

Durham E-Theses

*Blessing for the nations and the curse of the law:
Paul's citation of genesis and deuteronomy in gal
3.8-10*

Jeffrey Roger Wisdom

How to cite:

Wisdom, Jeffrey Roger (1998) Blessing for the nations and the curse of the law: Paul's citation of genesis and deuteronomy in gal 3.8-10. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/4781/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

**Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law:
Paul's Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10**

Jeffrey Roger Wisdom
Ph.D.
University of Durham
Department of Theology
1998

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



13 JAN 1999

Abstract

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law: Paul's Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10

Jeffrey Roger Wisdom
Ph.D.
1998

This thesis is an interpretation of Paul's citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10. The promise to Abraham to bless all nations and the curse of the covenant are surveyed in the Jewish scripture. We argue that blessing for the nations is an important part of God's covenant purpose for Abraham's descendants from the start and that the curse is consistently connected with the motifs of failure to do all the law and of the abandonment of the Lord for other gods. This thesis then identifies and analyzes the various strands of the postbiblical Jewish literature that cite the promise of blessing for the nations and the curse of the covenant. An interpretation of Gal 3.8-10 is argued, in which the importance for Paul's argument of blessing for the nations and the curse on those who are disloyal to the Lord is stressed. Paul's call to preach the gospel to the gentiles and his defense of the truth of the gospel provide the context for the connection between the gospel and the promise to Abraham of blessing for the nations in Gal 3.8, a blessing which has always been God's purpose for Abraham's descendants. The interpretation of Gal 3.10 then builds on this insight. Those who are of works of the law are identified as the troublemakers who have preached another gospel to the Galatians and thereby they have been disloyal to God and his purpose for Abraham's descendants. Paul cites Deut 27.26 to support this assertion that they have been disloyal to God and therefore are under the curse. This interpretation of Gal 3.8-10 is supported by other traces of the same perspective on the gospel and the curse in Galatians.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
Preface	xii
Abbreviations	xiii

Chapter One: Introduction

I. The Problem addressed by this study	1
II. A Survey of Recent Scholarship	4
III. The purpose of this Thesis	20
IV. The organization of this thesis	23

Part One

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Covenant in the Jewish Scripture

Chapter Two: Blessing for the Nations in Genesis and elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture

I. Introduction	26
II. The Promise in the Patriarchal Narrative	27
A. The Promise of Land and the Promise of Descendants in the Patriarchal Narrative	27
B. The Promise of Blessing for the Nations in the Patriarchal Narrative	30
1. Gen 12.3b	30
2. Gen 18.8	34
3. Gen 22.18	36
4. Gen 26.4	38
5. Gen 28.14	39
6. Summary	41
III. The promise to bless the nations elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture	41
A. Psa 72.17	43
B. Jer 4.1-2	44
C. Zech 8.13	46

D. Isa. 65.16	47
E. Summary	48
IV. Conclusion	48

Chapter Three: The Curse in Deuteronomy and elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture.

I. Introduction	50
II. The Curse in Deuteronomy	50
A. The use of קללה/κατάρα in Deuteronomy	51
B. The use of אלה/ἀρά in Deuteronomy	56
C. The use of ארר/ἐπικατάρατος in Deuteronomy	57
D. The use of ארר/ἀνάθεμα in Deuteronomy	58
E. Summary	61
III. The Curse elsewhere in the Jewish scripture	61
A. The Deuteronomistic History	62
1. Josh 23-24	62
2. I Kgs 9	64
3. II Kgs 17	65
4. II Kgs 21	66
5. II Kgs 22-23	66
B. Israel's Prophetic Literature	67
1. Jeremiah	67
2. Hosea	70
C. Summary	71
IV. Conclusion	72

Part Two

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Covenant in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism

Chapter Four: Blessing for the Nations in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism

I. Introduction	75
II. The Apocrypha	75

A. Ben Sirs	75
B. Tobit	78
III. The Pseudepigrapha	78
A. Introduction	79
B. Jubilees	79
C. Pseudo-Philo	85
D. The Ladder of Jacob	89
E. Summary	90
IV. The Qumran Literature	90
V. Philo	91
A. Migr.1=Gen 12.3	92
B. Heres 8=Gen 26.4	93
C. Som. I.3=Gen 28.14	94
D. Summary	95
VI. Josephus	96
A. Ant. 1.154=Gen 12.1-3	97
B. Ant. 1.234-235=Gen 22.16-18	97
C. Ant. 1.280-283=Gen 28.13-15	99
D. Summary	100
VII. Conclusion	101

