¹ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 216. The connection with the *familia* (which can be different from being connected with the family in the modern sense) cannot be overemphasized here in Paul's context. Though it is not possible to prove beyond doubts that there was a shortage of direct heirs in the Roman elite, Roman law seemed to highlight the importance of being connected to the right *familia* in the inheritance process. This lack of male heir was partly due to the high mortality rate.

were not legitimate by law (Gaius *Inst.* 1.78).⁵² In Paul's Sarah-Hagar story, he meant for the illegitimate children to symbolize the fallen Galatians. If they were part of the slave woman's family or had any connection to her name when they were born, they got no inheritance except for a legacy of slavery.⁵³

4.2.4 Meaning of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 4.30

Almost every character and geographical location in the Sarah-Hagar episode represents a type of person or thing. Gal. 4.30 builds on the previous verses. One important issue within Paul's story is the meaning of the two Jerusalems.⁵⁴ Paul describes the first Jerusalem in temporal terms as 'the present Jerusalem', whereas he describes the second Jerusalem in locative terms as 'the Jerusalem above'.⁵⁵ While the two Jerusalems are evidently in contrast to one another, they are not directly opposed because their terms of reference are different, one being temporal, the other locative. However, both Jerusalems could be described in temporal and locative terms. This location can be heavenly. After all, the heavenly language Paul used could transcend the earthly reality of time and space. Lincoln points out that transcendent Jerusalem fits the language of the post-exilic

⁵² Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 254. Hadrian's later legislation, which allowed illegitimate children to be brought back into the fold by the father's *potestas*, was not yet formed in Paul's time (Gaius *Inst.* 1.92). See also Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 9-10. This is not to say that women who bore many children were not allowed special privileges, and in some cases, freedom (Columella *Rust.* 1.8.19). However, these are exceptional and not normal cases. Paul probably did not have this scenario in mind when he wrote.

⁵³ In a mixed marriage, the mother's status at the birth of the child affected the child. P. R. C. Weaver, "The Status of Children in Mixed Marriages," in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, p. 148. In the case of illegitimate children in Greco-Roman society, the father had no more authority than the mother, thus diminishing the illegitimate child's value in the society. Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 257.

⁵⁴ Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, p. 23, suggests that the maternal image of Jerusalem could have come from the Old Testament. The "mother" Zion bore children (Ps. 87.5; Is. 50.1; Jer. 50.12).

⁵⁵ Jerusalem has a vital religious significance. The Temple was located there. The practice of the cultus in the Temple was a direct reflection of the spiritual health of Israel (1 Macc. 4. 36-55; 2 Macc. 4.7-16). The general welfare of Jerusalem was the indicator of God's relationship with His people (Ezk. 40ff; Zech. 2; Sir. 36.13; Tob. 13.9-18; Pss. Sol. 17.33; 1 Enoch 90.28-29). The authority to interpret the Torah lay in the Temple. As the new community of Christians saw itself as the alternative temple, the power to interpret the Torah remained in the Jerusalem church. Thus, anyone claiming any authority from the Jerusalem church or the Temple would be able to exercise tremendous power over a Christian church. The elements of chronology and geography are also important in the writings of the Qumran dwellers. Although they reacted negatively towards the Temple, the fact that they talked much about the cultus demonstrates the importance of the Temple and Jerusalem. Both Paul and his agitators in Galatia knew the central role of Jerusalem for power and Torah interpretation. See S. R. Isenberg, "Power Through Temple and Torah," in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (FS M. Smith; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 24-52.

community (Isa. 54.10-12; Dan. 7.13, 18; 1 QM 12.1-5; 1 Enoch 90.28-29).⁵⁶ Evident in Paul's metaphorical scheme, the first Jerusalem could be described as 'earthly' as well as 'present', and the second as 'future' as well as 'above'. Paul included the missing elements by implication and related the heavenly Jerusalem to his eschatology. Both covenants, or their manifestations, were concurrent and were expressed in terms of the earthly struggles of the Galatian churches, during the time of Paul's writing. Based on the argument of Gal. 3, there is a sequence to Paul's eschatological outlook. What was promised in Abraham was fulfilled in Christ, while Moses' covenant ceased with Christ's arrival.⁵⁷ Therefore, the first promise continued in a new manifestation, while the second promise became outdated.

Where then does the futuristic and transcendent Jerusalem fit in, if Abraham's promise is already fulfilled? Apart from the 'above' Jerusalem being a concept and possibly a location, Paul's application of the analogy is not futuristic, but present.⁵⁸ The 'above' Jerusalem gave birth to Paul's gentile mission (Gal. 4.26). Whether the idea is locative or temporal, the 'future' has already somehow broken into the present through Paul's gentile mission. The present and earthly Jerusalem was actually past and obsolete as well as fleshly. While the continuity is in the Abrahamic covenant, discontinuity of the Mosaic legislation resulted from coming of Christ. In other words, Paul spoke of the obsolete Law in terms of the present Jerusalem, and the present gentile mission in terms of the 'above' Jerusalem which was opposed to the fleshly origin of the

⁵⁶ Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, p. 29; Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 440, sees this heavenly language as being connected with the apocalyptic tradition of the Jewish religion(s).

⁵⁷ E. J. Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), p. 237, claims that there is a possible allusion to the 'seed' of the Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7.12; LXX Ps. 24.13; 88.4, 29,36; Isa. 44.3). This is possible but Paul did not elaborate on David because the Davidic covenant has little to do with the Galatian problem.

⁵⁸ Amadi-Azuogu, p. 277, dismisses the possibility of Paul talking about any future or 'idealized' Jerusalem. If the present Jerusalem is also earthly by its implication in contrast to the Jerusalem 'above', then there is no reason to dismiss the Jerusalem 'above' as being future as well. Otherwise, Jerusalem was not only the mother of the earthly elect but actually becomes the earthly elect. Any way one wishes to make the contrast to work, the pairs have to match one another. Here the present Jerusalem is no doubt the earthly Jerusalem. So why should the Jerusalem 'above' not be the opposite of the "present" Jerusalem? Note here that it is Paul's application, not his concept of heavenly Jerusalem, that is present in his mission. There needs to be a separation between application and concept. A future concept can still have present application. Amadi-Azuogu also asserts the possibility of the two Jerusalems not being opposites. This would neutralize the contrast between the lineage of Sarah and Hagar.

present Jerusalem in Gal. 4.23. Furthermore, Paul talked of no new covenant superseding the old covenant. In Paul's story, the Sinai/Hagar covenant was still giving birth to children 'in the flesh' and these children were never part of the Abrahamic covenant. Whether Paul fully justified his argument for doing away with the Abrahamic circumcision or not, Christ's incarnation allowed him to do just that while the 'gentile' elements in Abraham's covenant remained intact. In essence, the Galatians' application of the Law after Christ could either result in birth from the present Jerusalem or the heavenly Jerusalem. Hagar represents either the Jerusalem church or Jerusalem as a geographical location (Gal. 4.25). More than likely, Paul's Hagar typology was a veiled attack on the agitators' reliance on the Jerusalem authority, as the agitators were children of the present Jerusalem.⁵⁹ Thus, Paul was not necessarily attacking the mother church nor Judaism per se, but was dismissing any claim that the present Jerusalem had any authority in making gentiles practice the Law.⁶⁰ The geographical location of the present Jerusalem echoes the Jerusalem episode in Gal. 2. The problem of Gal. 2 and this passage may appear parallel. However, the claim of the agitators in this passage was that the Jerusalem church had the authority because the mother church did practice circumcision. In the case of Gal. 2, the gentile Titus was actually exempted from circumcision while visiting the Jerusalem church. The picture here provides a contrast against the agitators' claim. In this passage, Paul argued by the premise of the agitators, assuming that the Jerusalem church was really acting as a model for gentile Christians. According to Paul, so long as the Jerusalem church members were still following the Law, they were living as the children of the slave woman.⁶¹ Furthermore, Paul's attack on the earthly

⁵⁹ This does not eliminate the issue of Jerusalem's authority as Sumney, "*Servants of Satan*", "*False Brothers*", and *Other Opponents of Paul*, pp. 149-150, seems to claim. Whatever the role of Jerusalem is, Paul's negative portrait indicates at least the agitators' claim on the Jerusalem authority, this does not necessarily indicate a clear conflict between Paul and the Jerusalem church per se. However, Paul might not have had enough time to distinguish between a claim versus a perceived compromise. The matter was urgent enough for him to write with speed and fury.

⁶⁰ While Paul aimed to be independent of the Jerusalem church in the content of his gospel, he was dependent for their cooperation of his gentile mission (Gal. 2.2).

⁶¹ Martyn, *Galatians*, pp. 459-466, sees the earthly reference to the Jerusalem church. One possibility is that Paul perceived the Jerusalem church to house the agitators which made the church equally guilty. If this were the case, then Paul was calling the Jerusalem church the slave woman. Martyn sees a very antagonistic relationship between the two missions (p. 433). However, it seems that while the two missions had their differences, Paul presented them to cooperate to a large degree (Gal. 1-2). Could Jerusalem be simply a symbol of the Law or Law-

Jerusalem also corresponds with the fleshly birth of the enslaved (Gal. 4.23). The connection between earthly birth and earthly characteristics are consistent with Paul's intent, which is to show the agitators and their followers in the worst light. Therefore, Paul was more than likely equating the slave children with anyone living by the Law. These people were not the heirs to God's promise to Abraham. Instead, the children of the free woman were the heirs.

Having seen how circumcision was important for someone like Josephus, who probably had a great deal of training in Judaism, one very practical interpretive question still comes to mind when looking at this story.⁶² How did the Galatians know the Sarah-Hagar story in the Bible so well, since they had little biblical knowledge prior to conversion? Was Paul's brief stay in Galatia able to impart the life of Abraham to them in a way that was significant to their salvation? Was Abraham's story even a central element of the gospel of Paul? While it is likely that the Galatians had only some knowledge of Abraham, it is hard to imagine that they had all the details necessary to fully grasp Paul's allegory. Some may think that the way the story was so intricately worked out in Paul's argument could have completely confused the gentile audience.⁶³ As Downing points out, "We may note for example Galatians 3.1-5, where Paul reminds his hearers of factors in their early believing with no reference to scripture (none to fulfilled prophecy, for instance) ...".⁶⁴ Up to Gal. 4, only Abraham and possibly Moses (though not mentioned by name) make extensive appearance from the many characters of the Old Testament. This makes the appearance of the allegory even more peculiar. Unless one is ready to concede

keeping because of the cultic association with it? The argument could go either way. On the one hand, Jerusalem has been associated with the mother church in earlier chapters. On the other hand, if Paul did not specify the church but only the location, Jerusalem could be just a symbol of Law-keeping. Nowhere was there a city in the Roman Empire so thoroughly governed by Jewish customs and Law.

⁶² Even if different branches of Judaism had different views of circumcision, the rite was so important that it prompted a defense written by Philo. Philo had little trouble assimilating to Roman culture. Yet he still wrote on this issue. See R. D. Hecht, "The Exegetical Contexts of Philo's Interpretation of Circumcision," in F. E. Greenspahn *et al* (eds.), *Nourished with Peace*, pp. 51-79, on Philo's understanding in *Spec. Leg.*

⁶³ Very few would claim that Paul had some Jewish Christian audience in mind. See D. Garlington, "Role Reversal and Paul's Use of Scripture in Galatians 3.10-13," *JSNT* 65 (1997), p. 92 for such a claim. Garlington's scheme would require a deep understanding of Jewish covenant theology. One cannot assume such knowledge and subtlety of the Galatians.

⁶⁴ F. G. Downing, "A Cynic Preparation for Paul's Gospel for Jew and Greek, Slave and Free, Male and Female," *NTS* 42 (1996), p. 456.

that Paul made no sense to his Galatian listeners, one must look for a different explanation. There are hints in the story that lend themselves to a legitimate mirror-reading.⁶⁵ C. K. Barrett correctly suggests, “Paul was obliged to follow them (the agitators) from point to point because he could not afford to let it appear that his opponents had the Old Testament - the Bible - on their side.”⁶⁶ First, the importance of circumcision in the whole episode should alert the interpreter to the possibility that the agitators used the episode in a very similar argumentation to Josephus, namely by claiming that legitimacy came from circumcision.⁶⁷ After all, Paul was ignoring the most obvious and visible sign of circumcision in the Abrahamic covenant. In the light of the importance of the Abrahamic lineage in Jewish traditions, the debate on how this lineage could be obtained must have been central to the Galatian controversy. To these agitators, if one were to belong to Abraham’s *familia*, circumcision was the first priority. In line with the rest of the argument before the Sarah-Hagar story, the issue is about Abraham’s promise, which was only valid for the legitimate son, Isaac, since he was circumcised. As in Gal. 3.29, the concern then is about being a son of Abraham.

There is also a certain parallel between the missionary activities of Paul and those of the agitators which both arose out of Jewish Christianity. The closest activity to the gentile mission within Judaism was some kind of gentile involvement in the Diaspora synagogues.⁶⁸ Although proselytizing gentiles was

⁶⁵ W. D. Davies, *Pauline Studies* (London: SPCK, 1984), p. 176, questions the “Jewish” characteristic of the argument for a gentile audience. Mirror-reading would be an easy tool to answer W. D. Davies’ puzzlement. See Barclay, “Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case”.

⁶⁶ C. K. Barrett, *Freedom and Obligation*, p. 44.

⁶⁷ M. Hooker, “St. Paul’s Use of Scripture,” *NTS* 27 (1981), p. 305, commenting on a similar problem in 2 Cor. may have a point here. “Paul starts from Christian experience and expounds scripture in the light of that experience, quarrying the Old Testament where he will. It is perhaps no accident that, though Paul writes a *midrash* on this particular Exodus text, he does *not* write a commentary on the book of Exodus.” His experience in Galatians might have something to do with the dialogue he had with other leaders of the early church and his understanding of how these leaders viewed the Old Testament passages Christologically. Paul could either counter or adhere to such understanding.

⁶⁸ This is not to say that proselytizing was the main goal of Judaism, nor can one be sure of the degree of gentile involvement. While many Jews integrated well into their Roman society, Jewish opinions varied on the topic of proselytes. H. Conzelmann, *Gentiles, Jews, Christians: polemics and apologetics in the Greco-Roman era* (transl. M. E. Boring; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), pp. 140-233, and M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), pp. 54-57, demonstrate the scarce evidence of Jewish apology. Even then, the nature of evidence cannot always be classified as religious apologetics.

not a main feature of formative Judaism, there are hints of some form of proselytizing both in the New Testament and the Second Temple Jewish writings.⁶⁹ If J. M. Scott's research is correct, the adoption of proselytes was based on the belief that all believers shared a common God.⁷⁰ From a Jewish perspective, the agitators could easily have seen circumcision as the crucial element for proselyte adoption/conversion into the Abrahamic covenant.⁷¹ For a gentile audience, this adoption into Abraham's *familia* is prominent. Furthermore, the mention of Jerusalem does not make sense unless the Galatians were aware of the religious significance of Jerusalem. The place of Jerusalem in Paul's argument became almost a climactic remark.⁷² One has to acknowledge the possibility of the agitators claiming the authority of Jerusalem or possibly even the Jerusalem church as the standard for circumcision. Paul's counterclaim was that there was one Jerusalem that was the opposite of the religious community of the earthly Jerusalem, namely the heavenly Jerusalem.⁷³ Paul

Many so-called apologetic literature was probably written with a primarily Greek-speaking Jewish audience in mind. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion*, pp. 79-80 and V. A. Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," *Eos* 48 (1956), pp. 169-193. Conversion might not have been the main goal of such literature. Social acceptance among the gentiles was probably the more likely purpose.

⁶⁹ In addition to the debate within Jewish writings on the role of circumcision, the New Testament indicates some gentile admiration or even conversion to Judaism by the 'god-fearer' passages (e.g. Acts 10.2, 22; 13.16, 26). Otherwise, why is there any need to talk about the need for circumcision: circumcision was already an established Jewish practice by then. Whatever the term 'god-fearer' means (and this is not the forum to debate the meaning), it is always associated with synagogues or the Jewish religion(s).

⁷⁰ Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, pp. 81-85, shows that religious adoption existed among Essenes and the Qumran community (Josephus *BJ* 2.120-121; 1QH 9.34b-36; Philo *Sorb.* 56). The usage of 'brothers' for gentile believers hints at adoption. In practice, did the Qumran community really try to gain gentile converts?

⁷¹ This statement raises several related issues. Were these agitators Jewish or members of Judaism? Was there an active movement of gentile conversion in the Jewish missionary movement among the Galatians or anywhere in the Greco-Roman world? Unless Judaism was somehow 'Christianized', a positive answer to the previous questions is unlikely. Evidence on what is required of proselytes can show the importance of certain indispensable practices of Judaism. Although opinions regarding these rites are far from uniform, mere discussion shows their importance. Apparently, these practices influenced both the Galatians and the agitators heavily. The agitators were probably not involved in a 'Jewish mission' as much as a 'Judaized' Christianity. See M. Goodman, "Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century," *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, pp. 53-78, and S. McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles*, pp. 49-77, for discussions of the lack of emphasis on the gentile mission. Sim. Segal, *Rebecca's Children*, pp. 98ff, who states, "Even though Jews welcomed proselytes and sometimes went out of their way to explain Judaism to potential proselytes, the synagogue never indulged in the kind of proselytizing that characterized Christianity."

⁷² The Old Testament quotation provides a proper climax to Paul's case. Paul has used the Old Testament to create a rhetorical climax elsewhere (Rom. 3.10-18; 11.34; 15.9-12; 2 Cor. 6.16-18).

⁷³ J. L. White, *The Apostle of God*, p. 237, asserts that the Greco-Roman political ideals influenced Paul's concept of the heavenly Jerusalem. Terminologically, one must separate

simply did two things here, according to the dialogical situation: first, he reinterpreted the episode of Sarah and Hagar by initially talking about the legitimacy issue and then, appropriately, by dismissing the importance of circumcision in both the original Old Testament context and Jewish tradition; and second, he went against any claim of a Jerusalem authority by providing a third way.⁷⁴

This study has now come full circle back to the Abrahamic covenant, which seems to have occupied Paul's mind throughout Gal. 3-4. There is yet one more biblical parallel arising from the Abrahamic covenant. It is the parallel between the Galatians and Israel. The theology of 'seed' permeates the verses preceding Gal. 4. This corporate theology climaxes in the 'son' of the command in Gal. 4.30. The whole Sarah-Hagar episode presupposes the importance of Abraham and God's covenant with Israel.⁷⁵ There is no exception in the way Philo or Josephus viewed Abraham, whose ethnic importance resulted in their, as well as Paul's, positive views of the great patriarch.⁷⁶ The main difference between the

metaphors and ideals. Paul borrowed a political metaphor while discarding to all the ideals behind it. Here in Gal. 4, the literary context is clearly religious and there was no political conflict between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem. Nor was there a conflict between Christ and Caesar. Thus, White probably overemphasizes the political idea by using Gal. 4.21-31 as an example. In fact, the church as a 'civic entity' does not fit the argument of Gal. 4. The church could 'resemble' a civic entity, while functioning as a part of God's *familia* but it does not necessarily model itself on a civil entity here.

⁷⁴ S. K. Riegel, "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology," *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 410-415, draws on various scholars to give some kind of criteria for the label 'Jewish Christianity.' This label seems to fit the current situation. The requirement of circumcision was an issue in the Jewish discussion on gentile conversion to Judaism. See N. J. McEleney, "Conversion, Circumcision, and the Law," *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 319-341; M. Goodman, "Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century," *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, pp. 53-78.

⁷⁵ J. D. G. Dunn, "4QMMT and Galatians," *NTS* 43 (1997), p. 149, points out the parallel in terms of the blessings of Abraham and the Deuteronomic curses in 4QMMT. Similar concern seems to be in Paul's reflection of the curse in Gal. 3.8-14. Neither Paul nor many branches of Judaism believed that one could be saved by keeping the whole Law. However, if the Law was the paradigm as Paul's opponents claimed, Paul would keep the Law as an implication for the requirement of salvation (e.g. Gal. 3.10-11). The logic goes something like this. For Paul, though not necessarily for the agitators or any of the other branches of Judaism, keeping the Law is not partial. Nor is justification partial. Therefore, if one wants to keep part of the Law, one has put oneself under an obligation to keep the whole Law. If one wishes to keep the whole Law, then one is trying to attain justification by works, which is in opposition to justification by faith (Gal. 3.11). If one fails, then one loses one's justification by incurring a covenantal curse (Gal. 3.10, 12). In order for this curse not to hang over any believer's head, another route should be taken. This route is not of Law, but of faith in Christ (Gal. 3.13). It is not necessary here to look into where Paul's interpretation is different from Judaism. Paul was not just working within the shackles of his former beliefs but was exposing the implications of the Galatian errors.

⁷⁶ Perhaps this leads Hester, *Paul's Concept of Inheritance*, p. 47, to the conclusion that Paul generally used the Abrahamic argument against his agitators, while the argument of the 'sons of

three, is that Paul formulated his version of Abraham's covenant without any ethnic qualification. In fighting the claims and stories of the agitators, Paul went against the spirit of the original Abrahamic covenant by advocating non-circumcision for gentiles.⁷⁷ In order to make his argument convincing, Paul enlisted help from Christ who was the promised seed of Abraham as well as the link between God and the gentiles (Gal. 3.16). This is significant because the entire argument was Jewish and probably did not make much sense to the Galatians, except for Christ being the seed. Paul possibly conceived of the Galatians as being the spiritual Israel who became the newly adopted 'sons of God' in Christ (Gal. 6.16).⁷⁸ Through a shared faith with Abraham, the Galatians became a new kind of people incorporated into Christ the seed or original Abrahamic heir (Gal. 3.16; 4.6). Christ became the seed who legitimately inherited Abraham's promise as did all those who were brought into Christ's inner circle as a result of redemption from slavery (Gal. 4.4-6).⁷⁹ In other words,

God' was for the Galatians. While the contexts of these arguments seem to fit Hester's observation, he may be making too fine a distinction regarding Paul's audience(s).

⁷⁷ Furthermore, Paul seems to suggest that the Law was contrary to the Abrahamic promise until Gal. 3.19-21. C. H. Cosgrove, "Gal. 3.15-18 in Rhetorical Perspective," *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 536-549, rightly makes the suggestion that Paul was arguing *ad hominem* by taking up the possible response of the agitators in Gal. 3.15-18, so that the whole argument could be clarified in Gal. 19ff. N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), p. 166, proposes that the Law (or the way the Law was used by the agitators) was bad because it created different families. This division of ethnicity went against the purpose of Abraham's covenant. However, the problem persists when one looks at the Old Testament and see that the Law did intend to distinguish between Israel and its neighbors. So, did Paul suggest that God had made a mistake? The answer from Gal. 3.21 indicates a negative answer. Wright's scheme still has not solved the problem of Paul's usage of the Law in Gal. 3. Probably the only way to resolve the problem is Cosgrove's idea of Paul's *ad hominem* argument in Gal. 3.15-18.

⁷⁸ See H. Haag, "Sohn Gottes im Alten Testament," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 154 (1974), pp. 225-227, 230-231. Haag points out the importance of Israel as the adopted son (Ex. 4.22-23; Hos. 11.1; Dt. 32. 5, 19) and the kingly Messiah along the line of David being 'the' son of God (2 Sam. 7.14; 1 Chron. 17.13). J. D. Hester, "The 'Heir' and Heilsgeschichte: A Study of Galatians 4.1ff." p. 124 uses the "continuity/discontinuity" concepts to label the continuity between Israel and the Galatians in terms of their spiritual positions as Abraham's heir. Discontinuity in Hester's formulation has to do with the pedagogue and guardians, both of which represent the Law. The demarcating point was the coming of Christ. Similar is Hester's earlier thesis Hester, *Paul's Concept of Inheritance*. Following the lead of his mentor O. Cullmann, Hester focuses on the eschatological aspect of inheritance.

⁷⁹ Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, pp. 141-142, makes the impossible connection between the set date in Gal. 4.2 and the 430 years from Abraham to the Sinai event in Gal. 3.17. Scott's suggestion would make the Egyptians the guardians and managers of Israel, which hinders and confuses rather than helps Paul's argument. Seeing this difficulty, Scott takes shelter in asserting that Paul was arguing from a pattern in Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*. This kind of religious typology seems most complicated for a gentile audience, who had no background in understanding complex Jewish eschatology. More than likely, the set date is for the coming of Christ in Gal. 4.4 for the redemption of the Galatians. One can concede to the point that Paul might have been talking about Jewish Christians as the first fruits of Christ's salvation in Gal. 4.4-5.

the nation of Israel, as a result of exodus from Egypt, was the original adopted heir of God. Now the gentiles were the newly adopted heirs through Christ the original heir, thus bypassing the need to be exactly like national Israel. Under Roman adoption and inheritance laws, the continuity of the estate was the main concern of the owner. Similarly, the continuity of the Abrahamic covenant was expressed, first, through the land of Israel and, finally, through the church.⁸⁰ Although the subtlety and intricacies of Paul's theological argument might have eluded his original audience, the Greco-Roman metaphors within are dominant enough to communicate the major idea. The gentiles were no longer under slavery, but became adopted sons in Christ.

Following the patriarchal framework of Greco-Roman laws, Paul's analogy works perfectly well. He called the converts υἱοί instead of the gender neutral τέκνον (e.g. Gal. 4.19, 25, 28, 31).⁸¹ The idea of the sons being adopted fits perfectly with the concept of the legitimacy of the male heir and the disadvantages of the female.⁸² By mid second-century, it is completely clear that a woman who had a hereditary link to the *paterfamilia*, could because financially independent through inheritance (Gaius, *Inst.* 1.111). This added fact, which may or may not be anachronistic, confirms Paul's analogy between all brothers and

⁸⁰ Sim. Hester's thesis *Paul's Concept of Inheritance*, p. 19.

⁸¹ Keesmaat, *Paul and his Story*, p. 164 and Scott, *Adoption as the Sons of God*, p. 178, take the gender specific language to mean Israel as the elected 'son'. How would the Galatians know about this complex Jewish eschatological explanation? The so-called 'deuteronomic tone' in passages such as Gal. 5.1 is not apparent at all (Keesmaat, p. 171). A simpler explanation can be found in M. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, p. 61. The biggest problem with the second exodus interpretation is that it makes Paul a conversational partner to his Jewish contemporary. However, the letter to the Galatians has primarily the gentile audience in mind. No full-blown Jewish theological debate is readily apparent, although there is some *ad hominem* usage of the agitators' argument. Keesmaat assumes "that the Galatians inherited a telling of the exodus tradition." (Keesmaat, pp. 189-190) She further assumes that Paul made the same assumption. These are major assumptions which may or may not be true. Did the Galatians need to know the tradition to understand Paul's letter?