Chapter Five: The Curse in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism

I. Introduction	102
II. The Apocrypha	102
A. The Wisdom of Solomon	102
B. I Esdras	105
C. I Maccabees	106
D. Baruch	109
E. The Prayer of Azariah	111
F. Summary	112
III. Pseudepigrapha	113
A. Jubilees	113
B. The Testament of Moses	117
C. The Martyrdom of Isaiah	120
D. Pseudo-Philo	120

E. Summary.....	123
IV. The Qumran Literature.....	124
A. The Temple Scroll.....	124
B. The Community Rule.....	126
C. The Damascus Document.....	130
D. Summary.....	131
V. Philo.....	132
A. Loyalty to the Lord was the focus of Israel's religion.....	132
B. Philo on Deuteronomy.....	134
C. The Story of Midianite Women.....	136
D. Summary.....	137
VI. Josephus.....	137
A. Josephus on the covenant in Deuteronomy.....	138
B. The Story of Midianite Women.....	141
C. Josephus' record of the Monarchy.....	143
D. Summary.....	146
VII. Conclusion.....	148

Part Three

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law in Paul's Letter to the Galatians

Chapter Six: Blessing for the Nations and the Gospel of Jesus Christ: Paul's use of Genesis in Gal 3.8

I. Introduction.....	150
II. Paul's commission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles.....	151
III. Paul's Defense of the Truth of the Gospel (Gal 2.1-14).....	156
A. Gal 2.1-11.....	157
B. Gal 2.11-14.....	159
IV. The Gospel Paul preached and the Promise to Abraham to Bless all the nations through his seed.....	161
A. The Gospel Paul Preached and Its Connection to the Promise to Abraham (Gal 3.8).....	162
B. The Role of a Prior Covenant in God's Plan (Gal 3.15-29).....	171

V. Conclusion	177
<u>Chapter Seven: The Curse of the Law and the Deuteronomistic Framework of Paul's Polemic: Paul's Use of Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10</u>	
A. Introduction	179
B. Gal 3.10: those who are under the curse because they are disloyal to God's covenant purpose for his people	181
1. Paul's assertion that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν	182
2. Paul's use of Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10b to support his assertion in 3.10a	195
A. An Analysis of Paul's citation of Deuteronomy 27.26 in Gal 3.10b	196
B. πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου elsewhere in Deuteronomy	197
C. Paul's modified citation as support for his assertion in 3.10a	203
C. Conclusion	211
<u>Chapter Eight: The Deuteronomistic pattern as it relates to the Gospel of Jesus Christ elsewhere in Paul's letter to the Galatians.</u>	
I. Introduction	213
II. The Imminent Apostasy of the Galatians in 1.6-9 and 4.8-10	214
A. Gal 1.6-9	214
B. Gal 4.8-11	220
III. Other References	224
A. Gal 2.18	224
B. Gal 4.21-31	228
C. Gal 6.12-14	233
IV. Conclusion	234
<u>Chapter Nine: Conclusion</u>	235
<u>Bibliography</u>	240

**Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law:
Paul's Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10**

Jeffrey Roger Wisdom
Ph.D.
University of Durham
Department of Theology
1998

Abstract

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law: Paul's Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10

Jeffrey Roger Wisdom
Ph.D.
1998

This thesis is an interpretation of Paul's citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10. The promise to Abraham to bless all nations and the curse of the covenant are surveyed in the Jewish scripture. We argue that blessing for the nations is an important part of God's covenant purpose for Abraham's descendants from the start and that the curse is consistently connected with the motifs of failure to do all the law and of the abandonment of the Lord for other gods. This thesis then identifies and analyzes the various strands of the postbiblical Jewish literature that cite the promise of blessing for the nations and the curse of the covenant. An interpretation of Gal 3.8-10 is argued, in which the importance for Paul's argument of blessing for the nations and the curse on those who are disloyal to the Lord is stressed. Paul's call to preach the gospel to the gentiles and his defense of the truth of the gospel provide the context for the connection between the gospel and the promise to Abraham of blessing for the nations in Gal 3.8, a blessing which has always been God's purpose for Abraham's descendants. The interpretation of Gal 3.10 then builds on this insight. Those who are of works of the law are identified as the troublemakers who have preached another gospel to the Galatians and thereby they have been disloyal to God and his purpose for Abraham's descendants. Paul cites Deut 27.26 to support this assertion that they have been disloyal to God and therefore are under the curse. This interpretation of Gal 3.8-10 is supported by other traces of the same perspective on the gospel and the curse in Galatians.

To
Chris,
My Wife, Friend, and Partner in Life

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
Preface	xii
Abbreviations	xiii

Chapter One: Introduction

I. The Problem addressed by this study	1
II. A Survey of Recent Scholarship	4
III. The purpose of this Thesis	20
IV. The organization of this thesis	23

Part One

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Covenant in the Jewish Scripture

Chapter Two: Blessing for the Nations in Genesis and elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture

I. Introduction	26
II. The Promise in the Patriarchal Narrative	27
A. The Promise of Land and the Promise of Descendants in the Patriarchal Narrative	27
B. The Promise of Blessing for the Nations in the Patriarchal Narrative	30
1. Gen 12.3b	30
2. Gen 18.8	34
3. Gen 22.18	36
4. Gen 26.4	38
5. Gen 28.14	39
6. Summary	41
III. The promise to bless the nations elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture	41
A. Psa 72.17	43
B. Jer 4.1-2	44
C. Zech 8.13	46

D. Isa. 65.16	47
E. Summary	48
IV. Conclusion	48

Chapter Three: The Curse in Deuteronomy and elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture.

I. Introduction	50
II. The Curse in Deuteronomy	50
A. The use of קללה/κατάρα in Deuteronomy	51
B. The use of אלה/ἀρά in Deuteronomy	56
C. The use of ארר/ἐπικατάρατος in Deuteronomy	57
D. The use of ארר/ἀνάθεμα in Deuteronomy	58
E. Summary	61
III. The Curse elsewhere in the Jewish scripture	61
A. The Deuteronomistic History	62
1. Josh 23-24	62
2. I Kgs 9	64
3. II Kgs 17	65
4. II Kgs 21	66
5. II Kgs 22-23	66
B. Israel's Prophetic Literature	67
1. Jeremiah	67
2. Hosea	70
C. Summary	71
IV. Conclusion	72

Part Two

**Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Covenant
in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism**

Chapter Four: Blessing for the Nations in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism

I. Introduction	75
II. The Apocrypha	75

A. Ben Sira	75
B. Tobit	78
III. The Pseudepigrapha	78
A. Introduction	79
B. Jubilees	79
C. Pseudo-Philo	85
D. The Ladder of Jacob	89
E. Summary	90
IV. The Qumran Literature	90
V. Philo	91
A. Migr.1=Gen 12.3	92
B. Heres 8=Gen 26.4	93
C. Som. I.3=Gen 28.14	94
D. Summary	95
VI. Josephus	96
A. Ant. 1.154=Gen 12.1-3	97
B. Ant. 1.234-235=Gen 22.16-18	97
C. Ant. 1.280-283=Gen 28.13-15	99
D. Summary	100
VII. Conclusion	101

Chapter Five: The Curse in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism

I. Introduction	102
II. The Apocrypha	102
A. The Wisdom of Solomon	102
B. I Esdras	105
C. I Maccabees	106
D. Baruch	109
E. The Prayer of Azariah	111
F. Summary	112
III. Pseudepigrapha	113
A. Jubilees	113
B. The Testament of Moses	117
C. The Martyrdom of Isaiah	120
D. Pseudo-Philo	120

E. Summary.....	123
IV. The Qumran Literature.....	124
A. The Temple Scroll.....	124
B. The Community Rule.....	126
C. The Damascus Document.....	130
D. Summary.....	131
V. Philo.....	132
A. Loyalty to the Lord was the focus of Israel's religion.....	132
B. Philo on Deuteronomy.....	134
C. The Story of Midianite Women.....	136
D. Summary.....	137
VI. Josephus.....	137
A. Josephus on the covenant in Deuteronomy.....	138
B. The Story of Midianite Women.....	141
C. Josephus' record of the Monarchy.....	143
D. Summary.....	146
VII. Conclusion.....	148

Part Three

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law in Paul's Letter to the Galatians

Chapter Six: Blessing for the Nations and the Gospel of Jesus Christ: Paul's use of Genesis in Gal 3.8