⁸² One cannot help but agree with M. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, p. 61. "Christians are sons - we need the sexist language to emphasize the link [with Jesus the Son] ...". Briggs, "Galatians," p. 224, asks the question, "Was Paul's Hagar-Sarah allegory consistent with his quotation of the baptismal formula in Gal. 3:28?" The answer must be yes if one makes the distinction between the allegory of Gal. 4 and spiritual reality in Gal. 3.28. Even in the new sphere of existence, Paul used the language and imageries of his society to illustrate his ideas. Furthermore, As M. D. Hooker's comment above implies, the usage of the word 'son' for any female member of the Galatian church would confirm her rights in Gal. 3.28 in the eschatological scheme of Christ's church.

sisters in Christ and God's adopted male heir (Gal. 3.28).⁸³ Although the labels of Jew, Greek, slaves, free, male, female, could serve to either elevate or degrade, liberation from such worldly discriminations and equality of all Christians made Paul's gospel message universal. B. Thurston points out that these labels were the 'givens' of Paul's world.⁸⁴ Yet, Paul's account of Christian salvation replaces the 'givens' with a new 'given' in Christ. Gaventa formulates matters in other words, "As the gospel's arrival obliterates the Law, it also obliterates those other 'places' with which people identify themselves, even the most fundamental places of ethnicity, economic and social standing and gender. The only location available for those grasped by the gospel is 'in Christ'."⁸⁵ In Paul's community, those who chose otherwise would be incorporated into the singular 'son' of the slave woman and were excluded from God's promise to Abraham in Christ. Such a son had to be cast out to keep the purity of the community and thus ensures the benefits of the Abrahamic promise.

To arrive at the meaning of Gal. 4.30, one has to consider how Paul used it in the immediate context. Gal. 4.31 starts a concluding remark by talking about who the 'believers' are. The message from Gal. 4.30-31 follows this logic: cast out the slave woman and her son because her son shall not be an heir with the son of the free woman; therefore, the freed Galatian Christians were not children of a slave woman but of the free woman; and they too must cast out the slave woman's son. Here the theme is the necessary expulsion of the agitators, because of their counterproductive activities. The agitators are symbolized by the earthly Jerusalem. The *phoros* includes Abraham's expulsion of the slave woman and her son, in reference to Ishmael's counterproductive activity. The theme deals with the essential issue of who gets the inheritance. Only one party can get it. The theme and *phoros* merge at the following points. The counterproductive

⁸³ This is what R. Jewett, *Paul the Apostle to America*, pp. 48-49, calls "equality in principle". The principle in Gal. 3.28 is the complete Lordship of Jesus Christ over both men and women. The specific application of this credal statement has to do with salvation in Christ. Jewett's theory of an evolution of Paul's conviction on gender role may also impact on issues like slavery. However, that would be an issue for the study of Philemon. See also J. M. Gundry-Volf, "Paul on Women and Gender: A Comparison with Early Jewish Views," in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus*, pp. 184-212, for a discussion on the tension Paul faced in his principles and applications on women in the church.

⁸⁴ B. Thurston, *Women in the New Testament*, p. 37.

⁸⁵ B. R. Gaventa, "Is Galatians Just a 'Guy Thing'?": A Theological Reflection," *Interpretation* 54 (2000), p. 276.

activities of both the agitators and Ishmael would endanger the inheritance of the rightful heir. The inheritance of both has to do with Abraham's blessing. If Abraham, the father, cast out the slave woman and her son, how much more should the Galatians, who are Abraham's offspring, cast out the agitators (Gal. 3.29)? What Paul is saying through this metaphor is, "If you want to inherit Abraham's blessing, do as Abraham did."

4.2.5 Polemical Function of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 4.30

The polemical function of Gal. 4.30 comes from all the previous typology being fused together. Paul linked the women with geographical locations to great effect. Geography had symbolic and ideological significance for many ancient people. According to the Greek geographer Ptolemy, the role of the geographer is "to show the world in all its expanse, how it functions as much by its nature as by its position. (1.1)"⁸⁶ Thus, famous locations are more than a spot on a map. Locations such as Jerusalem would have symbolic significance in the ancient reader's mind. Some geographers, such as Strabo, linked histories of peoples with locations (5.4.4-7).⁸⁷ Ethnic features, such as the identity, dress, customs and language of the local population, were no less important in ancient geography to Strabo (5.4.11; 6.1.2; 6.3.1). Throughout Galatians, this symbolic significance is explicit, and in no place is it more so than in Gal. 4. In the case of Galatians, Jerusalem had religious association.

At the most basic level, the rhetorical taxonomy by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca makes sense of the metaphor in Gal. 4.30. Before this particular exhortation against his agitators, Paul had already formed an argument based on the Sarah-Hagar story. The exhortation is not separate from the context of the story, coming, as it does, directly from Gen. 21.10. In fact, Gen. 21.10 is part of a greater story about God's blessing on barren women in the Old Testament, and it is to this that the Sarah-Hagar story connects Paul's story by first using Is. 54.1, in which he analogized between God's blessing on Zion and a formerly barren woman. Paul reapplied the same verse from Isaiah to his story. Though Paul's letter is not about Sarah and Hagar, his story pointed to that situation in the same

⁸⁶ Quoted by R. Laurence, "Territory, Ethnonyms and Geography: The construction of identity in Roman Italy," in R. Laurence and J. Berry, *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1998), p. 96.

⁸⁷ Laurence, "Territory, Ethnonyms and Geography," pp. 99-101.

way Is. 54.1 points to Zion's blessing. Therefore, what Paul did was to form an argument and then tell a story that illustrated his argument through analogy. In using this story, Paul neither endorsed nor denounced the societal role of slavery. He was merely borrowing the negative imageries to make his point.⁸⁸ Finally, he drew his exhortation in Gal. 4.30 from both his argument and his story.⁸⁹

Paul was primarily labeling the agitators not only as slaves, but also as a slave woman. This strategy works in the same way as did his earlier anathema (Gal. 1.8-9), which denies any hope for the cursed one. Paul wanted to show the Galatians that the agitators and their spiritual children never had or would have any claim to God's promise. There was no provision in God's plan for them as there was for the Galatians (Gal. 4.4-5). Association with them would endanger the Galatians. One can further see the force of Paul's rebuke through the analogy between the slave woman and the agitators.⁹⁰ Paul could have alternatively, omitted Gal. 4.29-31 and the whole passage could have still worked didactically. However, he elaborated on the point of the slave woman in a way that emphasizes the contrast between the agitators and the matriarchal line of the heavenly Jerusalem (Gal. 4.26).⁹¹ This matriarchal argument seems very peculiar, since Paul's usual emphasis on a linkage with Abraham now takes on an unusual feminine dimension. Martyn's explanation for this seems sound. He writes, "The Teachers have very probably employed it ["our mother"] to refer to the church in Jerusalem."⁹² Furthermore, Martyn points out that Paul used the masculine verb

⁸⁸ As stated in the beginning of the present study, E. A. Castelli, "Paul on Women and Gender," *Women and Christian Origins*, p. 231, writes, "It is troubling that Paul derives his figurative imagery in this passage from the economic institution of slavery and from women's own particular relationship to that institution." However, Paul's 'trouble' disappears, if one were to separate the imagery from the principle stated in Gal. 3.28. Instead, one can easily see the tension Paul might have struggled with in applying a principle he stated in Gal. 3.28. See B. Thurston, *Women in the New Testament: Questions and Commentary* (New York: Crossroad, 1998), pp. 59-60 for her formulation of the tension.

⁸⁹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 400.

⁹⁰ As the Principate brought peace to Rome, the necessity for female slaves to become breeders of future slaves became greater. K. Bradley, "On The Roman Slave Supply and Slavebreeding," p. 48. Paul's mention of the slave woman Hagar, takes on a very important rhetorical significance here.

⁹¹ See R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence Wisdom and the Son of Man* (SNTSMS, 21; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 110. He points out the common usage of a maternal link to the heavenly Jerusalem in Jewish apocalyptic thought (2 Baruch 3.11ff; 4 Ezr. 10.7). The implied pre-existence of the heavenly city and its heirs demonstrates the superiority of the heavenly heirs over the heirs to the temporary Old Testament Law.

⁹² Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 441. Martyn sees two possible strands of tradition. First, there is the tradition that Jerusalem becomes the mother of her inhabitants (Is. 51.17-20; 54.1 etc.). Second,

γεγέννηται to refer to the birth of a Christian church.⁹³ More than likely, Paul's usage of γεννάω Related to the patrilineal perspective of the LXX Gen. 11 or of other Jewish genealogies. From the time of Josephus and Philo, the teaching concerning the unique connection of the heir to God's promise with the matriarchal line was possibly prevalent within some in Jewish intellectual circles. The heavenly Jerusalem functions as the opposite to the earthly Jerusalem. In his tale of the slave woman, Paul was probably casting a polemical stone at his agitators' claim to represent the Jerusalem authority. In addition to the above, Paul could have categorized both the agitators and the fallen Galatians as slaves instead of distinguishing between the slave woman and her enslaved son. By keeping both parties in a singular category, he could have either revised or cut out Gal. 4.30 altogether. He clearly wanted to put the agitators in a separate, undesirable category. A slave woman was at the lowest level in the Greco-Roman social order.⁹⁴ Paul placed the agitators as the slave woman, that is on the outer fringe of the outside group, which thwarted the agitators' aim to be seen by the Galatians as insiders. This rhetorical move used the analogy to shift the agitators from their temporary privileged positions, to a position of impotence, from a position of honor to one of extreme shame. Thus, Paul killed two birds with one rhetorical stone. He accomplished his main aim, which was to communicate to the Galatians their free status, and in doing so, Paul verbally expelled his agitators from the elect community.⁹⁵ Hansen concludes, "Thus, it

there may be a tradition connecting the mother Jerusalem, who nourishes both Jews and gentiles, to grow as part of the true religion (*Pesiq. Rab Kah. 22.1*).

⁹³ Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 451.

⁹⁴ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, pp. 209-210, 227. One can tell the woman's place by the meaning of the word *materfamilias*. This word does not mean a woman with the kind of power as her counterpart the *paterfamilias*. Rather, it means that the woman's *paterfamilias* has died, thus giving her legal independence. In other words, "the Roman mother, ... was either subordinate to her husband's *familia* ... or an outsider." Her only financial protection came from the tradition of *pietas* which is the children's respect due to both the father and the mother. Cases of court rulings reflect this mentality in Pliny's time. Other ways she could have a greater independence was to outlive her natural and adopted children. Such a notion is more theoretical than real.

⁹⁵ Sim. Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, p. 145; Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, p. 27. Both authors see polemical usage of the story. Hansen sees the portion of the letter before 4.12 as the rebuke section as the portion thereafter indicates requests from Paul. Gal. 4.30 is not only a request. It has a commanding presence in the midst of a story. Although Hansen notes a parallel in the way Paul resisted the Jerusalem agitators with the current command for the Galatians to resist, Paul seems to want the Galatians to go further than merely resisting. He wanted active expulsion. Hansen classifies this story as "deliberative rhetoric rather than forensic rhetoric, since

appears, the focal point in the Hagar-Sarah Allegory is the imperative to expel the bondswoman and her son. Paul's use of the biblical story is intended to support his appeal for the Galatian believers to expel the troublemakers from their churches."⁹⁶

What then did Paul achieve in his argument, within the Greco-Roman perspective? The Sarah-Hagar episode created further problems for Paul's agitators, if one were to interpret this story from from the perspective of the Greco-Roman *familia*. Paul's aim was to degrade the position of the agitators. By implication, there are two kinds of people here. First, there are the Galatians οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι (Gal. 4.21). Then, as the story in Gal. 4.22ff implies, there are the agitators οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον (Gal. 4.4-5, 21; 5.18).⁹⁷ In Gal. 4.25, Paul confirmed his agitators as being enslaved under the Law. By calling the converted Galatians children of promise, and by commanding the expulsion of the slave woman and her son in Gal. 4.28-30, Paul clothed the legal metaphors in Christian meaning. In the light of Gal. 3.28, the famous Pauline claim for a universal gospel, Paul's intolerance of the agitators is surprising. While many see a 'tolerant' Paul who abandoned traditional boundaries, others rightly note that there was also an intolerance in Paul's new religious boundary lines. Whether or not one chooses to use D. Boyarin's words, such as 'flaw', to describe Paul's logic, it is clear that Paul was not trying to do away with all boundaries.⁹⁸ Rather, he set clear and exacting new boundaries.

his [Paul's] primary aim is no longer to accuse or defend but to persuade the Galatian believers to adopt a certain course of action." (*Abraham*, p. 156)

⁹⁶ Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, p. 146.

⁹⁷ Paul used this phrase to denote those living under the Law in other letters too (Rom. 6.14-15; 1 Cor. 9.20).

⁹⁸ D. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), p. 10. Boyarin's assumption of Paul's aim to create a tolerant gospel might be the main reason why he sees the flaw in Paul's logic.

Chapter Five
THE DIDACTIC USAGE OF THE SERVILE METAPHOR IN
GALATIANS

5.1 Paul's Teaching of the Galatians in Gal. 3.23-26

5.1.1 Introductory Issues in Gal. 3.23-26

Gal. 3.23-26 is contained within a larger argument about the Law versus Abraham's blessing, which starts at Gal. 3 and ends at Gal. 4.31. Three issues demand attention in building the exegetical foundation necessary to interpret Gal. 3.23-26. The first issue deals with the role of the Law in a metaphor in Gal. 3.23-26. If a metaphor is a condensed analogy, then Gal. 3.23-26 attempts to illustrate what Paul says about the Law in Gal. 3.19 and 3.22. Generally, analogy aims to clarify rather than prove something.¹ Gal. 3.23-26 illustrates metaphorically what comes before it. This is why Gal. 3.23-26 follows an argument and proof taken from the Old Testament. Therefore, it is important to think in terms of how Paul described the role of the Law. The second issue deals with the continuity between Gal. 3.23-26 and Gal. 4. There is a more detailed discussion of the flow in the discussion of Gal. 4.1-10 in section 5.2. A third issue deals with the question of whether the Law leads humanity to Christ or Christ came to humanity.

The first issue then is how Paul described the function of the Law. Paul writes in the beginning of Gal. 3.19, "Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος;". Why indeed? Two important verses which give a glimpse into Paul's thinking precede the metaphor in Gal. 3.23-26. Paul made a series of claims as to what the Law did not do, and then in Gal. 3.19 he stated that the Law was for the sake of transgression. In Gal. 3.22, Paul stated that ἡ γραφή kept all humans under sin. The meanings of both verses need clarification if what Paul meant regarding the function of the Law is to be understood. Gal. 3.19 is peculiar because this particular idea of angels is not found anywhere else in the Pauline corpus. The LXX translation of Dt. 33.2 could give rise to the tradition found here in Gal. 3.² The agitators in Galatians probably made some claim about the authority of the Law originating from

¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, pp. 393-394.

² E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), p. 66.

angelic mediation.³ Later paragraphs will explore the angelic issues in more detail.

There is a need to look closely at certain points in Gal. 3.19 for an answer to the question “Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος;”. First, Paul stated that the Law ‘was added’ which is in aorist passive προσετέθη. The context makes clear what the Law was added to, that is the previous Abrahamic covenant. This makes the Law an ‘extra’ which does not belong to the core of God’s promise. Second, the Law was added τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν. The τῶν παραβάσεων here can be used in relation to the Law (Rom. 2.23; 4.15). Hence, the transgression is not some general sin but the “deviation” from God’s given Law. There are three possible interpretations of τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν in Gal. 3.19. First, the Law could have been added to curb Israel’s transgressions.⁴ However, there is little evidence in Gal. 3 that the Law had a curbing function in ancient Israel. Second, the Law could have added transgressions to the collective curse. While Rom. 5.20 talks of the Law increasing or bringing about transgression, the language in Galatians is revelatory. Third, the Law could have revealed to the recipients the transgression that was already there. Based on the argument in Gal. 3.10-13, the Law was there to add to the collective curse by recording those who did not practice and live by the Law.⁵ Gal. 3.22 could further validate the interpretation of the curse if the holding function of the Law is linked with the curse. This link depends on the outcome of the interpretation of ἡ γραφή in Gal. 3.22. Although the article does not necessarily point to any of the specific previous Old Testament quotations, it most certainly could.⁶ Ἡ γραφή could also mean the whole of the Old Testament Scripture in Paul’s time. Paul could have also separated the meanings into the

³ If one were to review the Second Temple Jewish literature, one would discover much speculation on the importance of angels. Dunn, “Theology of Galatians,” in J. M. Bassler (ed.), *Pauline Theology* (vol. 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), p. 136, theorizes that “Jewish thought” shows the importance of angels over the nation, while God kept Israel directly for Himself (Detu. 32.8-9; Dir. 17.17; Jub. 15.31-32; 1 Enoch 20.5 etc.). However, the importance of angels in literature like the Dead Seas Scrolls shows the diversity of thoughts concerning these heavenly beings.

⁴ See Lull, “‘The Law Was Our Pedagogue’: A Study in Galatians 3:19-25,” *JBL* 105 (1986), pp. 483-485 for the view that the Law curb transgression. See U. Wilckens, “Statements on the development of Paul’s view of the Law,” in M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (eds.), *Paul and Paulinism* (FS C. K. Barrett; London: SPCK, 1982), p. 22.

⁵ Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 175-176, suggests that the Law was added to cause transgression. This notion is not clear in Galatians, although there seems to be a hint of it in Rom. 5.

⁶ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 144, connects ἡ γραφή with Gal. 3.13.

general legal function of the Old Testament and the specific revelatory role of Scripture.⁷ Two other places in Galatians (Gal. 3.8; 4.30) use ἡ γραφή to indicate some revelatory function of the Old Testament for later salvation history, as if there were some principle of continuity from the Old Testament, with the Law being a discontinuous portion. Whether Paul's distinction between the two is clear or not, his solution dissolves the tension which arises from the Old Testament being both a curse as well as revelatory. Based on the other usage being linked to specific scripture (Gal. 3.8; 4.3), a candidate which must fit the context of Gal. 3.22 is Gal. 3.10.⁸ Such a solution, paradoxically, allows Paul to use the Old Testament to disprove the preeminence of the Law. Because both the Law and of ἡ γραφή exist in the context of Gal. 3, Martyn's distinction between the two is fully justified.⁹ Although this language refers specifically to Israel, the situation came to typify of what happens to humanity under God's rule. Commentators, such as N. T. Wright, see the crucifixion as Israel's curse. However, two factors undermine this interpretation (Gal. 3.13). The first factor is the change of focus in this passage. Gal. 3.15 shifts from a discussion about Abraham and the Law to the permanence of any covenant. While Paul did not change his topic completely in Gal. 3.15, he frequently used the vocative ἄδελφοί to shift his focus in Galatians (Gal. 1.11; 4.12; 5.11, 13; 6.1). Whether or not this was a deliberate ploy, the shift casts doubt over the close connection between discussions on the permanence of the covenant in Gal. 3.15-25 and the curse in Gal. 3.13. If there is a difference between the Law in Gal. 3.13 and the common revelatory voice of ἡ γραφή in Gal. 3.22, then ἡ γραφή reveals the curse and the holding function of the Law.¹⁰ Gal. 3.24 makes the holding function clearer still, if the anticipation of Christ's coming is important in Paul's gospel (Gal. 4.4-5). More discussion on the metaphor itself will take place in later paragraphs. The second factor that shows a universal application is the frequent use of 'everyone' and 'all' throughout the passage itself. If, in earlier passages, Paul seems to be talking about Israel's history, how does the retelling benefit his gentile situation?

⁷ The Law was not only condemning gentiles but also Jews (Gal. 3.10, 22; 4.1-7).

⁸ Certainly Gal. 3.6, 8, 22, 23, 24 do not fit 'all things/humans(?)' τὰ πάντα in Gal. 3.22.

⁹ Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 360.

¹⁰ N. T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, pp. 163, 172, sees this type of distinction as a play on word. He takes the 'Law' and 'Scripture' to refer to the same Law.

The τὰ πάντα in Gal. 3.22 confirms the universality of the application when the revelatory voice of ἡ γραφή speaks.¹¹

According to the interpretation so far, the Law was neither used to induce more transgression, nor to curb Israel's sins. Paul clearly stated that angels act as administrators of the revelation in the Law. Such a revelation brings awareness of transgression to the recipients. The order of the revelations for both the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants in Paul's argument in Gal. 3 favors what R. N. Longenecker calls the "cognitive interpretation."¹² The second point Paul wanted to make about the Law is that the Law had a demonstrative purpose. As previously stated, the effective period for the Law was nullified by the seed's arrival, which makes the Law's revelatory role temporary. This is in keeping with the logic of Gal. 3.16 and the wording of Genesis (e.g. Gen. 12.2-3; 13.15-16; 17.4; 22. 17-19 etc.). The promise was not only for Abraham, but also for his seed, who is interpreted Messianically.¹³ For Paul, God's promise to the believer was made with the believer being linked to Christ and not to the Law. So this chronological element is not only dealing with time but also with the very nature of the promise to Abraham which is closely tied to a concept of corporate personality.¹⁴

¹¹ There is always the argument over whether the example was universal or merely Jewish. The neuter favors the abolition of differences between Jews and gentiles. Such an abolition of ethnic differences also paves the way for salvation by Christ (Gal. 3.28). The mention of the Mosaic Law is clearly in reference to Israel, but the whole argument is universally applicable, thereby giving credibility to the Gal. 3.28 proclamation. However, W. J. Dalton, "The Meaning of the 'We' in Galatians," *ABR* 38 (1990), pp. 39-40, sees the impossibility of the 'we' being Israel in this passage. Curiously, he also sees the gentiles being bound by the Law, even if they were not within Israel's covenant. Dalton also desperately uses Rom. 1-2 as his proof for the universal law in humanity. He sees the universal law as being somehow equated with God's Law for the Jews.

¹² R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 138.

¹³ Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, p. 169, sees the 'seed' as embodying both Jews and gentiles. This affects how the one mediator and the 'not-one' mediator are interpreted in Gal. 3.20. Wright proposes that Moses did not mediate a covenant that keeps everyone in 'oneness'. Therefore, Moses becomes the 'not-one' mediator. However, the simpler solution is to simply look at the directness of Abrahamic revelation versus the indirectness of Moses' Law. Otherwise, the additional note on the angels adds no force to the argument. Martyn, *Galatians*, pp. 345ff, sees the seed as something originated from a physical interpretation of the Abrahamic covenant. Paul's reaction was merely a restructuring of his opponents' teaching. Martyn proposes that Paul changed his opponents' argument in two rhetorical moves. He first created distance between the word 'covenant' and its theological meaning to give it a unchangeable quality (Gal. 3.15). Then, he infused the same word with the theological or Christological idea. This double re-orientation of the agitators' teaching should make sense to the gentile audience.

¹⁴ A clearer example in Paul's thought is in Rom. 5. The same concepts occur in other Jewish traditions such as Heb. 7.10; Jub. 2.23; 3.30ff; 15.27; 16.26; T. Levi 18.10; 1 En. 90.19, 30, 37ff; Sir. 25.24 etc. See also K. M. Fischer, "Adam und Christus: Überlegungen zu einem

In order to deal with the context of Gal. 3.23-26, Paul's unusual mention of angels is worth discussing briefly. Paul mentioned the mediator of the Law as being angelic. The LXX Ps. 67.18 (MT Ps. 68.18) lends itself to Paul's interpretation. Did God use 'angels' to carry out his Sinaitic revelation? The LXX seems to indicate a positive answer. In some Jewish traditions, there were such teachings and speculations concerning angels.¹⁵ Because this study is not focusing on the angelic aspect of the Mosaic revelation, a detailed discussion is not appropriate. Furthermore, in order to interpret Gal. 3.23-26, it is enough to see that this angelic interpretations in Paul's statement, though unusual in his writing, was not unusual among his Jewish contemporaries. More than likely, this whole argument was first used by the agitators, and Paul's refutation was *ad hominem*. Furthermore, the final mediator was Moses whose name Paul did not mention here.¹⁶ Moses remained nameless not because he was unimportant, but because he was already well known. To summarize, the function of the Law is demonstrative and it is a temporary servant to God's purpose. The administrators and mediator of the Law are inferior to God who directly granted the Abrahamic covenant.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the second interpretive issue on Gal. 3.23-26 is how Gal. 3.23-26 fit into the subsequent verses which is better left for the Gal. 4 metaphor. This brings the analysis to the third interpretive issue from the beginning of the chapter. The third issue of whether humans were led by the Law to Christ or vice versa can be found Gal. 3.24-25. Some translators understand the Law to 'lead us to Christ' (e.g. NASB; NIV). This translation is based on the premise that the pedagogue's main job was to lead the child to school, which can imply that the Law has led the believer to the 'school of

religionsgeschichtlichen Problem," in K. -W. Tröger (ed.), *Altes Testament-Frühjudentum-Gnosis* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980), pp. 284-298.

¹⁵ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 140. *Jub.* 1.27-29; *Acts* 7.38, 53; *Heb.* 2.2; *Philo Somn.* 1.140-144; *Josephus AJ* 1.136.

¹⁶ The very difficult Gal. 2.20 seems to say that the mediator is not one as God is one. See Longenecker, *Galatians*, pp. 141-142, for some interpretive options. How can Moses the mediator not be one person? The verse probably means something like a mediator involves more than God, thereby making the method of a human mediator indirect, whereas the Abrahamic covenant is directly from God.

the child being led to school by the pedagogue. However, the leading function of the Law seems to contradict the idea that it was Christ who came and not the Law which took the believer to Christ. Elsewhere in Galatians, Paul confirmed that it was God who initiated salvation by the coming of Christ (Gal. 4.4-5). Therefore, it makes better sense to understand εἰς Χριστόν as ‘until Christ’, which is further explained in Gal. 3.25.¹⁸ This way, the temporary function of the Law in Gal. 3.19 is not lost in the metaphor of Gal. 3.24.

5.1.2 Literary Context of the Gal. 3.23-26 Metaphor

Since the discussion in Gal. 3 is not about the institution of the pedagogue, but about the function of the Law, the *phoros* of the pedagogue obviously fuses with the theme of the Law. When one discards the chapter divisions of the modern Bible, Gal. 3.23-26 is part of a continuous analogy with Gal. 4. Therefore, any relevant topic not covered here is covered in the section 5.2 of this chapter. The language of Gal. 3.23-26 resembles that of Gal. 4.1-10, thus it is easy to try to harmonize the two. However, there are certain irreconcilable inconsistencies in the analogies, and therefore, overly hasty harmonization can actually confuse the interpretive issues. Because of the differences between Paul’s metaphors, the modern Bible draws a reasonable dividing line between Gal. 3 and 4.

How exactly do the verses Gal. 3.23-26 fit into the literary context with the verses preceding them, that is Gal. 3.15-22, which are a detailed explanation of the purpose of the Law? Paul made some denials and affirmations regarding this issue. First, Paul denied that the Law superseded the Abrahamic covenant, since it came later in God’s plan (Gal. 3.17). Second, Paul denied that inheritance was based on the Law (Gal. 3.18). Third, Paul denied that the Law was permanent in God’s salvation history (Gal. 3.23). Fourth, Paul denied the superiority of administrators and mediators, even if the administrators were angels and the mediator was the great Moses (Gal. 3.19). Here, Paul was almost certainly reacting to the heightened regard for angelic mediation among his opponents. Regarding Paul’s affirmations, as has already been stated, first, Paul affirmed the

ROM, who speaks of the pedagogue as the educational function of the Law which “leads us to Christ”.