I. Introduction.....	150
II. Paul's commission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles.....	151
III. Paul's Defense of the Truth of the Gospel (Gal 2.1-14).....	156
A. Gal 2.1-11.....	157
B. Gal 2.11-14.....	159
IV. The Gospel Paul preached and the Promise to Abraham to Bless all the nations through his seed.....	161
A. The Gospel Paul Preached and Its Connection to the Promise to Abraham (Gal 3.8).....	162
B. The Role of a Prior Covenant in God's Plan (Gal 3.15-29).....	171

V. Conclusion.....	177
<u>Chapter Seven: The Curse of the Law and the Deuteronomistic Framework of Paul's Polemic: Paul's Use of Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10</u>	
A. Introduction.....	179
B. Gal 3.10: those who are under the curse because they are disloyal to God's covenant purpose for his people.....	181
1. Paul's assertion that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν.....	182
2. Paul's use of Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10b to support his assertion in 3.10a.....	195
A. An Analysis of Paul's citation of Deuteronomy 27.26 in Gal 3.10b.....	196
B. πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου elsewhere in Deuteronomy.....	197
C. Paul's modified citation as support for his assertion in 3.10a.....	203
C. Conclusion.....	211
<u>Chapter Eight: The Deuteronomistic pattern as it relates to the Gospel of Jesus Christ elsewhere in Paul's letter to the Galatians.</u>	
I. Introduction.....	213
II. The Imminent Apostasy of the Galatians in 1.6-9 and 4.8-10.....	214
A. Gal 1.6-9.....	214
B. Gal 4.8-11.....	220
III. Other References.....	224
A. Gal 2.18.....	224
B. Gal 4.21-31.....	228
C. Gal 6.12-14.....	233
IV. Conclusion.....	234
<u>Chapter Nine: Conclusion</u>	235
<u>Bibliography</u>	240

Acknowledgments

The completion of a thesis is a complex task, and I have benefited from the influence and support of many people who made the completion of this thesis possible. It is my pleasant obligation to acknowledge those who have helped me complete this work.

First, I owe a great debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. James D. G. Dunn. His careful scholarship, insightful critique, and personal warmth made my course of study at Durham both a time of academic growth and a source of great personal enrichment. It was my joy and privilege to complete this thesis under his direction. I am grateful to my examiners, Dr. Joel Marcus and Dr. Robert Hayward. Their careful reading of the thesis and many helpful comments have improved it at a number of points. I am also grateful to Dr. Donald Garlington, who sent me several drafts and the final version of his recent article on Galatians, and to Dr. R. Barry Matlock, who kindly sent me a draft of a paper he read on Gal 3.10-14 at SBL in New Orleans.

Many others have contributed to the completion of this thesis. I want to thank Dr. Greg Beale, who introduced me to the rigors of interpretation in a course on exegetical method, and Dr. T. David Gordon, who introduced me to many of the interpretive issues in Galatians in a course on this pauline letter. I am especially grateful to Dr. Scott Hafemann, under whom I served as a Byington assistant for three years at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. His tutelage of my growth in academics provided me with a model of the integration of scholastics with the practical concerns of the parish ministry. I am also grateful to the Rev. Paul Munro, who read and critiqued a final draft of the thesis, and to Ed Keazirian and Doug Mohrman, who gladly offered assistance on several points of detail as I approached the completion of the thesis.

I would like to thank the faculty and administration of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary for the Parish Pulpit Fellowship, which helped to fund our time of residence in Durham. I would also like to thank the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and

Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom for their award of an Overseas Research Students Award, which paid a substantial portion of my full-time tuition at the University of Durham. I am grateful to the staff at the University Library in Durham, especially the staff at the Palace Green Section. I am also grateful to the staff at Ira J. Taylor Library in Denver and the Andover-Harvard Theological Library in Cambridge.

I have greatly benefited from much personal support during the completion of the thesis. I am grateful to Mike and Cheryl Hoover for their friendship and support, at times even financial. I am also grateful to Martin and Bev Neil, who opened their home to Chris and me when I returned for my viva. Their warm hospitality is greatly appreciated. I want to thank the Rev. Robert Hinckley for his consistent encouragement over the last two years to complete the thesis. His model of ministry and his personal friendship have been a rich blessing to me and my family. I am grateful to my church family at First Baptist Church of Abington for their prayer, support and encouragement. My parents, the Rev. Roger and Barbara Wisdom, and my in-laws, Walt and Betty Palmer, have contributed greatly over the years through their love and support. I am very grateful to my children, who made many sacrifices which enabled me to complete this thesis. Brian, Megan, and Timothy lived in Durham, and Jeffrey Paul and Sophia joined us after we returned to the states to complete the thesis on a part-time basis. Each is a source of great joy and delight for me, and the process of the completion of this thesis would have been far less enjoyable for me without them. And finally, but most importantly, I am grateful to my wife, Chris, whose constant love for me and companionship with me enabled me to complete this thesis. She sacrificed much to see the completion of this work through to the end, and she is indeed my partner in all I do in this life. It is to her that this thesis is dedicated.

Many have contributed to the completion of this thesis, and any contribution to scholarship it makes is due in large measure to the positive influence of so many on my growth in academics. Any error it contains is my responsibility, however. It is my

sincere hope that the results of this study will bear fruit in the parish ministry to which God has called me. Soli Deo Gloria.

Preface

Unless otherwise noted, the following editions and translations are cited in this thesis. For the Jewish scripture, the Hebrew text is Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983) and the Greek text is A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta, 2 Vols. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935). The text of the apocrypha is in Rahlfs, Septuaginta. The translation of the pseudepigrapha is J. Charlesworth (Ed.) The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 2 Vols., (New York: Doubleday, 1983/1985). The text of the Qumran literature is E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran, (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1971) and the translation is F. García Martínez, The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994). The text and translation for Philo is F. Colson and G. Whitaker, Philo, LCL, 10 vol., (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958-62). The text and translation for Josephus is Thackeray, H. St. J., et. al., Josephus, LCL, 10 vol., (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1926-1963).

Unless otherwise noted above or in the notes in the thesis, all translations of Hebrew and Greek texts are the author's.

Abbreviations

Biblical Books

Gen	Genesis	II Chr	II Chronicles
Ex	Exodus	Esth	Esther
Lev	Leviticus	Ps	Pslams
Num	Numbers	Pr	Proverbs
Deut	Deuteronomy	Isa	Isaiah
Josh	Joshua	Jer	Jeremiah
Judg	Judges	Dan	Daniel
I Sam	I Samuel	Hos	Hosea
II Sam	II Samuel	Am	Amos
I Kgs	I Kings	Zech	Zechariah
II Kgs	II Kings	Mal	Malachi
Mk	Mark	Eph	Ephesians
Lk	Luke	Phil	Philippians
Rom	Romans	Col	Colossians
I Cor	I Corinthians	I Thess	I Thessalonians
II Cor	II Corinthians	Phm	Philemon
Gal	Galatians		

Apocrypha

Bar	Baruch
Ben Sira	The Wisdom of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)
Ep. Jer.	Epistle of Jeremiah
I Esd	1 Esdras
I Macc	1 Maccabees
II Macc	2 Maccabees
IV Macc	4 Maccabees
P.Man.	Prayer of Manasseh
Wisd. Sol.	The Wisdom of Solomon

Pseudepigrapha

Aris.	Letter of Aristeas
Jub	Jubilees
Ps.-Philo	Pseudo-Philo
T. Abr	Testament of Abraham
T. Jos	Testament of Joseph
T. Mos.	Testament of Moses

The Qumran Literature

CD	The Damascus Document
1QapGen	Genesis Apocryphon
1QS	The Community Rule
1Q22	The Words of Moses
4QFlor	Florilgium
4QMMT	Halakhic Letter
4Q252	4QGenesis Peshera ^a
11QT	The Temple Scroll

Philo

Abr.	De Abrahamo (On Abraham)
Agri.	De Agricultura (On Husbandry)
Apol.	Apologia Pro Iudaies (Apology for the Jews)
Cong.	De Congressu Eruditionis gratia (On the Preliminary Studies)
Dec.	De Decalogo (On the Decalogue)
Heres	Quis rerum divinarum Heres sit (Who is the Heir)
Migr.	De Migratione Abrahami (On the Migration of Abraham)
Immut.	Quod Deus sit Immutabilis (On the Unchangeableness of God)
Nomin.	De Mutatione Nominum (On the Change of Names)
Plant.	De Plantatione (On Noah's Work as a Planter)
Post.	De Posteritate Caini (On the Posterity and Exile of Cain)
Praem.	De Praemiis et Poenis (On Rewards and Punishments)
Qu. Gen.	Questiones et Solutiones in Genesin (Questions and Answers on Genesis)
Spec.	De Specialibus Legibus (On the Special Laws)
Som.	De Somniis (On Dreams)
Vir.	De Virtute (On the Virtues)

Josephus

Ant.	Jewish Antiquities
------	--------------------

Targums

Tg. Onq.	Targum Onqelos
Tg. Neof.	Targum Neofiti 1
Tg. Ps.-J.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or in any other University. This thesis is entirely my own independent contribution. Material from the work of others has been acknowledged and quotations and paraphrases suitably indicated.