¹⁸ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 147; Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 355. Martyn further states that the Law did not have its goal in Christ. Rather, God had the goal in Christ even when the Law was effectively governing those under it.

importance of the Law not to save, but to curse (Gal. 3.10-13).¹⁹ Second, he affirmed the promise to Abraham as the basis of any inheritance at all (Gal. 3.18). Third, he affirmed that the Law was only for defining and revealing transgression, without mention of salvation (Gal. 3.19). Fourth, he affirmed the superiority of God in the Abrahamic covenant over any angelic administrator or human mediator of the Law (Gal. 3.20). Fifth, he affirmed that the revelatory voice of Scripture itself cooperates with the Law in shutting all humanity under sin (Gal. 3.22). Paul universalized what was a historical fact of Israel.²⁰ Thus, one can see the thread of his argument having to do with the purpose of the Law, both positively and negatively. What then is the purpose of the Law in the light of Paul's metaphor in Gal. 3.23-26?

In Gal. 3.23-26, Paul communicated the purpose of the Law by comparing it to a pedagogue. It serves the purpose of this discussion to state that the pedagogue was a slave. The social implication of this metaphor is discussed in the next section. According to the Gal. 3.23-24, the first job of the pedagogue was to confine in custody the minor until Christ came. The second job of the

¹⁹ In dealing with Gal. 3.13, Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, p. 151, states that Israel was not able to fully receive Abraham's blessing because of its corporate failure to keep the Law. This could be true. An easier explanation is that the universal sinfulness which plagued Israel prevented it from being blessed (Gal. 3.19, 23). Wright then sees the Spirit reception as the sign of renewal for "we Christian Jews" in Gal. 3.13 (p. 154). However, it seems to include gentiles as well as no covenant renewal is discussed in the context. The first person plural can be confusing. It is safer to see the third person plural as Israel only when the linkage to Israel's legacy of the Law is mentioned.

²⁰ Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, p. 143, sees the first person plurals as Jewish as distinct from the gentiles in Gal. 3.12-13. He sees the curse as being the exile which does not have to be the case. However, Paul's idea of the curse (and perhaps not that of his contemporaries) in later verses applies to all, which indicates that he did not have a limited idea of the exile in view. He proposes that if Israel incurred the curse of the Law by not being able to keep it, then all who embrace the Law would be under its curse as well (p. 147). However, the possibility of blessing and curse is equal under the Law, what makes Paul think that the gentiles are less able to keep the Law, if given the chance? Paul did not seem to hypothesize this kind of situation, even if he considered the gentiles morally inferior. Rather it is the revelation of transgressions which create the ability for all to be shut up under sin and its implied curse. Wright cites Phil. 3.6 as one possibility of perfect keeping of the Law (p. 145). His claim is far from well grounded. The "blameless" character of Paul's Law-keeping has nothing to do with perfection but rather a generally moral conduct. The same word is used also for believers (Phil. 2.14-15). Whether Paul described the behavior of himself or the Philippian believers, the context of "blameless" character is that of comparison rather than absolute perfection. Paul compared himself to those around him in the light of the Law while he compared the Philippians to their wicked environment. Therefore, Wright's appeal to Paul's ability, thereby giving all Law-keepers the possibility perfect obedience, seems unfounded. The same word in Gen. 17.1 LXX was part of the condition for God's promise to Abraham but the great patriarch was still full of faults. Yet, the narrative showed that God kept His promise. Thus, Abraham's behavior was not legally "blameless" in the way Wright would define blameless Law-keeping.

pedagogue was to step out of the way when Christ came (Gal. 3.25). Burton describes the coming of Christ as “[an] historical succession of one period of revelation upon another, and the displacement of the Law by Christ.”²¹ The way in which Paul discussed the pedagogue ought to relate with the verses in the previous argument.

5.1.3 Cultural Context of the Gal. 3.23-26 Metaphor

The present application of the former enslavement of the Galatians answers one question in relation to the gentiles. Must gentiles adhere to regulations such as circumcision, a sacred calendar or, perhaps, a kosher diet (Gal. 4.10; 5.2-4)?²² Once again, he used the slave metaphor to answer this question by pointing to some of the functions of the Law. In Gal. 3.23-26, Paul used a metaphor derived from the *familia*. He used the pedagogue to describe the function of the Law that enslaved Israel before Christ (Gal. 3.23-25). Barrow says of the pedagogue, “his title is difficult to render, his work not easy to define or his reputation defend.”²³ The pedagogue had existed even before Plato. Paul used this metaphor with good reason. Before the Hellenistic period, the pedagogue had a limited role, that is of taking care of the child to make sure that the child behaved nobly. His job was to supervise where the child went and what the child did or said. At least from epigraphic depiction, they were always present with the children in public places. Due to the close contact with the young master, the pedagogue’s unofficial moral influence came with the job. However, in the Hellenistic period, the this position evolved and gained a better reputation. Socially the pedagogues were still slaves, but one can see from epitaphs that many masters appreciated,

²¹ Burton, *Galatians*, p. 200.

²² Smiles, *The Gospel and the Law in Galatia*, p. 24, wrongly denies that Paul was concerned about whether or not the gentiles had to follow Jewish laws. Rather, Smiles focuses on the role of the Law as Paul’s concern in the light of the nature of being Christian. Since one cannot deny circumcision as the Galatian problem from the Galatian point of view, one cannot discount the question of whether gentiles needed to follow the Law to be considered legitimate sons (Gal. 4). From Paul’s point of view, the overarching issue was the Law’s place in the plan of God in Christ. The Galatian situation seems to force the Galatians to follow Jewish laws, thereby bringing out Paul’s response, from which one can gain a glimpse of Paul’s view of the Law.

²³ Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 38. M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, p. 107, criticizes Barrow for not being selective enough in looking at the pedagogue institution. However, the contrasting and sometimes conflicting descriptions confirm the irregular characteristics of a wide spectrum of pedagogues. For a negative view by Suetonius, see *Claud.* 2.2. Supposedly, Claudius viewed his own tutor as a menacing barbarian.

praised and even respected their pedagogues for their merits.²⁴

Many pedagogues were of Greek descent. Their role was as much about being an example as about being a teacher. If R. N. Longenecker's distinction between a pedagogue and teacher is correct, then the pedagogue's role was not so much to educate as it was to discipline.²⁵ However, the culture of the non-Roman probably penetrated the minds of many young heirs. From literary sources as diverse as Juvenal to Quintilian, one can sometimes sense a negative attitude towards the pedagogue because the masters did not always pick the best qualified to fill this custodial role.²⁶ In any case, the Roman view of the pedagogue institution is far from uniform.²⁷

Based on the brief background on the pedagogue above, three significant features of the pedagogue institution make Paul's metaphor about the Law unique. First, the pedagogue served for about twelve years of a child's life. So long as a child remained a minor, the pedagogue was responsible for him or her (*Xen. Laced.* 3.1). In fact, after the children passed their seventh birthday, the pedagogue probably spent more time with the children than did the child's Roman parent. Often, the pedagogue could gain his freedom after the children became adults because his service was no longer required. Therefore, the pedagogue's function was time-bound. Second, the function of the pedagogue was primarily to be a caretaker rather than a teacher. Some of his tasks resembled those of the modern baby sitter or au pair.²⁸ From a practical point of view the pedagogue's job was important and as he may have influenced the young master, but from a social point of view, he was only a slave doing his job. Even as one who had low social standing, a good pedagogue was probably able to speak well

²⁴ For this point see article by C. Spicq, "παιδαγωγός", *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament III* (transl. J. D. Ernest; Peabody: Hendrikson, 1994), pp. 1-3.

²⁵ Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 146.

²⁶ Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, pp. 40-41, gives numerous examples. For other discussions on this topic, see D. J. Lull, "The Law was our Pedagogue: A Study in Galatians 3.19-25," *JBL* 105 (1986), pp. 481-498; T. D. Gordon, "A Note on ΠΑΙΔΑΓΟΓΟΣ in Galatians 3.24-25," *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 150-154; N. H. Young, "ΠΑΙΔΑΓΟΓΟΣ: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *NovT* 29 (1987), pp. 150-176.

²⁷ See Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 148. The most positive use of the metaphor would be Plutarch's description of Aratus as a good pedagogue of the people under his governing power (*Arat.* 48.3).

²⁸ Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, pp. 264-265.

in order that he could influence the child's speech positively.²⁹ Therefore, the pedagogue was at the same time both powerful and powerless. He was caught between being responsible to his present master for the upbringing of his possible future master and for the approval of that future master. He walked a fine line of having to please both sets of frequently conflicting interests. Third, the pedagogue was primarily a discipline tool towards the child's life. This slave guided many young children in their morals.

Did the Law function in any of the three ways just mentioned for Paul? Does the Roman caricature of the pedagogue shed any light on Paul's argument in Gal. 3.23-26? In general, something can be said about the negative caricature. No doubt, many young aristocrats suffered severe discipline under their pedagogues when they were young. The power and powerlessness of their pedagogue probably caused a great deal of resentment by the young master. As the young master started growing in knowledge and power, he probably grew to despise his caretaker. Eventually, when the youth grew older and began writing about life in the *familia*, the pedagogue could easily have served as the literary straw man at which arrows of hatred were shot. One can see the possible social dynamics behind the occasional negative caricature of the pedagogue by the Romans. The picture in Paul does not fit perfectly that of Roman sources, nor does his negative portrait come from the caricature in Roman writings. Rather, Paul 'invented' his own negative portrait emphasizing the servile nature of the pedagogue.³⁰

Although the pedagogue was not socially respected, his role was indispensable. Therefore, it is not hard to see why Paul used this image for his metaphor.

5.1.4 Meaning of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 3.23-26

There are various ways one can view the pedagogue. Some may think of the pedagogue as teaching from the Law 'concerning' the coming of Christ, while others may interpret the pedagogue as a confining and unfriendly custodian or may wish to stress the temporary function of the pedagogue from an ethical point

²⁹ T. Morgan, *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 244.

³⁰ "Invention" here has nothing to do with creating a fantasy. Rather, it is the rhetorical term for creating a metaphor or analogy for persuasion. See Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, pp. 371ff.

of view.³¹ The latter two emphases seem more fitting to the literary context, while the first interpretation seems to stress the cultural role of the pedagogue. It is best to narrow the interpretation from the argument of Galatians.

Paul's slave metaphor in Gal. 3.23-26 is curious because it is derived from a rich mixture of Roman culture and Jewish theology. If the interpreter takes the metaphor as an illustration of the previous argument on Jewish salvation history, the pedagogue represents the Law in a subservient role. The Law saw the son like a slave confining a minor until the predetermined time (Gal. 3.23).³² There might even be hints of the corrective or ethical function of the pedagogue, as the Law is meant to reveal transgression (Gal. 3.19).³³ While the role of the Law seems tyrannical at times (Gal. 2.4; 5.1 etc.), it is, in fact, a slave serving a temporary purpose. Although Paul carefully chose which aspect of the pedagogue's role to emphasize, his picture is not very different from that of his Roman contemporaries. Like the pedagogue, the Law was functioning in a necessary but negative manner. Therefore, Paul felt that the Law restricted those who were under it, whether they be Jews or gentiles, slave or free, male or female. The creed-like prescription in Gal. 3.28 serves to remind the audience of the complete dominion of either the Law or Christ. The legal provision of the Mosaic covenant was temporary in its enslaving characteristics (Gal. 3.23). For Paul indeed, Christ's arrival made the Law obsolete (Gal. 2.20-21; 3.24). More than likely, the one who set the time to free the heir was God the Father (Gal. 1.4). Just as it is impossible and dishonorable for a freed person to be re-enslaved to the original master for no reason, it is doubly unimaginable for the Galatians to return to a master who is a slave. From the metaphor of Paul, it is clear that he had little faith in the controlling power of the Law because it was not permanent.³⁴ Before

³¹ J. A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), p. 191, takes the first interpretation. Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 363, takes the second interpretation. Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, pp. 265-267, takes the last interpretation.

³² Amadi-Azuogu, *Paul and the Law in the Argument of Galatians*, p. 207, points out a similar usage in 1 Pet. 1.5.

³³ Young, "PAIDAGOGOS: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," p. 171, discounts the corrective function and limits the pedagogue to confining and restricting the minor. However, there may be a hint of corrective function of the Law in Gal. 3.19.

³⁴ Gordon, "A Note on ΠΑΙΔΑΓΟΓΟΣ in Galatians 3.24-25," pp. 151, 154, sees the protective characteristic of the Law against gentile idolatry. This may be the original function of the legal literature of the Old Testament but the main thrust of Gal. 3 does not involve the specific "gentile sin" of idolatry. Gordon does point to a glaring weakness among interpreters in their the ontological examination of the Law. Scholarly discussions often address whether Paul had a

Christ the Law ruled over Israel. After Christ it ruled over anyone who cared to follow it, thus re-enslaving all who lived by it, which is the point Paul makes in a later portion of his argument (Gal. 5.1). In other words, while the story of the pedagogue is derived from Israel's history, the consequences could spill over to the gentiles. As P. Esler remarks with good humor, "The law has passed its use-by date."³⁵

In the light of how Paul describes the pedagogue, one can easily see that not every task of a pedagogue is comparable to that of the Law. Indeed, Paul did not intend the metaphor to be carried over that far. This metaphor illustrates well two aspects of Paul's argument in this discussion. First, Paul illustrated the function of Moses' covenant. In Gal. 3.19, he stated that the Law was added for transgression by God's people. Israel needed a legal entity to govern its society while it waited for its Messiah. Hence, both the temporary service and the caretaker function of the pedagogue appear before Paul brought in the metaphor. If Israel stepped out of line and did something to jeopardize its part in God's plan, the Law was there to warn and admonish in a similar manner to the pedagogue. Second, Paul consistently illustrated the role of the child throughout the metaphors of the pedagogue and guardians/tutors. This proves to be significant in terms of his later argument on the ethics of freedom (e.g. Gal. 5.13). The child who was released from the supervision of the pedagogue was grown. Therefore, he or she was no longer a child but an adult. As faith in Christ came, for Israel first and then the gentiles, the child could take up responsibility to live freely but responsibly (Gal. 3.23; 4.4-7).³⁶ There is one subtle point of difference between the metaphors on the pedagogue and those of the guardians/tutors. The metaphor

positive or negative view regarding the content of the Law. This creates an unnecessary tension. The answer must address *how* and *when* the Law functions. Gordon rightly observes these issues in the metaphor of the pedagogue.

³⁵ Esler, *Galatians*, p. 202.

³⁶ See R. B. Matlock, "Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΠΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective," *NovT* (2000), pp. 1-23. Faith here is most likely the new faith in Christ and not faith in general. Nor is the faith referring to a faithfulness of Christ himself. Such an interpretation is dominated by the Christology of Phil. 2. See the different positions by R. B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* (SBL Dissertation Series, 56; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983), Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, pp. 181-182 and J. G. Janzen, "Coleridge and Pistis Christou," *ExpT* 107 (1996), pp. 265-268 who see the subjective genitive "Christ's faithfulness". M. D. Hooker, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ" *NTS* 35 (1989),

on the pedagogue points to justification (Gal. 3.24), while the guardians/tutors metaphor focuses on what life is like after the reception of the Spirit (Gal. 4.6, 10-11). Whether or not it is popular in the current Pauline scholarship to talk in terms of justification by faith, Paul did talk about this topic in Gal. 3.24. According to Paul in Gal. 3.24 and in his example from Abraham (Gal. 3.6, 11), humanity is never meant to be justified by Law at anytime in history. As the metaphor and the preceding argument indicate, the Law's function was not justification. The temporary function of the Law demonstrates once again that justification is always by faith. All faith in God was finally realized in the coming of Jesus in Gal. 3.23-24. Therefore, the pedagogue metaphor means to show the Galatians the limited function and time-scale of the Law. Regarding this metaphor, Witherington concludes, "Paul's view of 'salvation history' is not developmental or evolutionary but apocalyptic or interventionist."³⁷ Christ intervened while all of humanity was still under the Law. With this intervention the pedagogue, who is the Law, releases those who put their faith in Christ.

There is one final point Paul makes regarding salvation in Christ. Although Paul was concerned with the chronology of salvation history, he was more concerned about the outworking of salvation through Christ. The Law as a pedagogue has a leading function. However, Paul focuses not on the leading function, but on the waiting function. Some interpreters prefer the leading function of the Law to Christ.³⁸ Such an interpretation makes the whole metaphor an unresolved paradox. Was it Christ who came to meet the son or was it the son who arrived at Christ as a result of the Law's guidance? If the interpretation of the leading role of the pedagogue is correct, then Christ came at the same time as the son arrived at a faith in Christ. However, this is contrary to what the passage says. The passage clearly says that Christ, with the accompanying faith, was the one who came. The ambiguity lies in whether the Law 'led' the son to Christ or the 'school of Christ'.³⁹ If the emphasis on a

pp. 321-342, suggests "Christ's faith" as part of her interchange model between Christ and believer. She claims, "We are in him. We share his faith." (p. 337).

³⁷ Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, p. 266.

³⁸ New American Standard Version translates "to lead us".

³⁹ The meaning depends on whether one takes εἰς as spatial ('into', 'towards'), result ('so that') or reference ('with reference to'). In the light of the context, the last idea of reference is most

protective role in the previous verse is taken into account, then the Law did not lead the son to Christ or the 'school of Christ'; rather, it kept the son in a waiting role for the faith which accompanied Christ's coming. Thus, the pedagogue in Paul acted more like a baby sitter who made sure that the child behaved himself or herself rather than a slave who walked the child to school. Therefore, the previous context in the passage should dictate the definition of what the Law does as a pedagogue. The Law, then, is temporary, serving until the arrival of justification by faith in Christ.

Based on Perelman-Olbrechts-Tyteca's model, the theme of the passage is then about the position of humanity in relation to the Law and the *phoros* is about the position of the son in relation to the pedagogue. The aspect in the *phoros* is helpful because the pedagogue was an unofficial ethical educator and an official baby sitter, who was only required temporarily. As these aspects merge with the theme, one can see that the Law was there to reveal to Israel what transgression was (Gal. 3.19). Furthermore, the Law held humanity in custody until Christ came (Gal. 3.23-24). As a slave, the Law is not superior or even equal to its master, who is God. Nor does its indirect function nullify what the master originally intended for not only Israel but also for all humanity. There is no clear indication of where the example of Israel becomes applicable to all humanity. More than likely, the transition occurs somewhere in the pedagogue metaphor or just prior to it. No matter where the transition might have occurred within the greater argument in the second part of Gal. 3, Paul meant the application to be for all humanity (Gal. 3.26-29).

5.1.5 Rhetorical Function of the Metaphorical Story in Gal. 3.23-26

Based on the assessment of the literary and cultural factors in sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3, apart from being the preparation for the metaphor in Gal. 4, Gal. 3.23-26 is also a good illustration of the previous verses. The pedagogue is the vehicle for Paul's topic on how the Law functions. Everything in the Gal. 3.23-26 passage points to the importance of Christ in the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant because in Christ's coming the custody of the Law is taken away. In the argument of Gal. 3, the metaphor in Gal. 3.23-26 demonstrates the superiority of

promising. Sim. Burton, *Galatians*, p. 200; Longenecker, *Galatians*, p. 149; Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 363 etc.

the Abrahamic covenant over Moses' Law by emphasizing the servile role of the Law. At the same time, the pedagogue metaphor further illustrates Mosaic administration in Israel. Paul's argument on the nature of Christ's arrival is the most powerful proof for any believer, whether Jewish or gentile. Christ's arrival was most likely accepted among both the Galatians and the agitators as something uniquely important. What Paul did was to spell out the implications of Christ's coming. The ultimate proof was not in the antiquity of Abraham's covenant, as much as it was in Christ being the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham. Thus, though Gal. 3.23-26 may illustrate the argument in the preceding verses, the metaphor does more than merely illustrate. It points to the important issue of Christ's coming, without which the argument in Gal. 3.15-22 would fail.

What kind of metaphor is the pedagogue? First, it acts like an analogy or, better yet, simile. Rather than saying that the Law has become our pedagogue, Paul could easily have said, "The Law has become like our pedagogue." The two ideas are synonymous but have become a 'condensed analogy.'⁴⁰ Therefore, the first function of the metaphor is the same as a simile. Second, the metaphor also clarifies Paul's meaning in Gal. 3.23 when he refers to the imprisoning nature of the Law. Rather than describing the Law as a prison, which probably would be overly negative, Paul used the pedagogue to prevent his vocabulary from overtaking the usefulness of the Law in God's plan. So Paul first used an idea and then qualified it by using a metaphor. Rather than seeing the basic negative aspects of the Law (Gal. 3.21), Paul focused on when the Law was useful. Another function of this metaphor is to prepare for a slightly different metaphor in the next section of the letter. The pedagogue metaphor provides the transition from Gal. 3.15-22 to the beginning of Gal. 4. Gal. 4 moves away from talking directly about Abraham, and Gal. 3.23-26 provides the continuity for the topical switch. This relationship between the current and subsequent metaphors is something that sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 will clarify.

From the standpoint of writing strategy, how is this pedagogue metaphor significant? If one were to compare Paul's metaphor with a slightly different situation, one would see the contrast Paul made by employing a slave metaphor. At a superficial glance, the Galatians were going back to their former master;

however, this is not Paul's meaning. The Law was never a 'master' in the proper sense of the Roman metaphor. Instead, this 'master' was really a slave and had no authority over the Galatians in the first place. In other words, the Law was always a slave in the same way the pedagogue was a slave. While Paul generally followed social convention in his metaphors, the illustrative purpose is usually exact and generally consistent. The pedagogue metaphor serves its purpose well, in that through it the link between the Galatians and the Law is truly severed.

5.2 Paul's Teaching of the Galatians in Gal. 4.1-10

5.2.1 Introductory Issues in Gal. 4.1-10

When one reads Gal. 4.1-10, one needs to relate it to the previous chapter in order to see the context. Upon reading the literary context, several questions surface: first, in what ways are the metaphors in Gal. 4.1-10 and Gal. 3.23-24 related?; second, how does Gal. 4.1-10 relate to the verses at the end of Gal. 3?; third, how does Gal. 4.1-10 flow argumentatively?; fourth, how does Gal. 4.1-10, especially Gal. 4.1-2, relate to Paul's question of the Law's function in Gal. 3?

The first issue raised is discussed in more detail in the sections following this introduction. It serves the present purpose to know that Paul used the *familia* as the common context to link his metaphors from Gal. 4.1-10 and Gal. 3.23-24. The vocabulary of the metaphors in both sections is also in the ancient description of the household. The common theme arising from the spiritual household has to do with inheritance.

The second issue deserves more treatment at this point in the discussion because it indicates how Gal. 4.1-10 should be read. Gal. 3.25-29 catalogues the benefits arising out of Christ's coming. There are some commentators who try to form a close link between Gal. 4.1-2 and Gal. 3.25-29. S. C. Keesmaat sees the vocabulary of Gal. 4.1-2 as being descriptive of Israel, and she thereby links the verses to the Abrahamic seed in Gal. 3.29.⁴¹ However, she does not say that the description of Israel was linked to the nation. Rather, she seems to note a reapplication of the salvation story of Israel the Christian believer. While the general argument of Gal. 3-4 deals very clearly with the Abrahamic promise, it is

⁴⁰ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 398-399.

⁴¹ S. C. Keesmaat, *Paul and his Story*, p. 160, sees an exodus motif here. Retelling of any part of the Old Testament in such an incomplete form makes her claim doubtful.

difficult to link Gal. 4.1-2 to Gal. 3.25-29 according to Keesmaat's formulation.⁴² There is the drastic change in tone and deliberate switch in pronouns between the two sections. Gal. 3.25-29, which use the second person pronouns, are verses that assert who the Galatians were, possibly in the language of the 'new Israel'. Gal. 4.1-2, which use the third person pronoun, are stating a fact within a normal *familia*. The abrupt λέγω δέ in Gal. 4.1 at least indicates a partial shift of focus. This is not saying that Gal. 4.1-2 is completely unrelated to Gal. 3.25-29. Both sections still deal with God's promise; however, Gal. 4.1-2 seem to be the beginning of another metaphor.

The third issue deals with the internal structure of Gal. 4.1-10. The argument seems clear from the syntactical structure and shift in the usage of personal pronouns. Since the letter was probably dictated, it has an oral quality. Hence, the change in personal pronouns alone does not necessitate anything significant. After all, second and first person pronouns are commonly used in conversation. In Gal. 4.1-10, the shift in pronouns also seem to correspond roughly to the syntax. Gal. 4.1-2 form one sentence that states a fact in the third person. This fact of the guardians becomes the main metaphor by which verses 3 to 10 correspond. Then comes the 'we' section in Gal. 4.3-5. Some may consider Gal. 4.3-4 as a description of Israel or the Jewish Christian experience before Christ. This is a reasonable assessment because those who were redeemed were ὑπὸ νόμον. Gal. 4.6-10 seem to shift focus onto the Galatians.⁴³ The new sentence in Gal. 4.6 marks this break.

A further reason for seeing both Jewish and gentile motifs in Gal. 4.1-10 is that Paul used the calendrical example in Gal. 4.10 because both groups relied

⁴² Keesmaat, p. 161, agrees with Scott on the idea of 'date setting' as a link to the Exodus story in Gal. 3.17. See J. M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of UIOTHESIA in the Pauline Corpus* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1992), pp. 141-142. This connection is impossible as the contexts make clear. Gal. 3.17 is set in the Exodus story, while Gal. 4.2 is set in the story of Christ's coming, as Gal. 4.4 shows. The type of argument may be similar, but the two chapters are dealing with two different stories. It is possible to see Jesus as a new Moses and so on, but this view is not readily apparent in Gal. 4.