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

Chapter One

Introduction

I. The Problem addressed by this study

Paul's relationship with first century Judaism and his view of the law have been at the center of much scholarly controversy for the last two decades.¹ The impetus for this comes, at least in part, from E. P. Sanders' watershed work.² In the wake of this influential study, scholars have either vigorously defended traditional interpretations or have followed newly opened lines of investigation. Within the context of this vigorous scholarly debate, the interpretation of Gal 3.10 has been the focal point for a considerable amount of scholarly activity. The present study seeks to make a contribution to the current debate through an examination of Paul's citation of Gen 12.3/18.18 and Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.8 and 3.10 respectively.

The problem which this thesis seeks to address comes into focus when it is recognized that Paul's assertion in Gal 3.10 that ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν is widely acknowledged as one of the most difficult statements within the Pauline corpus.³ This is true especially with respect to the identity of ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.⁴ For many interpreters assume that Paul intended this phrase to refer to Judaism

¹Recent works which address the issue of Paul and the law include Sanders 1983; Räisänen 1983; idem 1992; Hübner; Moo 1987; Westerholm 1988; Martin 1989; Thielman 1989; idem 1994; Dunn 1990; Tomson; Wright 1992a; idem 1992b; Winger; Schreiner 1993; Hong 1993; Dewey; Amadi-Azuogu; and Eckstein.

²Sanders 1977.

³Cf. Dunn 1993a: 169; idem 1993b: 83; Wright 1992a: 137; Donaldson 1986: 94; Hansen 1989: 117; Scott 1993b: 657; and Garlington 1997: 85-86.

⁴For a survey of the suggestions for the phrase ἐξ ἔργων νόμου see Schreiner 1991: 218-224.

as a whole.⁵ However, there is reason to doubt this assumption.⁶ The present study thus will explore the suggestion that Paul's reference to ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου in Gal 3.10 is more narrow than is commonly assumed.

This difficulty, furthermore, is intensified when Paul's support in 3.10b for this assertion in 3.10a is brought into view. For as G. Hansen notes,

The basic problem in the interpretation of his use of Deut. 27.26 is the difficulty of relating this text to the opening statement that 'whoever is of the works of the law is under a curse'. The text seems to state the opposite: 'Cursed is everyone who does not abide by all the things written in the book of the law, and do them'. How can Paul support his statement that those who are of the works of the law are under a curse with a text that says that those who do not keep the law are under a curse?⁷

The diversity of interpretations offered for this verse testifies to the difficulty posed for modern scholarship in tracing the path of Paul's argument here.⁸ This apparent conflict between Paul's statement in Gal 3.10a and his use of scripture to support his argument in 3.10b is therefore an important aspect for the occasion of the present study because in spite of the attention this verse has received in recent years, we will argue that a crucial

⁵The resulting statement that all Jews living in Paul's era were under a curse has led some to the conclusion that Paul was anti-Semitic, a charge to which D. Boyarin's work is addressed, at least in part. Cf. Boyarin: 136-157.

⁶See, for example, Stanley 1990: 498. However, in his insistence that Paul only has the Galatians in mind in this text and has issued an implicit threat to them, Stanley has missed the rhetorical force of this verse in the context of the whole letter. Although Paul may have intended that the Galatians would understand that they themselves would be under the curse if they accepted circumcision, the primary force of Gal 3.10 is directed, we will argue, at a group of Jewish Christians, almost certainly those whom Paul termed the 'troublemakers' and upon whom he has already pronounced a curse (Gal 1.8).

⁷Hansen 1989: 117. Cf. also Stanley 1990: 481; Watson: 71; Cranford: 244; Martyn: 309; and Cosgrove: 53. Smiles: 10-11 statement concerning this difficult text is representative: "...Paul is sometimes on uncertain ground when trying to overturn the natural meaning of the ancient text (e.g. Deut 27.26 in 3.10)." So also Lührmann 1992: 61.