⁴³ The assurance of the Galatians being heirs in Gal. 4.6 is a clarification about what was previous. Paul could easily be understood to say that Israel was the only one who received adoption in Gal. 4.5. Thus, Gal. 4.6 is not so much a reminder of Gal. 4.5, but is of Gal. 3.26-29. Contra. Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 390, who sees the 'we' in Gal. 4.5 as Paul identifying himself with the Galatians. One must admit that it is not that clear that Paul was talking about Jews only in Gal. 4.3-4 but the ὑπὸ νόμον makes it possible.

heavily on the calendar for their cultic events.⁴⁴ For example, based on the later Mishnah Tractate *Rosh Hashanah* 1.3-3.1, the New Moon festival required the sighting of the 'new moon' to confirm an exact date.⁴⁵ T. C. G. Thorton's useful study shows that the Diaspora Jews used this method of confirmation, even though their geographical location would mean that the festival date was not the same as in Jerusalem, thus causing a difference in calendars.⁴⁶ Even if no one can prove with certainty the exact nature of Paul's vague allusion to astral elements, certain segments of Judaism did incorporate some symbols, if not belief, of gentile astrology.⁴⁷ Such calendrical practices were not limited to Jewish religions; the gentiles also relied on nature for different religious reasons. To illustrate this common practice among gentiles, the calendar was important for slaves. Saturnalia was a festival in which class differences were temporarily abolished and the slaves received their holiday (Juv. 6.154; Pliny *Ep.* 2.17.24).⁴⁸ For those who owned land, the calendar was central to agricultural fertility,

⁴⁴ J. Vanderkam, "The Calendar, 4Q327, And 4Q394" in M. Bernstein et al (eds.), *Legal Texts And Legal Issues*, p. 188, shows in his translation the importance of the twenty-eighth day of a month having significance for the writer of 4Q394. J. D. G. Dunn, "4QMMT and Galatians," *NTS* 43 (1997), p. 152, also notes the religious significance of the calendar in 4QMMT. By the most superficial connection, perhaps some of the Jewish and non-Christian religions had similar ideas about the heavenly bodies being a reflection of earthly religious reality. In Paul's metaphor, he boldly made this connection between the Jews and gentiles. A. E. Harvey, "Forty Strokes Save One: Social Aspects of Judaizing and Apostasy," in A. E. Harvey (ed.) *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study* (London: SPCK, 1985), p. 87, states that the Jewish synagogue had control over the festivals such as the New Moon. Anyone observing any Jewish festival would have a tie to the local Jewish authority. Therefore, observation of astronomical phenomenon was a religiously significant evidence of Jewish influence in any Diaspora location. Jewish presence and influence are both evident in what is known about Asia Minor. For instance, see the famous discovery of the Aphrodisias inscription published by J. Reynolds and R. Tannenbaum. *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987). Cf P. W. van der Horst, *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity* (Gottingen: Vandenhoech and Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 166-181.

⁴⁵ T. C. G. Thorton, "Jewish New Moon Festivals, Galatians 4:3-11 and Colossians 2:16," *JTS* 40 (1989), p. 97. For its prominence, see Judith 8.6 and 1 Macc. 10.34. A similar mentality links astronomical observations with the religious festivals in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (82.9). People who kept such dates were 'righteous' (82.4) and those who did not were not (82.5). See O. Neugebauer, *The "Astronomical" Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72 to 82) : Translation and Commentary with Additional Notes on the Aramaic Fragments by M. Black* (Copenhagen: Det Kongelige danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 1981), pp. 30-31.

⁴⁶ Thorton, p. 98.

⁴⁷ J. H. Charlesworth, "Jewish Astrology in the Talmud, Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Early Palestinian Synagogues," *HTR* 70 (1977), pp. 188-200. For example, some of the Dead Sea Scrolls from Cave 4 discuss the astrological determinism of a person's birthday (4QCryptic).

⁴⁸ Augustus was especially keen on keeping the religious calendar to express one of the Roman virtues, piety. The later *Feriale Duranum* (dated between 224 to 235 CE) found near the Euphrates revealed many of the first-century military practices relating to Roman religious years. A. D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, (vol. 2; Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), p. 743.

thereby making accurate astral observations essential. Such observations were in turn linked to religions.⁴⁹ Because calendrical disputes were mainly about cultic regulations, Paul used the holy days as an illustration of other rituals involved in both Jewish and gentile religions.⁵⁰ Therefore, calendrical observation was one of the basic elements of both Jewish and gentile religions.

The fourth issue, which is closely related to seeing how the pedagogue and guardians metaphors compliment one another, has to do with how Gal. 4.1-2 relate to Paul's discussion on the Law's function. A brief discussion is in order here and further discussions will arise later as comparisons between the pedagogue and guardians metaphors are drawn out. In review, here is a summary of what Paul has said thus far in an effort to answer the question, "Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος;": first, the Law was added to reveal transgression; second, the purpose of Law was to act as a temporary custodian to show what transgression was before the coming of Christ. Gal. 4.1-2, with the motif of date setting seem to fit the temporary custodian function of the Law. Nevertheless, there is no mention of the Law except in its having to do with Christ's coming or believer's bondage (Gal. 4.4-5). What then can one make of the identity of the guardians? There are two possibilities: first, because of the parallel between the present passage and Gal. 3.23-24, the guardians simply were the Law; and second, because of the lack of mention of the Law, the guardians were something different than the Law.

5.2.2 Literary Context of the Gal. 4.1-10 Metaphor

What has been said about Gal. 3.23-26 can be easily applied to Gal. 4.1-10. Both metaphors work the same way, in that while the *phoros* has nothing to do with the theme, it fuses nicely with the theme. The argument thus far from Gal. 3 expresses the gravity of the Galatian situation (Gal. 3.1-14). The Galatians were

⁴⁹ D. Georgi, "Who is the True Prophet?" in G. W. E. Nickelsburg and G. W. MacRae (eds.), *Christians Among Jews and Gentiles* (FS K. Stendahl; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), p. 118, "Rome's ideology and social structure had remained basically agrarian. Noble and rural, piety and soil, were always related, if not synonymous."

⁵⁰ B. Witherington III, "Rite and Rights for Women - Galatians 3.28," *NTS* 27 (1981), p. 599, somehow connects Gal. 4.10 with 3.28. In so doing, he links the problem of ritual purity with the women's menstrual period, which of course was based on a calendar. While the issue of purity could be included in the calendrical dispute, Paul's focus was not on the gender difference of Christian living. It is even harder to make an association between the agitators' teaching and women's monthly period. Female issues are not nearly as prominent in Galatians as in 1 Corinthians. See A. D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (vol. 1), pp. 493-502, for the significance of astrology in Roman religion.

in danger of undoing Paul's work with them (Gal. 3.3-4) because they were unable to realize the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant (Gal. 3.5-14). To strengthen his claim, Paul wanted to show the universality and permanence of Abraham's covenant in contrast with the Mosaic Law. He did this by showing the antiquity of the Abrahamic covenant (Gal. 3.15-22). In an ancient society that valued antiquity, Paul's argument worked perfectly.⁵¹ One may notice a similar line of argument in Josephus' *Antiquities*, and possibly, Virgil's *Aeneid*.⁵² What draws Gal. 3-4.10 together is this form of argumentation. There is little talk of the new covenant; indeed, Paul never mentioned the term. His argument here stems from the historical precedent of God's work with Abraham. Throughout Gal. 3-4.10, there is the argument of the realization of God's promise. Paul set this promise up by his mention of the Abrahamic covenant in Gal. 3. When the context of Paul's argument in Gal. 3 is considered, it can be seen that Gal. 3.23-4.10 argues that the future of the gentiles was in fact part of God's promise to Abraham. Paul started with the Galatians' situation in Gal. 3, and then proceeded to argue via justification at the end of Gal. 3. Then, Paul returned to his argument on the current Galatian situation by pairing the two metaphors of the pedagogue and the guardians/tutors. Thus, Paul's treatise comes full circle.

When one compares the pedagogue with the guardians (Gal. 3.24; 4.1-3), there is a clear distinction between the two. There are many commonalities between the messages of the two metaphors, but there are also some differences. One common theme Paul wanted to emphasize was the restrictive characteristic of the Law. Though Gal. 3 is the milder version of Gal. 4 in the degree of strictness shown by the Law, both shows the bondage of the Law for anyone under it. Both metaphors also emphasize the obsolescence of the Law. When Christ came, the Law was no longer useful. Two aspects are different in Gal. 3 and 4; first, Gal. 3 deals with the minor child in general, while Gal. 4 specifically

⁵¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, p. 461, note the importance of a shared premise in an argument by example.

⁵² This is partly due to the difficulty of doing 'research' in historiography. The ancients did not have a printing press to preserve information. Only important ideas and events are preserved. The longer the preservation, the more value the information had. Whatever research an ancient writer might have done, his source was most likely common knowledge among the educated with the literary twist of the writer. See T. Tarver, "Varro and the Antiquarianism of Philosophy," in J. Barnes and M. Griffin (eds.), *Philosophia Togata II* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), pp. 134-135,

mixes the metaphor of a slave being adopted; and second, Gal. 3 emphasizes the coming of Christ without mentioning the Spirit, while Gal. 4 talks of both Christ and the Spirit. More than likely, the Spirit is there as a reminder of the argument in Gal. 3.2-3. Paul might have intended to appeal to the 'S/spiritual experience' of the Galatians at their initial baptism. Therefore, the metaphor of Gal. 3 is one step behind Gal. 4, and Gal. 4 becomes a further elaboration of the preceding discussion. All of this is in preparation for the Sarah-Hagar lesson and exhortation.

The guardians/tutors metaphor is not a direct slave metaphor but must be included in the whole scheme of interpretation. The inclusion of the metaphor is because Gal. 4.1 links the life of a child to that of a slave. Henceforth, the slave metaphor continues throughout Gal. 4. Gal. 4.1 mixes the previous servile metaphor with the non-servile metaphor of the guardians in the verses following. Although the mixture might look confusing, at least both the pedagogue and the guardians/tutors were part of the *familia*. Apart from the issue of confusingly mixed metaphors, the passage itself also talks about separate issues as if they were the same issues. Paul first talked of the Jewish and gentile situations as if they were the same in Gal. 4.3, 8. Then, he discussed the similarity between the Galatian fall and any religious ritual in Gal. 4.9-10. At the beginning, Paul described the minor as he would the slave and not all the descriptions fit the cultural backgrounds. Based on the grammatical structure of the passage, Gal. 4.1-2 is the guiding metaphor for the rest of Gal. 4.1-10. Gal. 4.1-2 is in one sentence, stating a single thought. Everything thereafter is an elaboration and extension of that metaphor.

Gal. 4.1 compares a minor with a slave. Yet, Paul used the idea of adoption after Gal. 4.5. Thus, besides noting the similarity of theme in Gal. 4.1-10, one has to make some distinctions between the 'minor' analogy in Gal. 4.1-3 and the slave analogy in Gal. 4.5-11. When Paul mixed his metaphors, he only used them so long as they were functional for his message. He was not trying to harmonize

especially on the importance of religious antiquity in Varro's work. See also Ovid's *Fasti* for a praise of the antiquated Roman calendar.

them.⁵³ The distinctions between Paul's usage of the metaphors come in four characters. The first character is the minor who was legally similar but not the same as a slave. The second character is the tutor or guardians whose job was to stand guard over this minor. Yet, the Law's guarding function stopped at Gal. 4.3 because he was no longer useful in Paul's analogy. The guardian's power over the minor functioned negatively in a similar way as the power of the slave master (Gal. 4.3).⁵⁴ The language in Gal. 4.3 could just as easily be describing the slave master as the guardians. In comparing the minor and the slave, Paul sought to clarify the meaning of Gal. 4.1. In what way was the minor similar to the slave? The answer is that they were both under some kind of power and were not at liberty to exercise freedom. Such are the limits of the mixed metaphor. The third character in Paul's usage of the metaphors is the slave master. Paul used the slave master as a metaphor for pagan religion and, possibly, Jewish religion as well (Gal. 4.8-11). The fourth character is the slave who was under bondage. This bondage is in opposition to freedom throughout the passage.

Another contextual issue is the comparison between the Jews under the Law and the gentiles under their former religion. In Gal. 4.1-5, much of the 'child' analogy has to do with the Jews. This fits well in both the salvation history of the early church and Gal. 3.15-26, of which Jewish salvation took precedent over gentile salvation. Furthermore, the unique place of Israel as God's son in the Old Testament may have influenced the way Paul described the history of God's salvation.⁵⁵ From Gal. 4.6-10, the second person pronouns more than likely addressing the Galatians. This is not to say that there were two different paths to salvation according to Paul's gospel. Rather, Paul was using aspects of life external to Christ to illustrate the impotence of living under any religious law. The one specific characteristic of living under the law (whatever religious law)

⁵³ See Betz, *Galatians*, pp. 202-203, for a proposal of the exact legal situation. There are not enough details here to come up with a specific legal situation. See Amadi-Azuogu, *Paul and the Law in the Argument of Galatians*, p. 242.

⁵⁴ It is impossible to see the entire metaphor as positive as Amadi-Azuogu, *Paul and the Law in the Argument of Galatians*, p. 244, makes it. In describing the Law, Paul used considerable nuances, without appearing to attack God the Lawmaker Himself.

⁵⁵ Keesmaat, *Paul and his Story*, p. 179, believes that this sonship language connects Paul with the Exodus tradition. While Paul was possibly using new Israel language in the 'abba' proclamation in Gal. 4.6, there is no way to verify that Paul was using a tradition from Exodus particular to Israel's sonship. The tradition of Christ being God's Son is enough to show the Galatians, who are 'in Christ', to be sons (Gal. 2.16-17; 4.27-28 etc.).

which concerned Paul was the lack of freedom. This concern is precisely why he used similar language to describe Jewish and pagan religions in Gal. 4.3, 9.⁵⁶ He was not saying that the two were equal to each other. Shared elements, such as the calendrical disputes in both non-Christian and Jewish religions, confirm some of the superficial overlaps in gentile and Jewish laws (Jub. 6.32-35; 1 Enoch 82.4-7).⁵⁷ This is not to say that Paul saw the calendars as functioning in the same way in all religions.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Paul was using a superficial similarity to illustrate his argument against keeping the Law or religious rituals. In his interpretation of the elemental spirits of Gal. 4, T. L. Donaldson sees Israel's plight, namely Law-keeping, as the universal plight of humanity.⁵⁹ This is possible but not necessarily explicit in the context of the passage. The issue of calendrical dispute serves as a background to Paul's persuasive artistry, but it is not necessarily as neatly put as Donaldson suggests.⁶⁰ After the coming of Christ, both Jewish and gentile religions had one common point. Each was "a slavery to

⁵⁶ Byrne, 'Sons of God'—'Seed of Abraham', pp. 177-178, states, "This [4.10] can only mean that he understands the past of the heathen Galatians to have been a service under the στοιχεῖα. This kind of 'slavery', then, must be something wide enough to embrace both the servitude of the Jews under the Law of Moses and that of pagans under their (false) gods. ... It is best then, to see in vv. 1-3 an expression of that situation of slavery, common to both Jews and Gentiles, which was a feature of the religious past of all Christians."

⁵⁷ See also a related issue in R. T. Beckwith, "Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation," *RQ* 10 (1979-81) pp. 521-542. The Romans were systematic in making their calendars. This would be very important in getting the exact date for religious festivals. See R. Gordon, "From Republic to Principate: priesthood, religion and ideology," in M. Beard and J. North (eds.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth, 1990), pp. 184-188, lists a group of authors like Varro, Ovid and Suetonius. Curiously, the festivals could also celebrate the ruling powers, namely the Caesars. This is where religion and politics mixed. Paul's picture of the enslaving elemental spirits may also include such powers. See also J. Rives, "Religion in the Roman empire," in *Experiencing Rome*, pp. 253-257.

⁵⁸ The calendar for gentile religion often originally functioned for agricultural purposes out of which grew religious interpretations. The Jewish calendar seems to have a religious origin, though one cannot discount the role of the seasonal cycle within the Jewish religion.

⁵⁹ T. L. Donaldson, "The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3.13-14," pp. 104-105.

⁶⁰ For the importance of the Jewish cultic calendar, see the explanations of J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 358 who notes the struggle for exactness in the cultic calendar; P. R. Davies, "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory," *CBQ* 45 (1983) pp. 80-89; S. Talmon, "The Calendar of the Covenanters of the Judean Desert," *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), pp. 147-85; and J. Vanderkam, "The Calendar, 4Q327, And 4Q394" in M. Bernstein et al (eds), *Legal Texts And Legal Issues*, pp. 177-194. As this study shows, the calendar was also a religious element common to Jews and gentiles. More likely is the explanation provided by Byrne, 'Sons of God' — 'Seed of Abraham', pp. 177-178, whose solution could account for both Jewish and gentile religious calendars.

something less than God”.⁶¹ For the Jews, a certain relationship has changed. Formerly, they had related to God under the Law, but lived a slave-like childhood (Gal. 4.1-3). When Christ redeemed them, they had to relate to God through him (Gal. 4.5). For the gentiles, to live under the obsolete Law would put them back into their state before Christ (Gal. 4.10-11).

5.2.3 Cultural Context of the Gal. 4.1-10 Metaphor

In answering the question of whether the Galatians needed to follow legal regulations, Paul employed a metaphor from the institution of the guardians/tutors in Gal. 4.1-11.⁶² Such an institution is pertinent to the issue of freedom because the person under guardianship fits under the Roman laws of person. According to both Greco-Roman convention and Gal. 3.24, the tutor's job is different from the pedagogue's. While the enslaving nature of being under a pedagogue in Gal. 3.23 is straightforward, the metaphor in Gal. 4.1-11 seems to indicate otherwise. The metaphors of the pedagogue and the tutors are not necessarily parallel in every way. Nor are they required to be for Paul's argument to work. One similarity between the two is their role in education. The pedagogue practically showed the child what was right and wrong by accompanying him. The tutor intellectually taught the child many things, including sound ethics. Gal. 4.1-11 derives its illustration from the general condition of many estates in the Greco-Roman society. J. M. Scott, in his *Adoption as Sons of God*, suggests a Jewish background for adoption.⁶³ Though one cannot rule out Paul's Jewish background for adoption, Scott's claim begs the question of whether his complex explanation of the second exodus made any sense to the Galatians at all.⁶⁴ Even if Paul was familiar with all aspects of Jewish law on adoption, one must heed J. D. Hester's observation. He writes, "Jewish law is just not universal enough for

⁶¹ J. R. Braswell, "The Blessing of Abraham Versus 'The Curse of the Law': Another Look at Gal. 3:10-13," *WTJ* 53 (1991), p. 75, observes that the 'we/you' distinction of Gal. 3.23-4.1 affirms Israel's plight. Israel, then, can be the example of the plight anyone under the Law could face.

⁶² Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, pp. 149-150, claims that Paul used Gal. 4.1-2 as a type of Israel in Egyptian slavery. However, the text clearly talks about the child having some property rights. Israel had no property rights in Egypt. This is just one of several places where Scott's explanation of the second exodus breaks down against the metaphors of the text.

⁶³ Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, pp. 61-117, 130.

⁶⁴ W. H. Rossell, "New Testament Adoption — Graeco-Roman or Semitic?," *JBL* 71 (1952), p. 233, makes the unfounded suggestion that Paul was primarily writing to the Jews in each community. This puzzling presupposition contradicts the evidence within Galatians. Even Rossell has to concede his uncertainty in the case of Gal. 4.6. Although the quote in Gal. 4.27 comes from an exile application, Paul did not use this text in the same way.

Paul's purposes even though it undoubtedly provides some background⁶⁵ Scott's claim is simply that Israel was the original adopted son (Ex. 4.22-23). Perhaps Paul, as well as many other Jewish writers of the period, understood and used such a metaphor for Israel (Rom. 9.4, Assumption of Moses 10.1-3; 1 Enoch 62; Sirach 4.10 etc.).⁶⁶ However, Scott concludes from Israel's status as the adopted son an eschatological expectation of liberation in the post-exile times, through the 'second exodus' (Jer. 31.9).⁶⁷ Scott explains that guardianship was a practice among the Jews from Sir. 4.10. Even if Scott is correct, how could the Galatians relate to this practice, unless they were active readers of Jewish literature and participants in the Jewish *familiae*? There is little evidence that the Galatians were familiar with Jewish literature from the sparse Old Testament usage in Galatians. Is the 'second exodus' tradition equally prevalent outside of Palestine, if such a tradition actually existed?⁶⁸ Even if Scott's idea of a second exodus theology is accurate, it is difficult to explain how the pedagogue and guardians fit into his scheme. In Galatians, Paul's usage of a pedagogue and guardians favors a more Greco-Roman metaphor with a shade of Jewish theology from the Abrahamic covenant. The Greco-Roman metaphors planted throughout the passage indicates a Greco-Roman background. There are two different themes that run side by side. First, it is important to understand the guardian's

⁶⁵ J. D. Hester, *Paul's Concept of Inheritance*, p. 8.

⁶⁶ For more discussions on Israelite sonship, see B. Byrne, 'Sons of God'—'Seed of Abraham' (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979), pp. 13-15; 28-37. See also Sirach 23.1-4, 36.1-19, 4 Ezra 5.23-28, Ps. Solomon 17.25-30, 18.4, Jubilees 2.17-20, 19.27-29, 22.11-14 etc. Keesmaat, *Paul and his Story*, pp. 178-179.

⁶⁷ Except for very unsystematic mention of the exodus metaphor about the return of the exile, it is hard to see which text gives a substantial enough story for Paul to use. P. A. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (ed.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (FS B. Lindars; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 116-118, gives a series of criteria to qualify a story to be a retelling of a tradition. The metaphorical story in Israel's return does not fit many of these criteria. Most importantly, it is hard to find narratives that tell the return as if it were an exodus. There is also no certainty as to the popularity of the story of the second exodus.

⁶⁸ Keesmaat, *Paul and his Story*, pp. 18-19, indicates this as a tradition. Her model is based upon anthropological studies such as that of Geertz's. There is no denial of the various usages of the exodus theme in the post-exile Jewish community. How uniformed this tradition was and how it affected Paul are still largely unanswered, or unanswerable, questions. The tradition could have also been used metaphorically without a complete intertextuality with the whole tradition. This study cannot adequately interact with these important issues. However, there is no doubt that many such issues are still far from certain. Not all traditions affected Paul in the same way in every letter. The effect of the exodus tradition is not apparent in Galatians. Keesmaat escapes this dilemma by pleading Paul's unintentional echo (p. 50) through Roland Barthes' cultural code

job both within and outside of the passage. Second, it is equally important to look at the critical role the heir plays in the whole process of inheritance. The following paragraphs will look at the two themes in the above stated order.

Betz, among other scholars, points out, “there is no certain instance of the use of οἰκονόμους in the literature of antiquity for one who has charge of the person or estate of a minor, nor any case of the terms ἐπιτρόπους and οἰκονόμους appearing together.”⁶⁹ When one surveys relevant lexical studies, no one can easily explain the coexistence of the two words. Separately, both terms could describe workers in the *familia*.⁷⁰ Paul’s unusual usage of the two words in combination could have been another way he allowed these terms to have interchangeable meanings. It is probably best to take the terms as indicating some kind of guardianship within the legal context of Gal. 3.23ff. The pedagogue in Gal. 3.24 was a slave, whereas the child guardian in Gal. 4.2 was someone the *paterfamilias* trusted to ensure the best for the child (Ulpian 11.1-8).⁷¹ In Justinian’s record, there were instances where slaves became freedmen and guardians by the testator’s will (Just. *Inst.* 1.14.1). Being appointed tutor automatically gave a slave free status (Just. *Inst.* 1.14.1). Therefore, it is possible to act as a pedagogue first before being granted the freedom to be a guardian. The legal records allowed Paul’s seemingly inconsistent metaphors to coexist.⁷² C. A. Amadi-Azuogu, in his *Paul and the Law in the Arguments of Galatians*, is probably right in saying, “His legal argument here is based on facts, even though

vocabulary and Kristeva’s intertextuality theories. As interesting as such ‘unintentional echoes’ may be, they probably did not serve Galatians well and must be dismissed with this study.

⁶⁹ Betz, *Galatians*, p. 204. Scott, *Adoptions as Sons of God*, pp. 137-140, 145, attempts to harmonize the two titles as state officials. He cites Jewish parallels from Josephus, Targum Ps.-Jonathan, and Mechilta. Such a usage is possible (Josephus *BJ* 2.16,117, 220; *Ant.* 1.221.252; 15.406; 20.2.12; Philo *Leg.* 299, 333; Rom. 16.23 etc.) but problems arise when one tries to make the picture fit by making the ‘father’ in Gal. 4.1 the head of state. If the ‘father’ in Gal. 4.1 is God the Father, then God was in direct charge of the oppressive Egyptians and was thus the cruel tyrant. Such a picture does not fit well with Paul’s writings. Thus, the Exodus story still does not make sense for Galatians.

⁷⁰ For usage of ἐπιτρόπους in the *familia*, see Josephus *AJ* 7. 369 and Matt. 20.8. For the usage of οἰκονόμους in the *familia*, see Diod. Sic. 36.5.1; Josephus *AJ* 12.200; Lk. 12.42; 16.1,3 and 1 Cor. 4.2.

⁷¹ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 244, points out that not only the *familia* but also the family connection was important in intestate succession. Her data ranges from Brutus and Cicero to Pliny the Younger.

⁷² E.g. J. C. O’Neill, *The Recovery of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1972), p. 56 resorts to such a desperate measure as seeing another hand writing either Gal. 4.1-3 or Gal. 4.4-7. Some like F. Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief* (HThK 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1974), p. 268, rightly choose to disregard the inconsistency and dwell on the point Paul was making.

we cannot be absolutely certain about its details.”⁷³ In dealing with another connection with the legal institution, Gardner says, “It has been estimated that about one-sixth of Roman independent property owners were children under the age of puberty and therefore legally requiring a tutor for the administration of their property.”⁷⁴ These guardians were generally trustworthy people selected from among the relatives and close friends of the *paterfamilias*. In fact, if the guardians were appointed by will, they were not even required to give the normal security, which guaranteed that they would not misuse the property under their care (Just. *Inst.* 1.24.). Furthermore, the guardians were to concern themselves with the patrimony, the welfare of the whole estate and the security of the family interest.⁷⁵ This not only meant power over the mother but also the heir, as long as the guardians respected the wishes of the *paterfamilias*.

Whether his illustration was theoretical or practical, Paul emphasized the keeping of dates as an expression of the Galatians’ former enslavement (Gal. 4.10). This is the effect of cosmic enslavement. Both Jews and gentiles recognized the importance of keeping holy days, such as the Jewish Sabbath and various gentile ‘holi/holy’ days.⁷⁶ As J. J. Collins observes, both Philo and Seneca emphasized Sabbath observance among practicing Jews (Philo *Mos.* 2.17 etc.).⁷⁷ Apart from other issues like cultic sacrifices, the debate on religious rites

⁷³ C. A. Amadi-Azuogu, *Paul and the Law in the Arguments of Galatians: A Rhetorical and Exegetical Analysis of Galatians 2,14-6,2*, (Bonner Biblische Beitrage 104; Weinheim: Beltz Athenaum, 1996), p. 242.

⁷⁴ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 241n75. The age for puberty could have been up to twenty-five years old.

⁷⁵ Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, p. 204.

⁷⁶ See J. E. Stambaugh, *The Ancient Roman City* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1988), pp. 225-240, for information on the connection between Roman religion and holidays. The Jewish devotion to the Sabbath is unique among all the religions of the Empire. J. M. G. Barclay, “The Family as the Bearer of Religion,” in Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families*, p. 71, observes, “There is no parallel in the Graeco-Roman world to the devotion of the one whole day in seven to rest.”

⁷⁷ J. J. Collins, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup, 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), p. 218, notes this motif in Jewish propaganda literature. These samples of literature are probably the closest to a ‘source’ of Jewish ‘proselytizing’ preaching. Sources like Cassius Dio 57.18.5 indicate some kind of cross religious activities similar to proselytizing already existing before Paul’s time. Was Paul competing against such teachings in the Galatian situation? No one can prove one way or another, but Paul was joining the theological discussion in his missionary strategy.

seems to center around ideas of baptism, the Sabbath, and circumcision.⁷⁸ The fact that there were complex variations in the interpretations by various branches of Judaism on these issues shows the socio-religious concern of the day.⁷⁹

Having looked at the issues relating to the guardian's identity, it is clear that much of the guardian institution does not fit Paul's analogy. Much of the background to this institution seems irrelevant to Paul's argument. The guardians mentioned were associated with τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, which is a term that acquires sinister connotations as the verses progress (Gal. 4.3, 9).⁸⁰ This certainly does not accord with the Greco-Roman idea of the guardian as a benevolent figure. Although there are differences between the Greco-Roman background and Paul's usage, Paul used part of the background to achieve his rhetorical purpose. From the way Paul mixed his metaphors it is clear that, in his discussion of the Law, he almost equated the power of the pedagogue and the guardians. However, he also linked the guardians with common elements of Law-abiding Jewish and gentile religions (Gal. 4.4.2-3, 9).⁸¹ The power Paul talked about was not the official or legal power of the Roman laws. If that were the case, the guardians

⁷⁸ J. J. Collins, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*, pp. 218-228. The competing Jewish mission was widespread enough for Tacitus and Suetonius to include it in their writings.

⁷⁹ Collins, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*, p. 223, based on Philo's writing, makes some distinctions between the social and ritual aspect of these laws. Not all of the religious sects in Paul's day adhere to these distinction. Collins uses the example from *Joseph and Aseneth* in which Joseph's piety was expressed through dietary restrictions. The dietary aspect of religion had a social dimension in both Greco-Roman and Jewish circles. One can find numerous record of this social practice in the Gospels (Lk. 5.29-32; 7.33-34; Matt. 11.18-19) and the Greco-Roman symposia. Whether there was a religious emphasis or not, the religious and social aspects go hand in hand because eating was by nature social, while conversion was religious.

⁸⁰ See Martyn, *Galatians*, pp. 394-395 for interpretive possibilities of the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. The context of the 'we' indicates the unity of gentiles and Jews as a result of a certain commonality of their religions. Was the commonality the rulership of angels over both nations? The context does not deal with angelic rule over nations. Therefore, Gaston is probably incorrect in seeing Gal. 4.3 or 9 as being about angels. Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987), p. 75. To his credit, he sees the interpretation of the 'we' in Gal. 4.3 as the key to whether angels exist in this context. However, the 'we' prepares for Paul's Jewish examples in Gal. 4.5 and for gentile examples in Gal. 4.8-9. H. Hubner, *Law in Paul's Thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1984), p. 23, certainly sees the elements as sinful and demonic angelic powers. What seems to be the link between Jewish and gentile religions is the binding power of rituals over a whole group of people. These elements then are the "ABC" of all religions.

⁸¹ A representative of a view towards a 'pagan' religion comes from the contrast in Gal. 2.14. By contrast, in religious practices, Paul's agitators labeled the gentiles ἔθνικῶς, which is the opposite of Ἰουδαϊκῶς. See G. Luderitz, "What is the Politeuma?" in J. W. van Henton and P. W. van der Horst (ed.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), p. 210. However, Paul did not completely equate the two kinds of religion.

would have had greater legal authority than the pedagogue. Paul was talking about the practical governing power both the pedagogue and guardians had over the child, because both directly influenced the child's well being: the pedagogue looked after the heir's behavior, while the guardians looked after his inheritance.⁸²

Based on the above observation, Paul's analogy indicates two functions of the Law and basic elements of gentile religions.⁸³ First, the Law, and possibly gentile religion, had an ethical function. Second, the Law and religion both insured future inheritance at the time stipulated by the testator (Gal. 4.4; Just. *Inst.* 1.14.3). According to Paul, the Law shared certain similarities with other religions in the analogy of the guardians. Both Jewish and gentile religions had to yield some kind of consequence or inheritance, if Paul's analogy were to fit both. The Jewish option would lead to the inheritance of Christ's privileges, but Paul made no mention of any inheritance associated with gentile religions (Gal. 4.5-6).⁸⁴ Both Jewish and gentile religious institutions stipulated various rituals for the followers. So long as people lived under them, they behaved like slaves trying to follow instructions closely for their own benefit. As they lived under the management of these institutions, their inheritance within the Abrahamic promise remained inaccessible (Gal. 4.9-11). Despite the fact that many of the abuses slaves received did not enter into Paul's narrative world, those under the Law lived either as slaves or as children who were legally not much better off than

⁸² The guardians/tutor was also different from a curator. The same magistrate who appointed the tutors appointed a curator to look after a disabled person or to take over the duty of a disabled tutor (Just. *Inst.* 1.23). While the testator's will appointed tutors, the magistrate appointed curators.

⁸³ Another interpretation is 'the basic element of religion.' See Burton, *Galatians*, p. 518; Longenecker, *Galatians*, pp. 165-166, notes some of the common elements of what he considers different 'basic principles' that form Jewish and gentile religions. Longenecker is not saying that the two share common elements, but that both have basic elements which govern each religion.

⁸⁴ N. T. Wright, "Gospel and Theology in Galatians," in *Gospel in Paul*, p. 233, insists on a political interpretation of the elements in Gal. 4.3,9. There is no political message in Gal. 4 at all. Although it is possible to see Paul's gospel as having a political 'implication' regarding Roman imperial demands, it is quite a stretch to say that Paul's message in Gal. 4 is politically linked with Israel's post-exile or 'second exodus' politics. The issues with which Paul was battling were fundamentally religious. Circumcision was a purity rite, as the uncircumcised were deemed unclean in the Torah. The main purpose of purity rites was for participation in the cultus and Jewish covenant, both of which are heavily religious. Otherwise, it is hard to imagine why the Qumran dwellers would quarantine a person 'contaminated' with a gentile and not allow such a defiled person to eat until the evening. See H. K. Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis* (SBLDS, 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), pp. 104-107.

slaves.⁸⁵

Having looked at the metaphor of the guardians/tutors, it is clear that some further complementary ideas regarding the heir also exist in the passage just before Gal. 4 regarding the heir. In Gal. 3.27, within the previous passage, Paul used a transitional metaphor in to further hint at the confirmation of an adult sonship metaphor, which can be found in the Roman social context. In Gal. 3.27, the believer, whether Jew or gentile, is clothed with Christ. This new 'clothing' on the newly converted in Gal. 3.27 is coherent with Gal. 4.1-10, as clothing often denoted a personal identity in terms of geography, ethnicity, social class, gender and even age.⁸⁶ Since Gal. 3.23-4.10 deal with the future identity of the young heir, the clothing metaphor plays an important role in the adoption metaphor because the Romans expressed their geography, ethnicity, social class, gender, and even age in their clothing. For instance, the toga *praetexta* was the sign of rank for a prepubescent. Hence, age has legal and social ranking. To be clothed with Christ denotes a new identity, that is of being an heir just like Christ. This 'Christian' clothing, whatever it was, transferred Christ's privilege of

⁸⁵ See E. Eyben, "Fathers and Sons," in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, pp. 114-116, who uses examples of Gaius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus to demonstrate the *patria potestas* over children. See Valerius Maximus 5.1.3; 5.8.5. for a discussion on the extreme punishment of children by the *paterfamilias*, who also acted as a judge in the *familia*.

⁸⁶ Clothing held particular importance in Paul's days. In the most detailed ancient account on the toga, Quintilian took particular care in dealing with its length, proportion and shape (*Inst.* 11.3.137-149). The way the orator wore his toga could affect how his message would be received by his audience (*Inst.* 11.3.137). There should never be a hint of any identity other than that of a competent orator. Because the toga was a piece of free flowing clothe, every motion and even parts of the orator's speech were affected by how he wore and fixed it (*Inst.* 11.3.141-149). His person was identified by his dress. See S. Stone, "The Toga: From National to Ceremonial Costume," in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *From the World of Roman Costume* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1994), pp. 13-45. She shows the development of the purple mark as a royal identity which predates the Etruscans (p. 13). J. Sebesta, "Symbolism in the Costumes of the Roman Woman" in *From the World of Roman Costume*, pp. 46-50, shows that youngsters already sported aristocratic costumes. The marital status of women was also indicated by clothing, whether they were bride, matron, *materfamilias* or widow. Sebesta sums up her finding by stating, "If you were a married woman, you wore a stole; if you were not, you wore a toga, *praetexta*, if you were still a child, plain if you were an adulteress." L. A. Roussin, "Costume in Roman Palestine: Archaeological Remains and the Evidence from the Mishnah," pp. 182-190 and R. A. Gergel, "Costumes as Geographical Indicator: Barbarians and Prisoners on Cuirassed Statue Breastplates," pp. 191-209, in *From the World of Roman Costumes*, both shows the importance of geographical and ethnic identity in costumes. All these findings allow Paul's metaphor to speak for itself as Gal. 3.28 deals with ethnicity, gender and social ranking. Dunn, "The Theology of Galatians," p. 140 assumes that the 'ethnic' language in Gal. 2.15-16 overshadows the whole book. Ethnicity is only part of the Antioch incidence. One can make some kind of speculation about the Jerusalem episode as well. However, ethnicity does not tell the whole picture. It is only a superficial problem.

inheritance to the believing community. The element of clothing serves as a good transition and an introduction to the adult sonship metaphor in Gal. 4.1-7.

According to Paul, Christ's work transformed factors such as ethnicity, class, and gender in personal identity into a spiritual identity.⁸⁷ In the previous and subsequent metaphors, there is also a hint of the son being treated as an adult, regardless of the convert's earthly age. According to Paul, God viewed the converts as qualified to inherit His estate. The 'sons' or heirs are now clothed with Christ the Son. The clothing image emphasizes the status of the heir, which is drastically different from that of a slave. All the imageries so far fit the customs of the time.

To look at the heir in Gal. 4.1-10 in another way, Paul's comparison of a minor with an adult son was not a general statement but originated from Roman law. In the Roman law, the status of minors is somewhat ambiguous. For all of the genius and sophistication of Roman law, the status of children occupied a minor role.⁸⁸ Though the social reality did make distinction between the treatment of slaves and children, the Roman *paterfamilias* placed strong restrictions on both the child and the slave.⁸⁹ However, Paul did not dwell on this point through his metaphor.⁹⁰ Instead, Paul quickly made the guardians as the authority to make his analogy work. Paul used a legal and not a social analogy to describe a 'legal' situation in the Christian faith. Furthermore, the pedagogue and the guardians analogies point to a restriction put on the heir, while being under the power of both. Not matter how one connects this social inability of the minor to religious terms, Paul was presenting the possibility of humanity being able to

⁸⁷ Though 'spiritual' might be a vague word, the Christian identity is not social, geographical and gender oriented but the three factors do not change after conversion. Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul*, p. 16 labels baptism as a social identity. However, after baptism, the outside world does not see the sign of baptism anymore. Unlike Jewish practices, where clothing and diet were visible signs of one's social and religious leanings. Thus, the Christian identity of being clothed with Christ was spiritual. For Paul, being clothed with Christ could quite possibly means ethical dispositions from the fruit of the Spirit in Gal. 5, thus making conversion a spiritual identity. This not to deny her assertion on the importance of the covenant in any religious rituals but to put the matter only in social terms may be beyond Galatians. Paul's idea seems much more radical than external identification. He gave the label "new creation" in Gal. 6.15.

⁸⁸ P. Garnsey, "Sons, Slaves — and Christians," pp. 105-106.

⁸⁹ See R. P. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 142-153.

⁹⁰ See M. Kurylowicz, " 'Adoptio Plena' und 'Minus Plena'," *Labeo* 25 (1979), p. 167 for the exercise of the *patria potestas*.

become heir to its Creator.⁹¹ Paul saw the life under the Law as being a hindrance to the full God-given inheritance. Therefore, it is clear that the second reason for the former enslavement of the Galatians was chronological. They as gentiles simply had to wait for the coming of Jesus to relieve humanity from bondage, through God's planning and timing.⁹²

5.2.4 Meaning of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 4.1-10

The meaning of the metaphor in Gal. 4.1-10 is partially determined by the pronouns Paul used. Was Paul talking about Jewish or gentile religion when he used the tutor metaphor to describe the elements of the world? Commentators are divided on this issue. Some claim Gal. 4.4 to be Christian Jews with Gal. 4.6-7 being the Galatians.⁹³ Others just take the whole passage as a reference to Christians. The main issue is how one takes the phrase ὑπὸ νόμον in Gal. 4.4-5. If it refers to Jews, how does it affect the Galatians? The usage of νόμος in Galatians seem to indicate the Mosaic Law rather than general religious stipulations. The struggle in Galatia seems to be about circumcision which was within the Mosaic Law. Therefore, those under the Law should probably be Jewish Christians before their conversion. This is especially fitting within the context of the Mosaic Law in Gal. 3. However, when one deals with the effects on the Galatians, then the Jewish motif must be applicable in some way to Paul's gentile situation. Although there is more on how Paul applied this metaphor in the next section, it is enough to say that the experience of the Jewish Christians before conversion can be relevant in terms of the gentile mission. Such an argument from a traditional example is similar to that of Gal. 3 where Israel's history has a gentile application.

According to the literary context, what was Paul's message in mixing the four characters? In the light of the overall argument from Gal. 3-4, there are two types of people: the enslaved and the freed/adopted. People who choose to follow

⁹¹ One can see why M. Hooker repeatedly used Gal. 4 to fortify her theory of interchange between the believer and Christ through Adam Christology. After all, Adam was traditionally the first "son" of God with Jesus being the last Son (Gen. 5.1-3; Luke 3.38 etc.). M. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 8, 15-16, 27, 42, 59-61, 92, 99, 158-159, 168, 173, 185-186.

⁹² In following C. H. Dodd, Gale, *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul*, p. 60n37, overstates the situation by stating, "Hence when men receive the status of 'sons of God', they are entering into a relationship with him who, in one sense, was already their 'father'". This idea of universal fatherhood of humanity is not found in Paul here.

the Mosaic legislation are those who are enslaved. Positively, the Law had a similar function as the tutor who only took charge of the child until the day set by the Father. In Gal. 4.2-3, the guardians had more of a restrictive and protective function for the Jewish people.⁹⁴ Negatively, after the coming of the promised salvation, the Law had a similar power as the basic elements of other religions because of its enslaving capability. In Gal. 4.4-6, the turning point in the history of salvation happened through Jesus and the Spirit. When Paul uses full-fledged enslavement as a metaphor, he talks more in terms of what happened after the Galatians believed, in the light of their former state (Gal. 4.8-11). Although superficially there seems to be a similarity in how Paul portrayed Roman religion and the Jewish Law, the different metaphors between Gal. 4.1-2 and 4.8-9 may indicate a subtle difference. Therefore, at best, the Law acted as a supervisor; at worst, it had the enslaving power of gentile religions after the coming of Christ.

In contrast to the pedagogue metaphor in Gal. 3, the guardians metaphor in Gal. 4 indicates a difference in Paul's emphasis. While the pedagogical function of the Law before the coming of Christ was to demonstrate transgression (Gal. 3.24), the guardian function of the Law was to serve as a temporary religious measure until the final coming of the Spirit-led life (Gal. 4.6). Both pedagogue and guardian metaphors are time-bound. Yet, both illustrate slightly different concepts. On the one hand, justification by faith was complete when Christ finally came (Gal. 3.24). On the other hand, the Spirit not only allowed the believers to claim their right as children of God (Gal. 4.6), but it also continued to teach them how to live under the new administration of Christ (Gal. 5). Both aspects follow each other logically and work closely together. The two metaphors complement each other to better explain the function of the Law. The themes of justification and Spirit-reception occur frequently in the letter, thus making these two metaphors important analogies.

5.2.5 Didactic Function of the Slave Metaphor in Gal. 4.1-10

Comparing Gal. 4.1-10 and Gal. 3.23-26, Paul merged his theme and *phoros* in the in a similar manner in both. In Gal. 3.23-26, the theme is the Galatians' relationship with the Law and the *phoros* is the pedagogue's work on the son,

⁹³ E.g. Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, pp. 281-294.

⁹⁴ The first person plural seems to be a contrast against the "you" in Gal. 4.8.

while in Gal. 4.1-10, the theme is the holding function of the Law, and the *phoros* is the holding function of the guardian/tutor. The *phoros* in Gal. 4.1-10 further shows that the terms under which the guardian served is limited by the master (Gal. 4.2). One positive aspect that fits this chronological motif is the divine plan (Gal. 4.4ff; cf. 3.23-24). At no point is the master's plan questioned. The negative aspect of the *phoros* is that the guardian/tutor is no longer needed. Paul communicated this message by allowing the *phoros* to merge with the theme. Paul appears to be saying that although God's Law was as perfect as His plan, the situation required one to live under the Spirit rather than under the old guardians/tutors, the Law or any basic element of religion.

There is a similar structure in Gal. 4.1-10 and some of Paul's other metaphors. Paul first used a metaphor based on a common human experience in order to illustrate his subsequent theological ideas. The Galatians might not have understood all such theological ideas without such metaphors. Here, one can look at the function of the metaphor in terms of analogy. It is especially easy to see this form of argumentation as falling within the category of 'analogy'.⁹⁵ Essentially, Paul was saying, "My theological ideas are like these metaphors." When the guardians-tutors metaphor occurs, the form of the pericope starts with the analogical metaphor and ends with either an explanation or conclusion. Hence, it is not hard to see the didactic purpose of starting with an analogy. However, the metaphor as an analogy is different from a metaphorical example. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, analogy develops into a more specific application, while examples tend to move towards generalization.⁹⁶ In Gal. 4.1-2, the metaphor highlights specific aspects of God's salvation history. In terms of rhetoric, Paul's analogical metaphor is an invention by the author that aims to explain and apply specific ideas or experiences which are otherwise abstract and obscure to his audience.

This language of enslavement functions in several ways. First, Paul wanted to draw upon the Greco-Roman imagery of slavery to emphasize his own negative view of the agitators' position. One hesitates to go so far as to say that Paul had

⁹⁵ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, pp. 371-374. An analogy is something such as, "A is like B."

⁹⁶ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, p. 374, gives an example on how to differentiate one from the other.

an entirely negative view of the Law. In both analogies of the pedagogue and tutor, Paul was clearly struggling to tone down his polemic against the Law. However, it is hard to deny that Paul used the metaphors in a largely negative manner. When Paul used the metaphor of the pedagogue, he put the Law in the position of a household slave, even though Paul had just finished talking about the Law in a somewhat more positive manner (Gal. 3.19, 21). The metaphor of the guardians/tutors is not negative in its cultural background. However, the terms Paul used to describe it clearly put the Law in a subservient place (Gal. 4.3, 9). The enslaving application of this metaphor is also apparent (Gal. 4.9). While Paul had a problem with the religious practices his agitators advocated, he realized that he could not speak gloriously of the Law and still fortify his argument.⁹⁷ Since the Law was what the agitators seem to have taught, Paul had to attack its validity for Christians in order to make sure the Galatians were following his gospel. On the issue of the Law, Dunn makes the point that Paul was dealing with the Law and its function to create social identity and draw boundaries.⁹⁸ Even though the Law governed Jewish society, Paul compared it with the basic elements of gentile religious life. Paul probably saw the connection between the two because both practiced certain religious rituals. Later Jewish evidence suggests the seriousness of religious rituals in relation to the

⁹⁷ H. Räisänen, "Paul's Conversion and the Development of His View of the Law," *NTS* 33 (1987), p. 406, distinguishes the 'practice' from the 'doctrine' of Judaism based on the words ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ in Gal. 1.13. Such a distinction is probably more modern than Pauline. Paul seems to see a close relationship between the two and was certainly concerned with the practice of the Galatians. However, the letter clearly indicates more issues than practical considerations. See Y. Amir, "The Term Ἰουδαϊσμός (IOUDAISMOS), A Study in Jewish-Hellenistic Self-Identification," *Immanuel* 14 (1982), pp. 35-36, for the close link between belief and practice in Judaism.

⁹⁸ Dunn, "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14)," *NTS* 31 (1985), pp. 524ff. Although ethnicity is an important issue and the Law was probably all that Dunn asserts and more, Paul seems to indicate that the will of God in Christ is the fundamental issue. See especially Gal. 3.25, 29; 5.6; 6.15. Dunn, "Theology of Galatians," *Pauline Theology*, p. 128, further forges a similar connection with the 'social' function of the Law. Why should social function be a concern if the Galatian churches were founded as gentile missions with little to no direct social implications for Jews? Dunn also thinks that love and Spirit are the new 'markers' of the Law according to Paul (p. 132). However, these markers are far from explicit in the structure of the Old Testament Law. One can only infer such markers with 'covenantal nomism' in mind. These boundaries of circumcision, and possibly calendrical observances, were inconveniences the Jews had to endure when trying to assimilate with Romans. However important such ethnic identity markers were, Paul's argument was not founded on arguing against a Jewish identity but was about the divine plan for gentiles. For a discussion on the inconveniences of Jewish boundary markers, see M. Williamson, "Jews and Jewish communities in the Roman empire," in *Experiencing Rome*, pp. 324-326.

divine presence.⁹⁹ Any community that saw itself as the ‘pure’ temple of God would definitely be concerned with the divine presence. This concept was translated into the early church being the new temple of God. Naturally, the church would be concerned with divine presence. Since the early church congregated in their households, the dwelling place of the divine presence of God would also be in the household. In line with much of Jewish thoughts, God’s presence demanded legal and cultic purity.¹⁰⁰ Paul’s opponents could very well argued for circumcision as the key to the divine presence in the Galatian churches. Therefore, one cannot ignore the religious aspect of the Law, which may go beyond boundary lines based entirely on ethnicity.¹⁰¹ Paul raised the issue of the former religious life of the Galatians, not so much to attack a gentile religion, but to remind his audience of how similar the agitators’ teaching was to the Greco-Roman religions.¹⁰² Thus, Paul broadened his metaphor from the pedagogue to the guardians/tutors in order to include discussion on gentile religion(s). Because of the common belief among early Christians in the uniqueness of a risen Christ over the gentile gods/religions, Paul’s polemic against his agitators intentionally discredited their teaching. Although Paul’s portrait of the agitators’ claim was a caricature, he most likely shocked his audience with this vilification.

Apart from discrediting his agitators’ teaching, Paul also debased their character. Paul had essentially labeled their teaching as heresy, which implies that they were false teachers. Classifying someone as a teacher of ‘pagan’

⁹⁹ Without a doubt, circumcision was not just a sign of becoming a Jew, but of conversion to Judaism. Being a Jew in the Jewish perspective (as opposed to an ‘outsider’ gentile perspective), would consist of both social and religious adherence. S. Cohen, “Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew,” *HTR* 82 (1989), pp. 26-33. From his sources, Cohen sets three criteria for becoming a Jew. One had to keep the Law, to worship the one God, and to become integrated into the Jewish community. Two of the three criteria are clearly religious.

¹⁰⁰ See B. M. Bokser, “Approaching Sacred Space,” *HTR* 78 (1985), pp. 279-299.

¹⁰¹ Advocates for a limited interpretation of the ‘works of the Law’ neglect one obvious point. Dietary laws were not the Galatian problem: circumcision was. However, Paul used dietary laws to good effect highlighting the common connection between circumcision and kosher diet, both of which are from the Torah. Furthermore, Paul’s discussion on the pedagogue and guardians was applicable to the Law and not the ‘works of the Law’. Thus, Paul might have started his argument in Gal. 1-2 with certain ‘works of the Law’, but ultimately, the whole issue is about the place of the whole Law in the gentile mission, not just ceremonial restrictions.

¹⁰² J. Huskinson, “Introduction,” in *Experiencing Rome*, pp. 10-14, uses categories like ‘essential’ versus ‘relative’ to define what makes identity. Circumcision, date keeping and other aspects of Jewish life was definitely essential. What Paul did was to take the essentials of the gentile and Jewish religious identity before Christian conversion.

religion or heresy as Paul did the agitators was a serious charge in the early church.¹⁰³ These agitators were, by implication, also slaves, along with those who were enslaved, which did not make them look favorable to the Galatians. The agitators were trying to raise their profile by presenting themselves as the insiders (Gal. 4.17; 6.12), but Paul's portrait tarnished their reputation. The intent of such vicious rhetoric was to encourage the Galatians to distance themselves from such company. Paul's portrait of his enslaved agitators as those furthest from the inner circle is the complete opposite of their closer position as the insider of insiders.

History was always close to Paul's heart and could be found in his argumentation. Paul used Abraham and Moses as contrasting figures in Gal. 3 by reviewing the historical significance of both men. Subsequently, Paul used another argument on salvation history in Gal. 4.1-10. Gal. 4.4-5 use a Jewish example, while the following verses relate to the gentile experience of conversion.¹⁰⁴ Argument by example succeeds when the audience also shares a given premise.¹⁰⁵ The shared premise in Gal. 4.4-5 is the validity of the corporate and the individual Jewish salvation experience. The Galatians seem to understand examples of Abraham and Moses either because they knew of them from Paul or the agitators. One can assume the same knowledge of the Jewish salvation in Gal. 4.4-5. The text itself indicates an argument by example, in this case, from Jewish antiquity. As it was with the Abraham and Moses argument, argument for the antiquity of certain ideas was valid for an audience who valued historical precedent. Therefore, the Jewish Christian experience became the typological example for the subsequent gentile experience.

One final point is necessary in order to understand this rhetoric of former enslavement. Paul also wanted his converts to understand their former state and the danger of regression. This strategy is vital in terms of relating to the

¹⁰³ A. D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (vol. 2), pp. 930-931, states that Paul was not an expert of pagan religions. Pagan religion manifested itself socially in Paul's environment. Thus, Paul did not need to be an expert to appreciate the difference between his Jewish religion and the gentile counterparts.

¹⁰⁴ Amadi-Azuogu, p. 250, points to the similar phrasing in Job. 14.1; 25.4b etc. in both the Masoretic and the Septuagint versions. This would validate that Paul was using a Jewish expression. Furthermore, because Paul hardly referred to the incarnation let alone the human birth of Christ, Gal. 4.4 can easily be an early creed.

¹⁰⁵ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, p. 461.

Galatians' past experience as well as warning against the pitfalls of their current situation. The Galatians' former state was dire, in Paul's estimation. Perhaps the agitators were hinting at the fact that Law-keeping would prevent them from falling back into their former enslavement. By his ironic presentation of the guardians/tutors, Paul's claim is that they were actually doing the opposite as a result of a nomistic lifestyle. By trying to fulfill any part of the Law as a means of Christian living, the Galatians were regressing to their pre-Christian state. Therefore, the reminder of their former state served as a further warning against the possibility of going the way of the agitators. Furthermore, the surprise created by Paul's extreme metaphor should have served to turn the Galatians around.

Chapter Six

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

6.1 The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in His Self-defense

Many have claimed that Paul's purpose in writing Galatians was to defend his honor, while others have vehemently denied any self-defense on Paul's part. Depending on how one interprets the argument, one can justify either claim. Having looked in this study at the slave metaphor at the beginning and at the end of Galatians, it is clear that the claim for some form of Pauline self-defense is a strong one.

In looking at the autobiographical and the epilogue sections, there is one presupposition one must make to interpret any letter. Ancient authors and listeners understood letters to have a rhetorical purpose (Quint. 4.2.40; *Her.* 1.9.16). More specifically, authors did not compose autobiographical information merely to introduce themselves. This was especially evident to an audience who had a relationship with the author. What then was the intention of Paul's self-disclosure? Was it in self-defense that Paul conveyed his autobiographical information? This study confirms from the *inclusio* structure of the slave metaphor in Gal. 1.1, 10 and 6.17 that there is a tone of self-defense in Paul's letter. This is different from saying that the letter should be classified as an apologetic letter because an element of polemics also exists within it. Before he could claim apostolic authority and before he could proclaim a gospel of equality among Jews and non-Jews, Paul had to show his own equality with the apostles in the Jewish mission. Paul made bold claims in order to establish the equality of the gentile and Jewish missions.¹ These apologetic statements are a precursor to the argument that follows them. The next section will deal with polemics in detail. Paul could have made some counterclaims in contrasting the perceived understanding of his divine and human origin. Such a contrast is especially apparent in Gal. 1 and can support the claim to see an apologetic purpose in Paul's writing.

From a macroscopic or structural perspective, there is a very good reason to view the beginning and ending echoes of the slave metaphor in Galatians as

¹ See J. M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBL Dissertation Series, 59; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982), pp. 171-174.

apologetic. Both prescript and postscript repeatedly explain Paul's apostolic credentials. On the one hand, one can object to this understanding by citing the fact that the apologetic elements do not occur throughout the letter. One can also choose to see the repetition as coincidental. Furthermore, Paul dropped hints of his own examples throughout the letter, which causes G. W. Hansen and B. R. Gaventa to see the letter as having some exemplary function.² On the other hand, studies such as Finnegan's on the rhetoric of oral society confirm that repetition of ideas helps the audience to understand the message.³ Although the repetition in the prescript and postscript is far from consistent throughout the letter, epistolary research on ancient letters confirms the important role of the beginning and ending of ancient letters.⁴ Moreover, other references in Paul's defense seem to correspond to Paul's position in his self-description metaphors. Therefore, the chance of merely coincidental repetition is unlikely. Since postscripts can be summaries of the content of the letters, the repetition from the beginning confirms the importance of Paul's self-descriptions (*POxy.* 2985; *Cic. Fam.* 12.12.5). Therefore, the oral and epistolary conventions confirm the apologetic purpose of the slave metaphor in Galatians.

Having confirmed the existence of Paul's self-defense as part of Galatians, one must try to understand how Paul used the slave metaphor to defend himself. Paul's unique understanding of his honorary position as Christ's slave not only shows his authority, but also supports his claim to a unique gospel. The message and the integrity of the messenger usually went hand in hand in Paul's time. Whether one chooses to take Old Testament writings or Greco-Roman inscriptions as evidence of the powerful positions of some slaves, Paul's claim for himself was that of honor and not shame. The perception of integrity and honor is an essential element in apologetic rhetoric. Without these elements, apologetics, by logic alone, would bring the apologist to a dead end. Therefore, Paul found it necessary to use personal defense as an introduction to his logical arguments. For Paul, the purity of his message came directly from the purity of

² Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, calls the letter a request letter. One of the request is to "become as I am" (Gal. 4.12). See B. R. Gaventa, "Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as a Paradigm," *NovT* 28 (1986), pp. 309-326.

³ Finnegan, *Oral Poetry*, p. 129 and McCreech, *Biblical Sound and Sense*, pp. 120-148.

⁴ Cook, "The Prescript As Programme in Galatians" and Weima, *Neglected Endings*.

the messenger and the divine Master who called the messenger. In apologetic writing, it is important to establish the authority of the writer. This argument from authority not only exists in the beginning and at the end of Galatians, but also occurs throughout Gal. 1 and 2. If Paul's self-defense is inconsistent with the other slave metaphors, it is because of the uniqueness of the situation from which Paul borrowed his metaphor. There is no need for Paul to look to the social and common slave institution for inspiration here.⁵ Rather, Paul probably meant his self-description to be something unique. Even such a unique situation could have been Paul's own creation. In such a case, so long as his metaphor was possible, if uncommon, one can continue to derive meaning from individual cases in society and see Paul's self-description as positive.

In addition to his claim for authority for himself, Paul's use of the hyperbolic imagery of slavery indicates the absoluteness his message demands. The usage of self-description does not stop as an apology, but also shows the necessity of choices. Paul's contrasts between good and evil show the moral influence of siding with one or the other. If the Galatians chose to side with Paul, then they sided with good. Otherwise, Paul considered them to be on the side of the agitators. To side with the agitators would make one guilty of tolerating evildoers. Seeing the apologetic rhetoric is not enough because Paul's goal was to force a decision upon his audience. The message does not allow for middle ground. It forces itself on the listeners. It is agonistic and demanding, without any room whatsoever for compromises. The apology is the means but not the end to reaching Paul's audience.

What then can one make of Paul's apologetics? The different form of the letter in two places demands a single conclusion. The first place to look is the overall structure of the book. Paul first confirmed his authority in Gal. 1-2 before he presented his message in Gal. 3-6. The second place to look is the postscript where Paul first summarized his message in Gal. 6.12-16 and then reaffirmed his

⁵ Perhaps this is why Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, concludes differently. He bases his data on a common and general picture of societal slavery. Paul on the other hand, made use of individual cases to paint his picture. As unusual as such an individual case is, Paul's claim would not have been beyond the grasp of his original audience. Because the ideas of self-defense are so different from the polemics and didactic persuasion, one must categorize Paul's self-description as a different metaphor. Even if the metaphor can arise out

own authority in Gal. 6.17, as if to remind his audience once more of the importance of his position. If Gal. 6.17 is a reference to his suffering which is something the agitators used against him, then the purpose of Paul's self-description of the marks is to prevent defamation of his character. In such a defense, Paul repaints the picture for honor and shame, in the light of his gospel. Perhaps this is the reason he left the explanation of the marks to the end of his letter. Whether in his slave metaphor or his 'autobiography', Paul used apologetics to create a firm foundation for the persuasiveness of his message. The apologetics are the rhetorical stepping stones.

6.2 The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in His Attack on the Agitators

When dealing with Paul's rhetoric in attacking the persons and position of his agitators, interpretive approaches can vary from seeing Paul's polemics everywhere to almost nowhere. In order to be cautious, the present study only examines places where the explanation of polemics against the agitators make the most sense, which can include places where the presence of the agitators is not explicit. In the cases of polemical allusion, one must determine that polemics is the best explanation. In the case of the Sarah-Hagar story, the allusion in Gal. 4.30 seems explicit enough to warrant classifying it as a polemical statement. Chapter four has already discussed these examples extensively.

While the agitators' characteristics are vividly discernible in Gal. 1.6-9, the first place where this study sees the agitators' shadows lurking, is in Gal. 1.10. As stated in the previous summary on the rhetoric of Paul's defense, there is a certain possibility of reading the verse as polemical. Although this is far from certain, it is worthwhile seeing polemic here in conjunction with Gal. 6.17. The contrast of being a slave to God versus being a slave to humans in Gal. 1.10 complements Gal. 6.17. Although Gal. 1.10 has a defensive tone, Gal. 6.17 gives more than an hint of an external attack on Paul's character. Paul was more than likely being more than a moral example. Surely, there are other moral examples that are more edifying in relation to Paul's 'spiritual' and ethical teaching in Gal. 5.

of the social situation of a slave owning society, this does not make all slave metaphors inter-related or the same.

The second place where this study sees the agitators' shadows lurking is in Gal. 2.4. Apart from the curious 'grammatical shipwreck' of the anacaluthon, the verse points to the ideals of the agitators. If Paul had merely wanted to use the Titus incidence as an example of non-circumcision, he would not have elaborated on the intentions of the agitators in Jerusalem. In addition to the unusual mention of the agitators' intention, Paul seems to have included another issue in Gal. 2.5, in which the issue is his gospel, which is also a concern of the remaining chapters of Galatians. On the surface, the Titus event does not seem to relate to the gospel at all. Rather, the event itself is about a certain Jewish rite of circumcision. So, why link slavery with the gospel via an event that seems to be a religious practice? The reason is plain and simple. Because Paul saw the same danger in the Galatian situation as in the Jerusalem event, he aimed his rhetoric at the Galatian agitators. Gal. 2.4 is not only about Jerusalem, but ultimately about Galatia. All the extra explanation of the Jerusalem event serves to attack the agitators' position. The slave metaphor confirms the connection between Jerusalem and the Galatian churches.

Although Paul's rhetoric is altogether negative towards his agitators' teaching, one cannot be sure that there is no agreement between the two positions. Paul's usage of the pedagogue and guardian metaphors illustrates a hesitation to brand the Law as something entirely useless. The nature of Paul's metaphors indicates the Law, at some point in time, could be useful. This has less to do with Paul's conciliatory posture so much as his fear to blaspheme against the Lawmaker of the Old Testament. Therefore, any apparent agreement between Paul's 'positive' assessment of the Law and the agitators' position points to the real tension of the whole issue for the religious community. In his letters, Paul had no qualm about attacking his agitators in the worst terms. However, the polemics reveal as much about Paul as they do about his opponents. Paul's usage of the slave metaphors in Gal. 3 and 4 reveals much about his hermeneutical and theological struggle. In his most positive descriptions of the agitators, Paul deemed their theology obsolete. In his most negative descriptions, their company could jeopardize the Galatians' salvation.

The images in Paul's social metaphors on the spiritual position of the agitators are appalling. The Law-keepers were both slave and slave master. This

group of agitators lived contrary to the divine purpose. They were metaphorically slaves to the Law and other humans (Gal. 1.10). Their motive was to exploit for selfish purposes as in ancient slavery, possibly, as sophistic teachers (Gal. 1.10; 6.12-13). Although there is little consistency between Paul's images, there is a consistent negative tone throughout. Paul used this negative rhetoric to turn the agitators' story around in the Sarah-Hagar episode, at the end of which, the application is quite severe (Gal. 4.30). In Paul's Sarah-Hagar story, he used the metaphor of slave children to describe the agitators, making them illegitimate and thus unable to claim the inheritance of the Abrahamic promise. This polemic also warned the Galatians of the consequences of their current direction. Therefore, Paul's slave metaphor serves to draw the boundary line between those of his party and those of the agitators. Anything that contradicts Pauline Christianity is the 'other'.

6.3 The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in His Teaching of the Galatians

Paul's persuasion of the Galatians in his didactic expositions is consistent, and, it is therefore not hard to summarize how Paul used the metaphor of slavery to influence them. First, Paul linked his metaphor with Israel's historical example. Positively, an example comes from Abraham, while negatively, an example comes from the national history of Israel. Since the 'Old Testament' was the only available scripture in Paul's days, a certain assumption regarding audience knowledge is necessary in any interpretive exercise. Although the examples are from Israel's history, Paul's application was universal. Thus, these examples and their relative metaphors typify all humanity, or more specifically for gentiles as well as for Jews. So Paul argued from selected and specific incidences, deriving his principles from them for universal applications.

As this study showed earlier, there is a relationship between Israel's religion and gentile religion in Paul's discussion at the end of Gal. 3 and the beginning of Gal. 4, which is why Paul consistently universalized his argument. He was not saying that everything is the same but that commonality links back to the Law being obsolete. This is true not just in dealing with Jewish Law, but also the function of the law in any religion. For the most part, the ultimate assessment of both the pedagogue and the guardian is negative, regardless of any positive

function they might have had in the former days. Paul did not use all of the background from these social institutions, but just enough to convey his negative assessment in preparation for his exhortation in the last half of Gal. 4 and the beginning of Gal. 5. There were positive aspects of the institution behind these metaphors, but referring to them would not have enhanced Paul's argument. Therefore, Paul's didactic and persuasive metaphors serve to provoke certain actions from the Galatians regarding themselves as well as the agitators. Paul was using the metaphors to change minds and action.

A final point must be made in order to understand the problem of the frequency of various slave metaphors. Why do some metaphors occur more often than others do? If one metaphor occurs often, is Paul's audience aware of all the information necessary for interpretation? For metaphors Paul used sparingly, there is often no need for the audience to understand all the details in order to understand both the metaphor and its message. The social construct of the metaphor itself lends a hand in the interpretive process. In long episodes, such as the Sarah-Hagar story, the situation is different. The audience probably has to have some basic knowledge of the Abraham story to understand Paul's argument. Unless one takes the interpretive assumption that Paul made no sense to his audience whatsoever, one must assume the audience to have some knowledge because the Sarah-Hagar episode was beyond the social construct of the gentile audience.

6.4 The Function of Paul's Metaphor of Slavery in Galatians

As should be obvious from the methodology of this study, the rhetorical function of a metaphor is apparent only after one determines its meaning. The meaning of a metaphor can be derived from two sources. First, it can be derived from the context of the text. This context is important because it sets a boundary line for the information derived from the second source. Second, it can be derived from the cultural context or the symbolic universe of the society. Both the author and the audience shared this symbolic universe. Anything from the symbolic universe, which coheres with the literary context, is useful in enriching the meaning of the metaphor.

How, then, did Paul use the rhetoric of slavery in Galatians? First, he used it to describe himself in his apology. This apology must point towards the unusual

case of the upwardly mobile slave. As many recent studies demonstrate, it is entirely possible to see the setting of this slavery as an aristocratic household. Second, Paul used the slave metaphor to attack the agitators. The rhetorical effects, which serve to insult and degrade, are much more than the mere opposite of his self-defense. The origin from which Paul received his slave metaphor for the agitators seems more commonly to be the general condition of slavery rather than the upwardly mobile slave. The description of his agitators is exceedingly dire, in line with the common slave experience in the urban setting. Third, Paul used the slave metaphor to persuade the Galatians to take his side. The usage of the slave metaphor to persuade was also derived from the common slave experience, which fits perfectly with the social condition of Paul's days.

What are the implications of specifying Paul's rhetorical purpose in Galatians based on his usage of the slave metaphor? Below are the wider implications of how Paul uses his metaphors. In his own defense, Paul only infrequently used his 'honorable' slave position as a metaphor. Why he did this is unclear. Perhaps Paul guessed that the metaphor of an honored slave was too uncommon to serve his apologetic purpose. Generally, there is less apologetic material in Galatians. One can find apologetic material in Gal. 1-2, though this does not exclude any polemical material within the autobiography. In terms of Paul's polemical and didactic usage, the slave metaphor was very familiar to the slaves of his time. Furthermore, Paul was much more liberal in applying the slave metaphor in a consistently negative tone in his polemics and teaching. This common slave metaphor dominates throughout Gal. 3-6. Therefore, one can interpret these lines of evidence in two ways. First, one can look at how often Paul used the slave metaphors to say that the letter was not primarily apologetic. This may be a justifiable claim if statistics on frequency alone become the basis of rhetorical judgment. Second, one can look at the *inclusio* structure of the slave metaphor and note the uncommon slave metaphor of Paul. As one examines the letter in terms of both its linear development as well as its repetition, one can also argue that the beginning and the end are the most important parts of the letter. If the unusual slave metaphor indicates anything in this case, it would highlight Paul's apologetics. It is calling Paul's audience to pay special attention to the repetition. Moreover, one can also read the unusual repetition as an oral

issues. One way is to isolate areas of inconsistency in Paul and realize that Paul contradicted himself by adhering to his environment. Thus, in theory, Paul believed in equality, but in practice, he favored one party over another. Another way to look at the whole situation is to try to harmonize all of Paul's tensions and dismiss the observation made by the other side.

If nothing else, the history of interpretation of Paul's ideas on slavery proves that the argument can go either way. The best starting point is to recognize the slave metaphor as something rhetorically different from any clear statement Paul made about his conviction on slavery. Furthermore, even though Paul was no abolitionist, his view towards slavery was decisively negative because the *phoros* with which he used to illustrate the theme was negative. This study is based on the theory that the *phoros* of the slave metaphor is slavery while the theme is idea illustrated. When one studies the metaphor, one should look very closely at the connection between *phoros* and theme. However, one can equally look at how Paul describes the metaphor from his *phoros* to get an idea about his feelings towards slavery.

The following are the vehicles Paul used to illustrate salvation. In these examples one can see how Paul viewed slavery by the way in which he used the vehicles to describe the various solutions he proposed for the Galatians. The first example comes from Paul's self-description. Paul described his position as being a slave of Christ (Gal. 1.1,10; 6.17). He used this metaphor effectively to defend his person and message, which in turn brought out his authority. One must conclude that he viewed slavery positively from his self-assessment. Before a general conclusion that Paul viewed slavery as a positive social institution can be made, the interpreter must be more specific about which aspect of slavery Paul described as positive. Before one sees slavery in all aspects of Paul's self-understanding, the 'Lordship' language in Galatians gives the specific aspect of slavery Paul was talking about. In his Lord, Paul saw one who granted special privileges to him first by dying for him (Gal. 2.20) and then by calling him to be His spokesman in the new era (Gal. 1.15-16). Paul gave his all to his Lord only because he saw that his Lord first gave himself for him (Gal. 2.20-21; 6.14). Rather than seeing the parallel between the general Greco-Roman master-slave relationship at every point in Paul's metaphor, there is a need to see the drastic

differences here. For the most part, Paul's theology guides his vehicle and not the other way around. His self-description is a special case which does not typify the ancient master-slave relationship. He only used parallel ideas when they suited his main point. This is not to say that such a good relationship between master and slave was theoretically impossible, but such possibilities, if they existed, were exceptions rather than the norm. In the special case of Paul's self-understanding, no one should make a general statement about Paul's own conviction regarding slavery.

In Paul's attack on the agitators, he consistently used the slave metaphor negatively. By talking about the agitators in derogatory terms, Paul indicated that he had a very negative impression of both slavery and the enslaving powers. When he talked of the agitators being slave traders in Gal. 2.4, Paul puts the agitators' character into question. When he talked of Sarah and Hagar in Gal. 4.30, Paul used Old Testament narrative as a tool to expel these agitators. Both pictures of slavery are consistent with ancient slavery. The institution of slavery here is presented negatively through it is used as a vehicle. Paul viewed both the slave trade and the exposure of slaves as something negative. Although he used the Sarah-Hagar story as a command to be rid of the agitators, he did not advise the masters to expel their slaves. By noting Paul's use of slavery as a negative metaphor indicates that his attitude towards the common slave experience was primarily negative.

In Paul's persuasion of the Galatians, there is also a consistently negative pattern in relation to slavery. By talking about the negative issues, such as the Law and religion in terms of the pedagogue and guardian, Paul demonstrated again that both the pedagogue and guardian were people from whom one aimed to be liberated. They both acted as subordinate and temporary institutions until Christ came. In comparison to either Christ or the Abrahamic covenant, these were temporary measures. These vehicles which are used to describe the Law and religion, are consistent with the picture of ancient slavery. Paul's picture is not a special case. Although Paul viewed the slave institution less negatively, his ultimate aim was still to warn the Galatians to stay away from it.

Some preliminary conclusions can be drawn in viewing Paul's conviction on slavery as negative. When talking in negative terms about slavery in his

metaphors, Paul usually drew much from the general societal condition of slavery. When dealing with his own situation, he described a special situation different from the experience of the common slave. Although these conclusions may seem arbitrary, they are based on what is known about ancient slavery in comparison with Paul's metaphors. The more parallels one can find between the metaphors of Paul and the ancient condition, the more one can see how Paul felt about the institution from which he borrowed his metaphors. Furthermore, Paul very rarely used positive imagery in relation to slavery. Any positive description was only in passing. Thus, this gives a very partial picture of what Paul felt about the sparse descriptions of the special cases. Hence, deciding whether Paul felt positive or negative towards slavery is based on two criteria. First, the more his metaphor is drawn from the common condition, the more one can assess how Paul felt. Second, the more positive or negative the metaphor of slavery, the more one can tell Paul's conviction. One cannot give a simple 'yes' or 'no' as an answer to whether Paul felt positive towards the social institution of slavery. When one surveys other distinctions within the Pauline corpus, it is clear that Paul took the 'practice' of equality between Jews and gentiles much further than he did with slavery or gender issues.⁶ The degree of application on the principle of equality differs in each case.⁷

This study has come full circle in terms of Paul's creedal statement in Gal. 3.28. Many interpreters rightly note the verse as being vital as a principle of Pauline ethics. The impact of Gal. 3.28 on Pauline theology surfaces in similar dicta in Col. 3.11 and 1 Cor. 12.13. When one separates the core of Paul's belief in the statements of convictions and metaphors, the conviction statements should always take priority over the metaphors in representing Paul's conviction. The context of a verse like Gal. 3.28 coheres with Paul's metaphor of slavery which is negative. So Gal. 3.28 becomes the best expression of Paul's idea of slavery and

⁶ See C. Kruse, "Human Relationships in the Pauline Corpus," in D. Peterson and J. Pryor, *In the Fullness of Time* (FS D. Robinson; Homebush West: Anzea, 1992), pp. 167-181.

⁷ Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures," in Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families*, pp. 161, calls this struggle "egalitarianism within inherited structures." Some structures such as slavery were just unchangeable. Similarly, perhaps this is why Paul had the equality of Jews and gentiles at the forefront of his statements in Gal. 3.28, 1 Cor. 12.13 and Col. 3.11. The practice of the gentile mission was primarily about an ethnically inclusive gospel. There is also no certainty why Paul reversed his order of privilege in 'slave or free' in the light of the normal 'Jew, gentile, male, female' where the privileged is always the first one mentioned.

takes precedent over all the metaphors, no matter how close those metaphors are to showing Paul's mind. When comparing ~~metaphors~~ with its *phoros*, the *phoros* should take priority in expressing an author's conviction about the object in the *phoros*. In examining the *phoros* and theme of slavery in Galatians, slavery is predominately a negative concept in Paul's writing. From the present study of slavery, Paul seems more consistent than inconsistent. Any so-called inconsistency is merely evidence that Paul was a missionary who wrestled with real-life issues in the light of his principles. When the real world clashes with the ideal world, tension arises. Why should anyone expect otherwise with Paul?

a / S

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources and Reference Materials

- Blass, F. and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and rev. R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).
- Colson, F. H., and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo of Alexandria* (10 vol.; LCL; London: Heinemann, 1929-1962).
- Ehrenberg, V. and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949).
- Frey, P. J.-B., *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions* (New York: Ktav, 1975).
- Geffcken, J., *Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902).
- Hornblower, S., and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Horbury, W., *Jewish Inscriptions from Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Horsley, G. H. R. (ed.), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (vol. 1, North Ryde: Macquarie University, 1981).
- __ *New Documents* (vol. 2, 1982).
- __ *New Documents* (vol. 3, 1983).
- __ *New Documents* (vol. 4, 1987).
- __ *New Documents* (vol. 5, 1989).
- Horst, P. W. van der, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: and introductory survey of a millennium of Jewish funerary epigraphy (300 BCE - 700 CE)* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1991).
- James, M. R. (ed.), *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London: SPCK, 1917).
- Kittel, G., "Αββα" *TDNT* I, pp. 5-6.
- Klienkecht, H. and W. Gutbrod, "Νομος," *TDNT*, IV, pp. 1023-1051.
- Le Glay, M., J-L Voisin and Y. le Bohec, *A History of Rome* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).
- Llewelyn, S. R. (ed.), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (vol. 6, North Ryde: Macquarie University, 1992).
- __ *New Documents* (vol. 7, 1994).

— *New Documents* (vol. 8, 1997).

McCrum, R. and A. G. Woodhead, *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961).

Mayer, G., *Index Philoneus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974).

Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other*

Non-Literary Sources (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997).

Noy, D., *Jewish Inscriptions from Western Europe: Italy (excluding the City of Rome), Spain and Gaul* (vol. 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

— *Jewish Inscriptions: the City of Rome* (vol. 2.; 1995).

Panciera, S. (ed.), *Inscrizion Greche e Latine del Foro Romano e del Palatino* (Rome: Edizioni di Storiæ Letteraturea, 1996).

Reynolds, J. "Inscriptions and Roman Studies, 1910-1960," *JRS* 50 (1960), pp. 204-9.

— "Roman Epigraphy, 1961-65," *JRS* 56 (1966), pp. 116-21.

— "Roman Inscriptions, 1966-70" , *JRS* 61 (1971), pp. 136-52.

— "Roman Inscriptions, 1976-80," *JRS* 71 (1981), pp. 174-99.

Reynolds, J., M. Beard and C. Roueche, "Roman Inscriptions, 1981-5," *JRS* 71 (1981), pp. 121-43.

Reynolds, J., and R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987).

Sasse, H., "ΑΙΩΝ" *TWNT* I, pp. 197-209.

Sandys, J. E., *Latin Epigraphy* (2nd ed. rev. by S. G. Campbell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927).

Schrenk, G., "Δικαιωμα," *TDNT* II, pp. 178-225.

Schweizer, E., "Πνευμα, πνευματικός," *TDNT* VI, pp. 332-451.

— "Υιοθεσια," *TDNT* VIII, pp. 399.

Scott, S. P., *The Civil Law* (vol. 1 of 17; Cincinnati: The Central Trust, 1973).

Smallwood, E. M., *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius, and Nero* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

Stern, M., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, vol. 1, 1974, vol. 2, 1980,

vol. 3, 1984).

Thackeray, H. St. J., and R. Marcus, *A Lexicon to Josephus* (4 vols.; Paris: Librarie Orientaliste Paul Guenther, 1930-1955).

Thackeray, H. St. J., R. Marcus, A. Wikgren, and L. Feldman (eds.), *Josephus* (10 vols.; LCL, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976-1981).

Thomas, J. A. C., *The Institutes of Justinian* (Oxford: North-Holland, 1975).

Wevers, J. W., *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954-cont).

Whiston, W. (ed.), *The Works of Flavius Josephus* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992 [1737]).

Articles and Monographs

Abegg, M. G., "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and 4QMMT," *BAR* 20/6 (1994), pp. 52-55, 82.

Achtemeier, P. J., "An Apocalyptic Shift in Early Christian Tradition: Reflections on Some Canonical Evidence," *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 231-48.

Adler, M. K., *Naming and Addressing: a Sociological Study* (Harburg: Burke, 1978).

Aichele, G. and G. A. Phillips (eds.), "Intertextuality and the Bible" *Semeia* 69-70 (1996).

Alexander, P. ~~A.~~, "Jewish law in the time of Jesus: towards a clarification of the problem," in B. Lindars (ed.), *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (Cambridge: James Clark & Co. 1988), pp. 44-58.

— "Retelling the Old Testament" in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SST* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 99-121.

Allison, D. C., "Jesus and the Covenant: a Response to E. P. Sanders," *JSNT* 29 (1987), pp. 57-78.

Allmen, D. von, "Reconciliation du monde et christologie cosmique", *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses* 1 (1968), pp.32-45.

Amadi-Azuogu, C. A., *Paul and the Law in the Arguments of Galatians: A*

S./

- Rhetorical and Exegetical Analysis of Galatians 2,14-6,2*, (Bonner Biblische Beitrage 104; Weinheim: Beltz Athenaum, 1996).
- Amir, Y., "The term Ἰουδαισμός (IOUDAISMOS) a study in Jewish Hellenistic Self-Identification," *Immanuel* 14 (1982), pp. 34-41.
- ___ "The Transference of Greek Allegories to Biblical Motifs in Philo," in F. E. Greenspahn *et al* (eds.), *Nourished with Peace*, pp. 15-25.
- Anderson, R. D., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Leuven: Peeters, 1999).
- Atkins, R. A., *Egalitarian Community: Ethnography and Exegesis* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1991).
- Attridge, H. W., *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion, 7; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).
- Bahr, G. J., "The Subscriptions in the Pauline Letters," *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 27-41.
- Bammel, E., "Νόμος Χριστού" in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica* III, (TU, 88. Berlin: Akademie, 1964), pp. 12-28.
- Banstra, A. J., *The Law and the Elements of the World: An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching* (Kempen: Kok Pharos, 1964).
- Barclay, J. M. G., "The Family as the Bearer of Religion," in Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families*, pp.66-80.
- ___ "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 31 (1987), pp. 73-93.
- ___ *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988).
- ___ "Paul, Philemon and Christian Slave-Ownership," *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 161-186.
- Barclay, J. M. G. and J. Sweet (eds.), *Early Christian thought in Its Jewish Context* (FS M. D. Hooker, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Barr, J., "Abba Father," *Theology* 91 (1988), pp. 173-179.
- ___ "Abba isn't 'Daddy'," *JTS* 39 (1988), pp. 28-47.
- ___ *Biblical Words for Time* (Studies in Biblical Theology First Series 33; London: SCM, 1955).
- ___ "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in the Hellenistic Age," *CHJ* 2.79-114.

- Barrett, C. K., *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1985).
- ___ *Paul: An Introduction to His Thought* (Louisville: WJKP, 1994).
- Barrow, R. H., *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (London: Methuen & Co. 1928).
- Bartchy, S., *ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΧΡΗΣΑΙ: First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of First Corinthians 7.21* (SBLDS, 11; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
- Barth, M., *The People of God* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983).
- Bassler, J. M., *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBL Dissertation Series, 59; Chino: Scholars Press, 1982).
- ___ (ed.), *Pauline Theology: Toward a New Synthesis* (Vol. 1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1991).
- Baumgarten, J. M., "The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes in 4 Q Flor," *RQ* 8 (1972), pp. 87-96.
- ___ "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I," *JJS* 33 (1982), pp. 215-225.
- Bauckham, R. J., "The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha," *JSNT* 26 (1986), pp. 97-117.
- ___ "Barnabas in Galatians," *JSNT* 2 (1979), pp. 61-70.
- ___ "James and the Jerusalem Church" in R. J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* (vol. 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), pp. 415-480.
- Beavis, M. A., "Ancient Slavery as an Interpretive Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8)," *JBL* 111 (1992), pp. 37-54.
- Becker, J., *Paul: An Apostle to the Gentiles* (trans. O. C. Dean Jr.; Louisville: WJKP, 1993).
- Beckwith, R. T., "Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation," *RQ* 10 (1979-81), pp. 521-542.
- ___ "The Vegetarianism of Therapeutae, and the Motives for Vegetarianism in Early Jewish and Christian Circles," *RQ* 13 (1988), pp. 407-410.
- Beckwith, R. T., and W. Stott, *This is the Day: The Biblical Doctrine of the Christian Sunday in Its Jewish and Early Christian Setting* (London:

- Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1978).
- Beker, J. C., *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).
- Belleville, L. L., “‘Under Law’: Structural Analysis the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3.21-4.11,” *JSNT* 26 (1986), pp. 53-78.
- Benjamin, D. C., and V. H. Matthews (eds.), “Honor and Shame in the World of the Bible,” *Semeia* 68 (1996).
- Berger, P. L., and T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1967).
- Bernstein, M., F. Garcia Martinez, and J. Kampen (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meetings of the International Organization for Qumran Studies* (FS J. M. Baumgarten; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Betz, H-D., “The Literary Composition and Function of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” *NTS* 21 (1974), pp. 353-79.
- *Paul’s Concept of Freedom in the Context of Hellenistic Discussions about the Possibility of Human Freedom* (Berkeley: University of California, 1977).
- “Spirit, Freedom, and Law: Paul’s Message to the Galatian Churches,” *SEA* 39 (1974), pp. 145-60.
- Black, M., “More about metaphor” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 19-41.
- Boers, H., *The Justification of the Gentiles: Paul’s letters to the Galatians and Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994).
- “We Who Are by Inheritance Jews; Not from the Gentile Sinners,” *JBL* 111 (1992), pp. 273-81.
- Bokser, B. M., “Approaching Sacred Space,” *HTR* 78 (1985), pp. 279-299.
- Bonneau, N., “The Logic of Paul’s Argument on the Curse of the Law in Galatians 3: 10-14,” *NovT* 39 (1997), pp. 60-80.
- Booth, A. D., “The Schooling of Slaves in First-Century Rome,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109 (1979), pp. 11-19.
- Borgen, P., “Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men” in M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (eds.), *Paul and Paulinism* (FS C. K. Barrett; London: SPCK 1982), pp. 37-46.

- Borkowski, A., *Textbook on Roman Law* (London: Blackstone, 1994).
- Bornkamm, G., *Paul* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971).
- Boyarin, D., *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
- ___ "Was Paul an 'Anti-Semite'? A Reading of Galatians 3-4," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 47 (1993), pp. 47-80.
- Bradley, K., "On the Roman Slave Supply and Slavebreeding," in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Classical Slavery*, pp. 42- 64.
- ___ "Roman Slavery and Roman Law," *Historical Reflections* 15 (1988), pp. 477-495.
- ___ *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Braswell, J. P., "The Blessing of Abraham versus 'The Curse of the Law': Another Look at Gal 3: 10-13," *WTJ* 53 (1991), pp. 73-91.
- Brown, R. E., "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Types of Jewish/ Gentile Christianity," *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 74-79.
- Brown, R. E. and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: NT Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (London: Chapman, 1983).
- Bruce, F. F. "Further Thoughts on Paul's Biography: Galatians 1:11-2:14" in E. E. Ellis and E. Gasser (ed.), *Jesus und Paulus* (FS W. G. Kummel; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), pp. 21-29.
- ___ "The Curse of the Law" in M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (eds.), *Paul and Paulinism* (FS C. K. Barrett; London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 27-36.
- ___ "Paul and the Law in Recent Research" in B. Lindars (ed.), *Law and Religion* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988), pp. 115-125.
- ___ *Paul the Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).
- Bryan, D., *Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995).
- Buchanan, G. W., "Covenantal Sectarianism," *The Consequences of the Covenant* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), pp. 238-259.
- ___ "The Role of Purity in the Structure of the Essene Sect," *RQ* 4 (1963), pp. 397-406.
- Buckland, W. W., *The Roman Law of Slavery* (Cambridge: Cambridge University

- Press, 1970).
- Bultmann, R., "Christ the End of the Law" *Essays Philosophical and Theological* (London: SCM Press, 1955), pp. 36-66.
- *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; New York: Scribner's, 1951, 1955).
- Byrne, B., 'Son of God' - 'Seed of Abraham': *A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background* (Analecta Biblica, 83; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979).
- Campbell, D. A., "The ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ From Durham: Professor Dunn's *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*," *JSNT* 72 (1998), pp. 91-111.
- Campbell, R. A., "Against such things there is no law?" Galatians 5:23b again," *ExpT* 107 (1996), pp. 271-272.
- Campbell, W. S., "Did Paul Advocate Separation from the Synagogue? A Reaction to Francis Watson: Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: a Sociological Approach," *SJT* 42 (1989), pp. 457-467.
- Caneday, A., " 'Redeemed from the Curse of the Law': The Use of Deut 21:22-23 in Gal 3:13," *TrinJ* 10 (1989), pp.185-209.
- Carmigac, J., "Les Horoscopes de Qumran," *RQ* 5 (1965), pp. 199-217.
- Casson, L., *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974).
- Castelli, E. A., "Paul on Women and Gender," in R. S. Kraemer, M. R. D'Angelo (eds.), *Women and Christian Origins* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 221-235.
- Catchpole, D. R., "Paul, James and the Apostolic Decree," *NTS* 23 (1977), pp. 428-444.
- Cavallin, H. C. C., " 'The Righteous shall Live by Faith': A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation," *ST* 32 (1978), pp. 33-43.
- Charles, R. H., *Eschatology: the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity: a Critical History* (New York: Schocken Books, 1963 [1899]).
- Charlesworth, J. H., "The Concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha," *ANRW* 2. 19. 1 (1907), pp. 187-219.
- (ed.), *Overcoming Fear Between Jews and Christians* (New York: Crossroad, 1992).

- ___ “Jewish Astrology in the Talmud, Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Early Palestinian Synagogues,” *HTR* 70 (1977), pp. 183-200.
- ___ “The Triumphant Majority as Seen by a Dwindled Minority: The Outsider according to the Insider of the Jewish Apocalypses” in J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (eds.), *“To See Ourselves as Others See Us”:* *Christian, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 285-316.
- Chatman, S., *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1978).
- Chazon, E. G., “Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications,” *DSD* 1 (1994), pp. 256-284.
- Chevallier, R., *Roman Roads* (London: Batsford, 1976).
- Chow, J. K., *Patronage and Power* (JSNTSup, 75; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).
- Christiansen, E. J., *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- Chyutin, M., “The New Jerusalem: Ideal City,” *DSD* 1 (1994), pp. 71-97.
- Clines, D. J., “Varieties of Indeterminacy” in *Semeia* 71 (1995), pp. 17-27.
- Cohen, N. G., *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995).
- Cohen, S. J. D., “Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew,” *HTR* 82 (1989), pp. 13-33.
- ___ “Ioudaios: ‘Judaeian’ and ‘Jew’ in Susanna, First Maccabees, and Second Maccabees,” in H. Cancik *et al* (eds.), *Geschichte - Tradition - Reflexion* (Band I; FS Martin Hengel; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996), pp. 211-220.
- ___ “Ἰουδαῖος τὸ γένος and Related Expressions in Josephus” in F. Parente and J. Sievers (eds.), *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman* (Studia Post-Biblica; Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 23-38
- Cohn-Sherbok, D., “Some Reflections on James Dunn’s: ‘The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2.11-18),’” *JSNT* 18 (1983), pp. 68-74.
- Collins, J. J., *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984).
- ___ *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983).

- “Cosmos and Salvation : Jewish Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Hellenistic Age,” in J. J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJ Sup, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 317-338.
- “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in J. J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* pp. 287-300.
- “Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls,” *JETS* 30 (1987), pp. 267-78.
- “A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century,” in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us* : Christian, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquities pp. 163-186.
- “The Works of the Messiah,” *DSD* 1 (1994), pp. 98-112.
- Combes, I. A. H., *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church* (JSNTSup, 156; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- Conzelmann, H., *Gentiles, Jews, Christians: polemics and apologetics in the Greco-Roman era* (transl. M. E. Boring; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).
- Cook, J. A., “Feminine Inadequacy and the *Senatusconsultum Velleianum*” in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 83-92.
- Corbier, M., “Divorce and Adoption as Familial Strategies,” in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, pp. 45-78.
- Cosgrove, C. H., “Arguing Like a Mere Human Being: Galatians 3.15-18 in Rhetorical Perspective,” *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 536-549.
- *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians* (Macon: Mercer, 1988).
- “The Mosaic Law Preaches Faith: A Study in Galatians 3,” *WTJ* 41 (1978), pp. 146-164.
- Crabtree, A. B., *The Restored Relationship* (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1963).
- Cranfield, C. E. B., “St. Paul and the Law,” *SJT* 17 (1964), pp. 43-68.
- Crook, J. A., *Law and Life of Rome* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967).
- Cullmann, O., *Christ and Times* (transl. London: SCM, 1962).
- Dahl, N. A., *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977).

- Dalton, W. J., "The Meaning of 'We' in Galatians," *AusBR* 38 (1990), pp. 33-44.
- Danker, F., *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982).
- Davies, A. T., (ed.), *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1979).
- Davies, P. R., "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory," *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 80-89.
- Davies, P. R., and R. T. White, *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).
- Davies, W. D., "Law in First -Century Judaism," *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), pp. 3-26.
- ___ "Law in the New Testament," *Jewish and Pauline Studies*, pp. 227-242.
- ___ "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit" in K. Standahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957), pp. 157-82.
- ___ "Paul and the Law: Reflections on Pitfalls in Interpretation," *Jewish and Pauline Studies*, pp. 91-122.
- ___ "Paul and the People of Israel," *NTS* 24 (1977), pp. 4-39.
- ___ *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (4th ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).
- Deidum, T. J., *New Covenant Morality in Paul* (Analectica Biblica, 89; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981).
- Delacey, D. R., "Paul in Jerusalem," *NTS* 20 (1983), pp. 82-86.
- Dilke, O. A. W. , *Greek and Roman Maps* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1985).
- Dockery, D. S., "The Shape of Life in the Spirit in Pauline Thought" in D. A. Black (ed.), *Scribes and Scripture* (FS J. H. Greenlee; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), pp. 49-60.
- Dodd, B. J., "Christ's Slave, People Pleasers and Galatians 1.10," *NTS* 42 (1996), pp. 90-104.
- Dodd, C. H., *Gospel and Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951).
- Davidson, D., "What Metaphors Mean" in A. P. Martinich (ed.), *The Philosophy of Language*, pp. 415-426.
- Donaldson, T. L., "The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3.13-14," *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 94-112.

- “Israelite, convert, Apostle to the Gentiles: The Origin of Paul’s Gentile Mission,” in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus: The Impact of Paul’s Conversion on His Life, Thought and Ministry*, pp. 62-83.
- *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle’s Convictional World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997).
- Doty, W. G., *Letters in Primitive Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973).
- Douglas, M., *Purity and Danger: an Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966).
- Downing, F. G., “A bas les aristos,” *NovT* 30 (1988), pp. 210-230.
- “A Cynic Preparation for Paul’s Gospel for Jew and Greek, Slave and Free, Male and Female,” *NTS* 42 (1996), pp. 454-462.
- Drane, J. W., *Paul, Libertine or Legalist? A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1975).
- Duff, A. M., *Freedman in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928).
- Dunn, J. D. G., “4QMMT and Galatians,” *NTS* 43 (1997), pp. 147-153.
- “The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2. 11-18),” *JSNT* 18 (1983), pp. 7-11.
- *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville: Westminster, 1990).
- “The New Perspective on Paul,” *BJRL* 65 (1983), pp. 95-122.
- “‘A Light to the Gentiles’ the Significance of the Damascus Road Christophany for Paul” in L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright (eds.), *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament. Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 251-266.
- “Paul and Justification by Faith,” in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus*, pp. 85-101.
- “Paul’s Understanding of the Death of Jesus,” in R. J. Banks (ed.), *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology, Presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1974), pp. 125-141.
- “The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem according to Galatians 1 and 2,” *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 461-478.

- “Theology of Galatians,” in J. M. Bassler (ed.), *Pauline Theology*, pp. 125-146.
- *The Theology of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- “Whatever Happened to Exegesis? In Response to the Reviews by R. B. Matlock and D. A. Campbell,” *JSNT* 72 (1998), pp. 113-120.
- “Yet Once More - ‘The Works of the Law’: A Response,” *JSNT* 46 (1992), pp. 99-117.
- Eck, W., “Hadrian als *pater patriae* und die Verleihung des Augustatitels an Sabina” in G. Wirth *et al* (eds.), *Romanitas Christianitas* (FS Johannes Straub; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), pp. 217-229.
- Eco, U., *The Role of the Reader* (London: Hutchinson, 1983).
- Eisenstadt, S. N., L. Roniger, “Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (1980), pp. 42-77.
- Elliot, N., *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and The Politics of the Apostle* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
- Elliott, S. M., “Paul and His Gentile Audiences: Mystery-Cults, Anatolian Popular Religiosity, and Paul’s Claim of Divine Authority in Galatians,” *Listening* 31 (1996), pp. 117-136.
- Ellis, E. E., “Paul and his Opponents. Trends in Research,” *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity, New Testament Essays* (WUNT, 18; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978), pp. 80-115.
- *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957).
- Esler, P. (ed.), *Modeling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London: Routledge, 1995).
- Evans, C. A., “Paul as Prophet,” in G. R. Hawthorne *et al* (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993).
- “Predictions of the Destruction of the Herodian Temple in the Pseudepigraphy, Qumran Scrolls and Related Texts,” *JSP* 10 (1992), pp. 89-147.
- Evans, C. A. and P. W. Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Eyben, E., “Fathers and Sons,” in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and*

- Children in Ancient Rome*, pp. 114-143.
- Fee, G. D., *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994).
- Feignin, S., "Some Cases of Adoption in Israel," *JBL* 50 (1931), pp. 186-200.
- Feldman, L. H., "Diaspora Synagogues: New Light from Inscriptions and Papyri," *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 577-602.
- ___ "Josephus' Vocabulary for Slavery," in *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, pp. 83-110.
- Ferch, A. J., "The Two Aeons and the Messiah in Pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch," *AUSS* 15 (1977), pp. 135-51.
- Finley, M. I., *The Ancient Economy* (London: Hogarth, 1985).
- ___ (ed.), *Classical Slavery* (London: Frank Cass, 1987).
- ___ (ed.), *Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1960).
- Fischer, K. M., "Adam und Christus: Überlegungen zu einem religionsgeschichtlichen Problem," in K-W. Tröger (ed.), *Altes Testament-Frühjudentum-Gnosis* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980), pp. 284-298.
- Fitzmyer, J. A., *According to Paul: Studies in the Theology of the Apostle* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1993).
- ___ *To Advance the Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1981).
- Forbes, C. A., "The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 86 (1955), pp. 321-360.
- Freed, E. D., *The Apostle Paul, Christian Jew: Faithfulness and Law* (New York: University Press of America, 1994).
- French, D., *Roman Roads and Milestones of Asia Minor* (fasc. I; British Archaeological Reports, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).
- Frilingos, C., "'For My Child, Onesimus': Paul and Domestic Power in Philemon," *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 91-104.
- Fung, R. Y. K., "The Nature of the Ministry according to Paul," *EvQ* 54 (1982), pp. 129-46.
- Gager, J. G., "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language," *JBL* 89 (1970), pp. 325-337.
- ___ *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

- Westminster, 1964).
- Garlington, D., "Role Reversal and Paul's Use of Scripture in Galatians 3.10-13," *JSNT* 65 (1997), pp. 85-121.
- Gardner, J., *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).
- Garnsey, P., "Non-Slave Labor in the Roman World" in P. Garnsey (ed.), *Non-Slave Labor in the Greco-Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1980).
- *Social Status and Legal Privileges in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).
- "Sons, Slaves — and Christianity," in B. Rawson and P. R. C. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman Family in Italy*, pp.101-121.
- Garnsey, P., R. Saller, "Patronal Power Relations" in R. A. Horsley, *Paul and Empire* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1997), pp. 96-103.
- *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture* (London: Duckworth, 1987).
- Gaston, L., "Paul and the Torah," in A. T. Davies (ed.), *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1979), pp. 48-71.
- *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987).
- Gavenata, B. R., "Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as a Paradigm," *NovT* 28 (1986), pp. 309-326.
- "Is Galatians Just a 'Guy Thing'?": A Theological Reflection," *Interpretation* 54 (2000), pp. 267-278.
- Gayer, R., *Die Stellung des Sklaven in den paulinischen Gemeinden und bei Paulus* (Bern: Hebert Lang; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1976).
- Georgi, D., "Who is the True Prophet?" in G. W. E. Nickelsburg and G. W. MacRae (eds.), *Christians Among Jews and Gentiles*, pp. 100-125.
- Gergel, R. A., "Costumes as Geographical Indicator: Barbarians and Prisoners on Cuirassed Statue Breastplates," in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *From the World of Roman Costume*, pp. 191-209.
- Gibbs, R. W., "Process and products in making sense of tropes," in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 252-276.
- Gielen, M., *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik*

- (Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1990).
- Glancy, J. A., "Slaves and Slavery in the Matthean Parables," *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 67-90.
- Glasson, T. F., *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology: with special reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphas* (London: SPCK, 1961).
- Gluck, J. J., "Paronomasia in Biblical Literature," *Semitics* 1 (1970), pp. 50-78.
- Glucksberg, S., B. Keysar, "How metaphors work," in A. Ortony, *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 401-424.
- Goodenough, E., *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961).
- Goodman, M., "Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century," *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, pp. 53-78.
- *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).
- Gordon, M. L., "The Freedman's Son in Municipal Life," *JRS* 21 (1931), pp. 65-77.
- "The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire," *JRS* 14 (1924), pp. 93-111.
- Gordon, R., "From Republic to Principate: priesthood, religion and ideology," in M. Beard and J. North (eds.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth, 1990), pp. 179-198.
- Gordon, T. D., "A Note on ΠΑΙΔΑΓΩΓΟΣ in Galatians 3.24-25," *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 150-154.
- "The Problem at Galatia," *Int* 41 (1987), pp. 32-43.
- Grassi, E., *Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980).
- Greenspahn F. E. et al (eds.), *Nourished with Peace* (FS S. Sandmel; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984).
- Gundry-Volf, J. M., "Paul on Women and Gender: A Comparison with Early Jewish Views," in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus*, pp. 184-212
- Gunther, J. J., *Paul: Messenger and Exile* (Valley Forge: Judson, 1972).
- *St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background: A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings* (NovTSup, 35; Leiden: Brill, 1973).

- Hafemann, S. J., "Entering and Remaining: E. P. Sanders' View of Palestinian Judaism," *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 11 (1981), pp. 139-49.
- Haag, H., "Sohn Gottes im Alten Testament," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 154 (1974), pp. 225-231.
- Hall, R. G., "Arguing Like an Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient *Topos* Outside the Greco-Roman Rhetorical Tradition," *NTS* 42 (1996), pp. 434-453.
- ___ "Historical Inference and Rhetorical Effect: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2," in D. F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* (JSNTSup, 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), pp. 308-320.
- ___ "The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians. A Reconsideration," *JBL* 106 (1987), pp. 277-87.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G., *Pre-Existence Wisdom and the Son of Man* (SNTSMS, 21; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- ___ "Sacred Violence and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.13): The Death of Christ as a Sacrificial Travesty," *NTS* 36 (1990), pp. 98-118.
- ___ "Sacred Violence and 'Works of Law'. 'Is Christ Then an Agent of Sin?' (Galatians 2:17)," *CBQ* 52 (1990), pp. 55-75.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. and R. Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Essays in Honour of W. D. Davies*; Leiden: Brill, 1976).
- Hansen, G. W., *Abraham in Galatians* (JSNTSup, 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).
- ___ "A Paradigm of the Apocalypse: The Gospel in the Light of Epistolary Analysis," in L. A. Jervis and P. Richardson (eds.), *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans*, pp. 194-209.
- ___ "Paul's Conversion and His Ethic of Freedom in Galatians," in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus*, pp. 213-237.
- Harrill, J. A., *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1995).
- ___ "Paul and Slavery: The Problem of 1 Corinthians 7:21," *Biblical Research* 39 (1994).
- ___ The Vice of Slave Dealers in Greco-Roman Society: the Use of a *Topos* in 1

- Timothy 1:10," *JBL* 118 (1999), pp. 97-122.
- Harrington, D., *God's People in Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).
- Harrington, H. K., "Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT" in M. Bernstein et al (eds), *Legal Texts And Legal Issues*, pp.109-128.
- ___ *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations* (SBL Dissertation Series, 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- Harris, M., *Slave of Christ* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1999).
- Harvey, A. E., (ed.), *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study* (London: SPCK, 1985).
- Harvey, G., *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew & Israel in Ancient Jewish & Early Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Hass, P. J. (ed.), "Biblical Hermeneutics in Jewish Moral Discourse," *Semeia* 34 (1985).
- Hays, R. B., "Christology and Ethics in Galatians: The Law of Christ," *CBQ* 49 (1987), pp. 268-290.
- ___ *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- ___ *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* (SBL Dissertation Series, 56; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983).
- ___ " 'The Righteous One' as Eschatological Deliverer: A Case Study in Paul's Apocalyptic Hermeneutic," in J. Marcus and M. L. Soards (eds.), *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), pp. 191-215.
- Hecht, R. D., "Philo's Interpretation of Circumcision," in F. E. Greenspahn *et al* (eds.), *Nourished with Peace*, pp. 51-79.
- Hengel, M., "The Pre-Christian Paul," *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, pp. 29-52.
- Henten, J. W. van, and P. W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- Hester, J. D., "The 'Heir' and Heilsgeschichte: A Study of Galatians 4.1ff.," in F. Christ (ed.), *Oikonomia: Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie* (FS O.

- Cullmann; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich Evang. Verlag GmbH, 1967), pp. 118-125.
- ___ *Paul's Concept of Inheritance* (SJT Occasional Papers, 14; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1968).
- ___ "The Presence of Epideictic in Galatians 1-2" in D. F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry* (JSNTSup, 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), pp. 281-307.
- ___ "The Rhetorical Structure of Galatians 1:11-2:14," *JBL* 103 (1984), pp. 223-233.
- ___ "The Use and Influence of Rhetoric in Galatians 2:1-14.," *TZ* 42 (1986), pp. 386-408.
- Hight, G., "Libertino Patre Natus," *American Journal of Philology* 94 (1973), pp. 268-281.
- Hill, C. C., *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).
- Hill, D., *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967).
- ___ "Salvation Proclaimed IV. Galatians 3:10-14: Freedom and Acceptance," *ExpT* 93 (1981), pp. 196-200.
- Hock, R. F., *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).
- Holmberg, B., *Paul and Power* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978).
- Holtz, T., "Der antiochenische Zwischenfall (Galater 2.11-14)," *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 344-361.
- Hopkins, K., *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Hong, I-G., "Does Paul Misrepresent the Jewish law? Law and Covenant in Gal. 3:1-14," *NovT* 36 (1994), pp.164-182.
- Hooker, M. D., "Beyond the Things that are Written? St. Paul's Use of Scripture," *NTS* 27 (1981), pp. 295-309.
- ___ *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- ___ "Paul and 'Covenantal Nomism'" in M. D. Hooker and S. G Wilson (eds.), *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* (London: SPCK,

- 1982), pp. 47-56.
- ___ “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ” *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 321-342.
- Horbury, W., “Paul and Judaism,” *ExpT* 90 (1979), pp. 116-118.
- Horst, P. W. van der, *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 14; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990).
- ___ *Hellenism-Judaism-Christianity: Essays on Their Interaction* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994).
- ___ “Jews and Christians in Aphrodisias,” *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 43 (1989), pp. 106-121.
- Houlden, J. L., “A Response to James D. G. Dunn,” *JSNT* 18 (1983), pp. 116-118.
- Howard, G., *Paul: Crisis in Galatia: A Study in Early Christian Theology* (SNTSMS, 35; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- Hultgren, A. J., *Paul’s Gospel and Mission* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- ___ “The *Pistis Christou* Formulation in Paul,” *NovT* 22 (1980), pp. 248-263.
- Hurtado, L. W., “The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians,” *JSNT* 5 (1979), pp. 46-62.
- Huskinson, J. “Introduction,” in J. Huskinson (ed.), *Experiencing Rome: Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 10-27.
- Isenberg, S. R., “Power Through Temple and Torah,” in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, pp. 24-52.
- Janzen, J. G., “Coleridge and *Pistis Christou*,” *ExpT* 107 (1996), pp. 265-268.
- Jervis, L. A., and P. Richardson (eds.), *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard Longenecker* (JSNTSup, 108; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- Jewett, R., “The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation,” *NTS* 17 (1970-71), pp. 198-212.
- ___ “The Law and the Coexistence of Jews and Gentiles in Romans,” *Int* 39 (1985), pp. 341-356.
- ___ *Paul the Apostle to America* (Louisville: WJKP, 1994).
- ___ *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Situations*

- (Leiden: E J. Brill, 1971).
- Jones, C. P., "Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," *JRS* 77 (1987), p. 139-155.
- Judge, E. A., "Early Christians as a Scholastic Community" *JRH* 1 (1960-61), pp. 4-15, 125-137.
- ___ *Rank and Status in the World of the Caesars and of St. Paul* (Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1982).
- ___ "The Social Identity of the First Christians: a Question of Method in Religious History," *JRH* 11 (1980), pp. 210-217.
- ___ *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960).
- ___ "St. Paul and Classical Society," *JAC* 15 (1972), pp. 19-36.
- Kasemann, E., *Perspectives on Paul* (transl. M. Kohl, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).
- Keck, L. E., "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran," *ZNW* 57 (1966), pp. 54-78.
- Keesmaat, S. C., *Paul and his Story: (Re) Interpreting the Exodus Tradition* (JSNTSup, 181; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Kennedy, G. A., *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).
- ___ *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984).
- ___ *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).
- Kertelge, K., "Gesetz und Freiheit im Galaterbrief," *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 382-394.
- Kern, P. H., *Rhetoric and Galatians* (SNTSMS, 101; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Kertelge, K., "Gesetz und Freiheit in Galaterbrief," *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 382-394.
- Kim, S., *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neu Testament, 2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984).
- King, D. H., "Paul and the Tannaim: A Study in Galatians," *WTJ* 45 (1983), pp. 340-370.
- Kirschenbaum, A., *Sons, Slaves and Freedmen in Roman Commerce* (Jerusalem:

- Magnes, 1987).
- Kittay, E. F., *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).
- Kittredge, C. B., *Community and Authority: The Rhetoric of Obedience in the Pauline Tradition* (Harvard Theological Studies, 45; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998).
- Koptak, P. E., "Rhetorical Identification in Paul's Autobiographical Narrative: Galatians 1.13-2.14," *JSNT* 40 (1990), pp. 97-115.
- Kruse, C., "Human Relationships in the Pauline Corpus," in D. Peterson and J. Pryor (eds.), *In the Fullness of Time: Biblical Studies in Honour of Archbishop Donald Robinson*, (Homebush West: Anzea, 1992), pp. 167-184.
- *Paul, the Law, and Justification* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996).
- "The Price Paid for a Ministry Among the Gentiles: Paul's Persecution at the Hand of the Jews," in M. J. Wilkins and T. Paige (eds.), *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honour of Ralph P. Martin* (JSNTSup, 87; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), pp. 260-272.
- Kurylowicz, M., "'Adoptio Plena' und 'Minus Plena'," *Labeo* 25 (1979), pp. 163-182.
- Kyrtatas, D. J., *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities* (London: Verso, 1987).
- Laato, T., *Paulus und das Judentum: Anthropologische Erwagungen* (Abo: Abo Academy Press, 1991).
- Lacey, W. K., "Patria Potestas," in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 121-144.
- Ladd, G. E., *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974).
- Lakoff, G., "Contemporary theory of metaphor," in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 202-251.
- Lakoff, G., M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
- Lambrecht, J., "The Line of Thought in Gal. 2:14-21," *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 484-495.

- ___ *Pauline Studies* (Leuven: Leuven University, 1994).
- Lane, W. L., "Paul's Legacy from Pharisaism: Light from the Psalms of Solomon," *Concordia Journal* 8 (1982), pp. 130-138.
- Lapide, P. and P. Stuhlmacher, *Paul: Rabbi and Apostle* (trans. L. W. Denef; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984).
- Lassen, E. M., "The Roman Family: Ideal and Metaphor," in Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families*, pp. 103-120.
- LaSor, W. S., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972).
- Lategan, B. C., "Is Paul Defending his Apostleship in Galatians? The Function of Galatians 1:11-12 and 2:19-20 in the Development of Paul's Argument," *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 411-430.
- ___ "Reader Instructions in Galatians," in *Semeia* 48 (1989).
- Laurence, R., J. Berry (eds.), *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1998).
- ___ "Territory, Ethnonyms and Geography: The construction of identity in Roman Italy," in R. Laurence and J. Berry, *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 95-110.
- Levin, S. R., "Language, concepts and words: Three domains of metaphor," in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 112-123.
- Lieu J., et al (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1992).
- Lincoln, A. T., *Paradise Now and Not Yet* (SNTSMS, 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- Lindars, B., "All Foods Clean: Thoughts on Jesus and the Law," in B. Lindars (ed.), *Law and Religion* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988), pp. 61-71.
- Loader, B., "Paul and Judaism - Is He Fighting Strawmen?" *Colloquium: The Australia and New Zealand Theological Review* 16 (1984), pp. 11-20.
- Loewe, H., "The Idea of Pharisaism," *Judaism and Christianity: Three Volumes in One* (New York: Ktav, 1969 [1937-38] II), pp. 3-58.
- Longenecker, R. N., *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).
- ___ (ed.), *The Road from Damascus: The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

- Luderitz, G., "What is the Politeuma?" in *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*, pp. 183-225.
- Lull, D. J. "The Law was our Pedagogue: A Study in Galatians 3.19-25," *JBL* 105 (1986), pp. 481-498.
- Lycan, W. G., *Philosophy of Language* (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Lyall, F. *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984).
- Lyons, G., *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding* (SBL Dissertation Series, 73; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
- McCall, M., *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1969).
- McEleney, N. J., "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law," *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 319-341.
- McKnight, S., *A Light Among the Gentiles* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).
- McLean, B. H. (ed.), *Origins and Method: towards a new understanding of Judaism and Christianity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).
- Maccoby, H., *Paul and Hellenism* (London: SCM, 1991).
- ___ *The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity* (New York: Harper & Row, 1986).
- MacDonald, M. Y., *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero Pauline Writings* (SNTSMS, 60; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- MacMullen, R., *Roman Social Relations, 50 BC to AD 284* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).
- ___ "What difference did Christianity make?" *Historia* 35 (1986), pp. 322-341.
- Malherbe, A. J., *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
- Malina, B. J., *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (rev. ed. Louisville: WJKP, 1993).

- Malina, B. J., J. H. Neyrey, *Portraits of Paul* (Louisville: WJKP, 1996).
- Martin, B. L., *Christ and the Law in Paul* (Leiden: Brill, 1989).
- Martin, D. B., *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Martinich, A. P. (ed.), *The Philosophy of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Martyn, J. L., "A Law-Observant Mission to Gentiles: The Background of Galatians," *SJT* 38 (1985), pp. 307-324.
- ___ *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997).
- Matera, F. J., "The Culmination of Paul's Argument to the Galatians: Gal. 5.1-6.17," *JSNT* 32 (1988), pp. 79-91.
- Matlock, R. B., "Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΠΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective," *NovT* (2000), pp. 1-23.
- ___ "Sins of the Flesh and Suspicious Minds: Dunn's New Theology of Paul," *JSNT* 72 (1998), pp. 67-90.
- Mawhinney, A., "Baptism, Servanthood, and Sonship," *WTJ* 49 (1987), pp. 35-64.
- Meecham, H. G., *Light from Ancient Letters: Private Correspondence in the Non-Literary Papyri of Oxyrhynchus of the First Four Centuries and its Bearing on New Testament Language and Thought* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1923).
- Meeks, W. A., *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).
- ___ *The Moral World of the First Christian* (London: SPCK, 1986).
- ___ *The Origin of Christian Morality* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).
- Meeks, W. A., R. L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (SBL Sources for Biblical Studies, 19; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988).

- Miller, G. A., "Images and models, similes and metaphors" in in Ortony, A., (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 357- 400
- Montefiore, C. G., *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays* (London: Max Goschen, 1914).
- Moore, G. F., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30).
- Moreland, K. A., *The Rhetoric of Curse in Galatians* (Emory Studies in Early Christianity; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Morgan, J. L., "Pragmatics of metaphor" in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 124-134.
- Morris, L. L., *Apocalyptic* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972).
- Moxnes, H., "What is Family? Problem in constructing early Christian families," in H. Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families*, pp. 13-41.
- Moxnes, H. (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- Munck, J., *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. F. Clarke; Richmond: John Knox, 1959).
- Munier, C., "Jews and Christians," in A. D. Bernardino (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* (Cambridge: James Clark, 1992), pp. 436-7.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., *Becoming Human Together: The Pastoral Anthropology of St. Paul* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1982).
- ___ "A Literary Analysis of *Damascus Document XIX, 33-XX, 34*," *RB* 79 (1972), pp. 544-64.
- ___ "The New Covenant in the Letters of Paul and the Essene Documents" in M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelski (eds.), *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), pp. 194-204.
- Neusner, J., "History and Purity in First-Century Judaism," *History of Religions* 18 (1978), pp. 1-17.
- ___ *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).
- ___ *Judaism in Late Antiquity* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- ___ "Pharisaic Law in New Testament Times," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 26 (1971), pp. 331-340.

- Neusner, J. (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults* (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1975).
- Neusner, J., W. S. Green, E. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaism and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Newton, M., *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (SNTS Monograph Series, 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- Neyrey, J. H., "Bewitched in Galatia: Paul and Cultural Anthropology," *CBQ* 50 (1988), pp. 72-100.
- Neyrey, J. H., "Loss of Wealth, Loss of Family and Loss of Honor," in P. Esler (ed.), *Modeling Early Christianity*, pp. 139-158.
- *Paul in Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters* (Louisville: WJKP, 1990).
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E., "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity," in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity*, pp. 73-92.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E., and G. W. MacRae (eds.), *Christian Among Jews and Gentiles* (FS K. Stendahl; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
- Nicols, J., "Tabulae Patronatus: A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community," *ANRW* 2.13 (1980), pp. 533-561.
- Nock, A. D., *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (vol. 1 and 2; Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).
- O'Neill, J. C., *The Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1972).
- Olbricht T. H., S. E. Porter (eds.), *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (JSNTSup, 90; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
- Ortony, A., "Similarity in similes and metaphors" in Ortony, A., (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 342-356.
- Ortony, A., (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Pate, M., *The End of the Ages Has Come: The Theology of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995).

- Patterson, O., *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).
- Perelman, Ch., L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971),
- Perriman, A. C., "The Rhetorical Strategy of Galatians 4:21-5:1," *EvQ* 65 (1993), pp. 27-42.
- Peters, F. E., *Jerusalem: The Holy City in the Eyes of Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).
- Petersen, N. R., *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).
- Petersmann, H., "Umwelt, Sprachsituation und Stilschichten in Petrons 'Satyrica'," *ANRW* 2.32.3 (1985), pp. 1687- 1705.
- Pleket, H. W., "Religious History as the History of Mentality," in H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship*, pp.166-178.
- Porter, S. E. (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 BC. - AD.400* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Räsänen, H., "Galatians 2.16 and Paul's Break with Judaism," *NTS* 31 (1985), pp. 543-553.
- ___ "Paul's Conversion and the Development of his View of the Law," *NTS* 33 (1987), pp. 404-419.
- ___ *The Torah and Christ: Essays in German and English on the Problem of the Law in Early Christianity* (PFES, 45; Helsinki: PFES, 1986).
- Rawson, B., "Adult-Child Relationships in Roman Society," in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, pp. 7-30.
- ___ "Children in the Roman *Familia*," in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 170-200.
- ___ "The Iconography of Roman Childhood," in B. Rawson and P. R. C. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman Family in Italy*, pp. 205-232.
- ___ "The Roman Family," in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome* , pp. 1-57.
- Rawson, B. (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome* (London: Routledge, 1992).
- ___ (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon,

- 1996).
- Rawson, B., P. R. C. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman Family in Italy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Rapske, B. M., "The Prisoner Paul in the Eyes of Onesimus," *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 187-203.
- Reed, J. T., "The Epistle," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, pp. 171-193.
- "Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre," in T. H. Olbricht and S. E. Porter (eds.), *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, pp. 292-324.
- Reigel, S. K., "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology," *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 410-415.
- Rhyne, C. T., *Faith Establishes the Law* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).
- Richards, E. R., *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 42; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991).
- Richardson, A., *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1958).
- Richardson, P., *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSMS, 10; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 74-102.
- *Paul's Ethic of Freedom* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979).
- (ed.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, Vol. 1. Paul and the Gospels* (Studies in Christianity and Judaism/ Etudes sur le christianisme et le judaïsme; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986).
- Ridderbos, H., *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).
- Rives, J., "Religion in the Roman empire," in J. Huskinson (ed.), *Experiencing Rome*, pp. 245-275.
- Robinson, D. W. B., "The Circumcision of Titus, and Paul's 'Liberty'," *ABR* 13 (1965), pp. 29-44.
- "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope," in R. J. Banks (ed.), *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday* (Exeter:

- Paternoster Press, 1974), pp. 231-45.
- Robinson, J. A. T., *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1952).
- Robinson, O., "Slaves and Criminal Law," *Zeitschrift Der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 98 (1981), pp. 213-254.
- Roetzel, C. J., *The World that Shaped the New Testament* (Knoxville: John Knox, 1985).
- Rohser, G., "Mann und Frau in Christus. Eine Verhältnisbestimmung von Gal 3,28 und 1 Kor 11,2-16," *StudNTUmwelt* 22 (1997), pp. 57-78.
- Roller, O., *Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Antiken Brief* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933).
- Rollins, W. G., "Greco-Roman Slavery Terminology and the Pauline Metaphors for Salvation," in K. H. Richards (ed.), *SBL Seminar Papers 1987* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 100-110.
- Rossell, W. H., "New Testament Adoption — Graeco-Roman or Semitic?," *JBL* 71 (1952), pp. 233-234.
- Roussin, A. L., "Costumes in Roman Palestine: Archaeological Remains and the Evidence from the Mishnah," in J. L. Sebesta J. L., L. Bonfante (eds.), *From the World of Roman Costume*, pp. 182-190.
- Roux, J. H. le, "The 'Last Days' in Apocalyptic Perspective," *Neot* 12 (1981), pp. 41-74.
- Rowe, G. O., "Style," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, pp. 121-157.
- Ste. Croix, G. E. M. de, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth, 1980)
- Saller, R. P., *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- "Roman Heirship Strategies," in R. P. Saller and I. Kertzer (eds.), *The Family in Italy: from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven: Yale, 1991), pp. 26-47.
- "Slavery and the Roman Family," in M. I. Finley, *Classical Slavery*, pp. 65-87.
- Sanders, E. P., *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press

- International, 1990).
- ___ *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (London: SCM Press, 1985).
- ___ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).
- Sanders, E. P., "Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11-14," in R. T. Fortna and B. R. Gaventa (eds.), *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John* (FS J. L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), pp. 170-188.
- Sanders, J. T., "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus," *JBL* 81 (1962), pp. 348-362.
- Sandmel, S., *Judaism and Christian Beginnings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).
- ___ *Philo of Alexandria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
- ___ *Philo's Place in Judaism* (New York: KTAV, 1971).
- Sandnes, K. O., "Equality within Patriarchal Structures," in Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families*, pp. 150-165.
- ___ *Paul: One of the Prophets?* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991).
- Sappington, T. J., "The Factor of Function in Defining Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," *JSP* 12 (1994), pp. 83-123.
- Sass, G., "Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus," *ZNW* 40 (1941), pp. 24-32.
- Schlier, H., *Grundzüge einer paulinischen Theologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1978).
- Schoeps, H. J., *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (London: Lutterworth, 1961).
- Schnabel, E. J., *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985).
- Scholem, G. G., *The Messianic Idea in Judaism: And Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971).
- Schreiner, T., "The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul," *JSNT* 35 (1989), pp. 47-74.
- ___ *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993).
- Schweitzer, A., *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: A & C Black, 1931).

- Scott, J. M., *Adoption as Sons of God* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992).
- “‘For as Many as are of Works of the Law are under a Curse’ (Galatians 3. 10),” in C. A. Evens and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup, 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).
- Searle, J. R., “Metaphor,” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 83-111.
- Sebesta J. L., L. Bonfante (eds.), *From the World of Roman Costume* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1994).
- Segal, A. F., “The Costs of Proselytism and Conversion,” *Seminar Papers* (SBL 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), pp. 336-369.
- *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).
- *Rebecca’s Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1986).
- Seifrid, M. A., *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- Shemesh, A., “The Holiness According to the Temple Scroll,” *RQ* 19 (2000), pp. 369-382.
- Sherwin-White, A. N., *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963).
- Shutt, R. J. H., “The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus,” *JJS* 31 (1980), pp. 171-189.
- Silva, M., ‘Is the Law Against the Promises? The Significance of Galatians 3:21 for Covenant Continuity’ in W. S. Barker and W. R. Godfrey (eds.), *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), pp. 153-166.
- Sitwell, N. H. H., *The Roman Roads of Europe* (London: Cassell, 1981).
- Smiles, V. M., *The Gospel and The Law in Galatia* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998).
- Smit, J., “The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: Deliberative Speech,” *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 1-26.
- Smith, D. M., “The Pauline literature,” in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (ed.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, pp. 265-291.

- Snodgrass, K. "Spheres of Influence: A Possible Solution to the Problem of Paul and the Law," *JSNT* 32 (1988), pp. 93-113.
- Stacey, W. D., *The Pauline View of Man* (New York: St. Martin's 1956).
- Stambaugh, J. E., *The Ancient Roman City* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).
- Stambaugh, J. and D. Balch, *The Social World of the First Christians* (London: SPCK, 1986).
- Stark, R., *The Rise of Christianity* (San Francisco: Harper, 1997).
- Steinhauser, M. G., "Gal 4, 25a: evidence of Targumic Tradition in Gal 4, 21-31?," *Bib* 70 (1989), pp. 234-240.
- Stendahl, K., *Paul among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976).
- Sterling, G. E., *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden, New York: Brill, 1991).
- Stevenson, R. J., *Language, Thought and Representation* (Chichester: J. Wiley and Sons, 1993),
- Stone, S., "The Toga: From National to Ceremonial Costume," in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *From the World of Roman Costume*, pp. 13-45
- Stowers, S. K., *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986).
- van Straten, F. T., "Gifts for the Gods," in H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship*, pp. 105-151.
- Stuhlmacher, P., *Reconciliation, Law and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology* (trans. E. Kalin, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).
- Sullivan, J. P., "Petronius' 'Satyricon' and its Neronian Context," *ANRW* 2.32.3 (1985), pp. 1666-1686
- Sumney, J. L. *Identifying Paul's Opponents* (JSNTSup, 40; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).
- "Servants of Satan", "False Brothers" and Other Opponents of Paul (JSNTSup, 188; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Talmon, S., "The Calendar of the Covenanters of the Judean Desert," *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), pp. 147-85.

- Tannehill, R. C., *Dying and Rising with Christ* (BZNW, 32; Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1967).
- Tarver, T., "Varro and the Antiquarianism of Philosophy," in J. Barnes and M. Griffin (eds.), *Philosophia Togata II* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), pp. 130-164.
- Taylor, L. R., "Freedman and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome," *American Journal of Philology* 82 (1961), pp. 113-132.
- Taylor, N., *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in relationship and Authority in Earliest Christianity* (JSNTSup, 66; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992).
- Tcherikover, V. A., "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," *Eos* 48 (1956), pp. 169-193.
- Theissen, G., *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982).
- Thielman, F., *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1994).
- *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans* (Leiden: Brill, 1989).
- Thornton, T. C. G., "Jewish New Moon Festivals, Galatians 4:3-11 and Colossians 2:16," *JTS* 40 (1989), pp. 97-100.
- Thurston, B., *Women in the New Testament: Questions and Commentary* (New York: Crossroad, 1998).
- Tomson, P. J., *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).
- Treggiari, S., "Domestic Staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian Period," *Social History* 6 (1973), pp. 241-255.
- *Roman Freedmen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).
- Trilling, W., *A Conversation with Paul* (New York: Crossroads, 1986).
- Tyson, J. B., "Paul's Opponents in Galatia," *NovT* 10 (1968), pp. 241-54.
- " 'Works of Law' in Galatians," *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 423-31.
- Udoh, F. E., "Paul's View on the Law: Question about Origin (Gal. 1:6-2:21; Phil. 3:2-11)," *NovT* 42 (2000), pp. 214-237.
- Vanderkam, J., "The Calendar, 4Q327, And 4Q394," in M. Bernstein et al (eds), *Legal Texts And Legal Issues*, pp. 177-194.

- Vermaseren, M. J., *Cybele and Attis: The Myth and the Cult* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).
- Versnel, H. S. (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).
- Verseput, D. J., "Paul's Gentile Mission and the Jewish Christian Community," *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 36-58.
- Vlastos, G., "Slavery in Plato's Thought" in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies*, pp. 205-305
- Vogt, J., *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* (transl. T. Wiedemann; Oxford: Blackwell, 1974).
- Volf, J. G., *Paul and Perseverance: Staying in and Falling Away* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990).
- Vos, J. S., "Die hermeneutics Antinomy bei Paulus (Galater 3.11-12; Romer 10.5-10)," *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 254-270.
- Vouga, F., "La construction de l'histoire en Galates 3-4," *ZNW* 75 (1984), pp. 259-269.
- ___ "Zur rhetorischen Gattung des Galaterbriefes," *ZNW* 79 (1988), pp. 291-292.
- Walker, W. O. Jr., "Why Paul Went to Jerusalem: The Interpretation of Galatians 2:1-5," *CBQ* 54 (1992), pp. 503-510.
- Wallace, D. B., "Galatians 3:19-20: A Crux Interpretum for Paul's View of the Law," *WJT* 52 (1990), pp. 225-245.
- Wallace, R., and W. Williams, *The Three Worlds of Paul of Tarsus* (London: Routledge, 1998).
- Warren, L. B., "Roman Costumes: A Glossary and Some Etruscan Derivations," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), pp. 586-614.
- Watson, A., *Rome of the XII Tables* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).
- ___ *Roman Slave Law* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
- Watson, F. B., *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (SNTSMS, 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- Weaver, P. R. C., "Children of Junian Latins," in Rawson and P. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman Family in Italy*, pp. 55- 72.
- ___ "Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)," in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, pp. 166-190.

- ___ "The Status of Children in Mixed Marriages," in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 145-169.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M., "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity," *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 161-182.
- Weima, J. A. D., *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (JSNTSup, 101; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).
- Westerholm, S., "Law, Grace and the 'Soteriology' of Judaism," in P. Richardson and S. Westerholm (eds.), *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman Period* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991), pp. 57-74.
- ___ "Letter and Spirit: The Foundation of Pauline Ethics," *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 229-248.
- ___ *Preface to the Study of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- White, J. L., *The Apostle of God* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).
- ___ "Epistolary Formulas And Cliches In Greek Papyrus Letters," P. J. Achtemeier, *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers* (vol. 2; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), pp. 289-319.
- ___ *Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).
- Whiteley, D. E. H., *The Theology of St. Paul* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964).
- Wilckens, U., "Statements on the development of Paul's view of the Law," in M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (eds.), *Paul and Paulinism* (FS C. K. Barrett; London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 17-26.
- Williams, D. J., *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).
- Williams, S. K., "The Hearing of Faith: AKOE PISTEOS in Galatians 3," *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 82-93.
- ___ "Justification and the Spirit in Galatians," *JSNT* 29 (1987), pp. 91-100.
- Williamson, C. M. and J. Allen, *Interpreting Difficult Texts: Anti-Judaism and Christian Preaching* (London: SCM Press, 1989).
- Williamson, M., "Jews and Jewish communities in the Roman empire," in J. Huskinson (ed.), *Experiencing Rome*, pp. 305-333.
- Wilson, A. N., *Paul: The Mind of the Apostle* (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1997).
- Wink, W., *Unmasking the Powers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).

- Winter, B., *Paul and Philo Among the Sophists* (SNTSMS, 96; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Witherington, B., *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World: A Comparative Study in New Testament Eschatology* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1992).
- ___ *Paul's Narrative Thought World* (Louisville: WJKP, 1994).
- ___ "Rite and Rights for Women — Gal. 3. 28," *NTS* 27 (1981), pp. 593-604.
- Wright, N. T., *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991).
- ___ "Gospel and Theology in Galatians," in L. A. Jervis, and P. Richardson (eds.), *Gospel in Paul*, pp. 222-239.
- ___ *The New Testament and the People of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1992).
- ___ "Paul, Arabia and Elijah (Galatians 1:17)," *JBL* 115 (1996), pp. 683-92.
- ___ *What St. Paul Really Said* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Yavetz, Z., *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Rome* (London: Transaction Publishers, 1991).
- Young, N. H., "PAIDAGOGOS: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *NovT* 29 (1987), pp. 150-176.
- ___ "Who's Cursed----And Why? (Galatians 3: 10-14)," *JBL* 117 (1998), pp. 79-92.
- Ziesler, J. A., *Pauline Christianity* (The Oxford Bible Series; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- ___ *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul* (SNTSMS, 20; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

Commentaries

- Betz, H. D., *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979).
- Bligh, J., *Galatians: A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle* (London: St. Paul Publishing, 1989).
- Briggs, S., "Galatians," in E. Schussler-Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures* (London: SCM, 1994), pp. 218-236.
- Bruce, F. F., *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICGT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,

- 1982).
- Burton, E. D., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921).
- Duncan, G. S., *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (MNTC; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934).
- Dunn, J. D. G., *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993).
- Ebeling, G., *The Truth of the Gospel* (trans. D. Green; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).
- Fung, R. Y. K., *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988).
- Longenecker, R. N., *Galatians* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1990).
- Maier, J., *The Temple Scroll: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (trans. R. T. White; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985).
- Martyn, J. L., *Galatians* (AB, 34A; New York: Doubleday, 1997).
- Mussner, F., *Der Galaterbrief* (HThK, 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1977).
- Neugebauer, O., *The 'Astronomical' Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72-82),: Translation and Commentary with Additional Notes on the Aramaic Fragments by M. Black* (Copenhagen: Det Kongelige danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 1981).
- Ramsay, W. M., *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1900).
- Witherington, B., *Grace in Galatia* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).