⁸For surveys of the interpretive options concerning Gal 3.10, see section II. below. See also Stanley 1990: 482-486; Wright 1992a: 138-139, 144-145; Scott 1993a: 188-194; Thielman 1989: 66-67; Cosgrove: 6-16; Braswell: 90-91; Bonneau: 60-62; and Dunn 1993a: 171-172.

aspect of Paul's use of scripture has been overlooked. In particular, no one has thus far attempted to place Paul's use of scripture within the context of the dominant theme of Deuteronomy,⁹ which is that the covenant demands exclusive loyalty to the Lord and his commandments.

Within the context of this difficult statement in 3.10, another important aspect of the problem addressed by this study is Paul's use of Genesis in Gal 3.8, a text which has received little attention from scholars.¹⁰ Usually this text is taken as the further elaboration of Paul's citation of Gen 15.6 in Gal 3.6,¹¹ and thus it is taken as an ancillary point in Paul's argument. On the other hand, the blessing mentioned in Gal 3.8 is understood as the natural corollary of the curse in 3.10,¹² and although Paul was more concerned with his discussion of the curse of the law,¹³ it is presumed that its mere mention caused his mind to turn briefly to its opposite—blessing. What is left unexplored is why Paul's mind turned to blessing *in Genesis* and not its natural corollary in

⁹Face Wright 1992a: 137-156; Scott 1993a; and Thielman 1989. These scholars attempt to place Paul's argument within a redemptive-historical context which was predicted in Deuteronomy and which was commonly assumed in postbiblical Judaism. This thesis will argue that Paul has applied the dominant motif of Deuteronomy itself to the Galatian crisis.

¹⁰For example, Longenecker's recent commentary on Galatians does not list a single article or monograph devoted to Paul's use of scripture here.

¹¹E.g. Lührmann: 60.

¹²Cf. e.g. Sanders 1983: 22.

¹³It must be noted that the phrase "the curse of the law" is apparently Paul's own, since it never occurs in the Jewish literature of this period. Instead, the phrase frequently used in the Jewish scripture and by Paul's contemporaries is "the curse of the covenant." Bonneau: 60 has rightly noted that in Paul's letters the phrase "the curse of the law" is unique to Gal 3.13, but has failed to note that this is the only occurrence of this phrase. I owe this observation to Dr. R. Hayward, who kindly read and critiqued one of the earliest versions of a section of chapter three while I was in residence in Durham. The significance of this observation will be discussed in chapter seven below. For the moment it will suffice to note that caution must be exercised with respect to the notion that the law itself was a curse for Israel or for Jews, as Boers: 126 suggests: "Rather than appearing as wholesome, the Law is seen as a veritable curse, as in Gal 3:10...The Law on which the Jews rely for their privileged relationship with God is in reality a curse." In this study, therefore, "the curse of the law" will be used only in connection with Paul's usage in Galatians, and "the curse of the covenant" will be used in connection with references in the Jewish scripture or in the postbiblical literature.

Deuteronomy of covenant blessing for those who are obedient to the law.¹⁴

Furthermore, the significance of Paul's citation of this text has not been set fully within the context of the Jewish scripture or the postbiblical literature contemporaneous with Paul. This failure to include a detailed study of Paul's use of scripture here is indeed striking, since most commentators have noted the profoundly significant statement that the gospel was preached beforehand to Abraham in the form of the promise to bless the nations through his descendants.

The problem that this thesis confronts then is two-fold. On the one hand, in spite of much recent effort, the inner logic between Gal 3.10a and 3.10b remains obscure. In particular, no one has attempted to apply the insight concerning the dominant theme of Deuteronomy to the situation in Galatia to which Paul's letter is addressed. On the other hand, the close relationship between Paul's citation of scripture in 3.10b and 3.8b has thus far not been adequately traced. We will argue that for Paul the heart of the covenant which has found expression in the gospel of Jesus Christ is the Lord's promise in Genesis to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants. According to Paul, this has been God's covenant purpose for his people right from the start. Hence both Paul's association of the promise to bless the nations with the gospel and the juxtaposition of this theme with the curse of the law provide the occasion for a fruitful approach to a difficult Pauline text.

II. A Survey of Recent Scholarship.

¹⁴For example, why Paul did not cite Deut 30 here which speaks of the blessing for obedience and the curse for disobedience. He was clearly familiar with this text and cited it elsewhere in his letters (Rom 10.6-8; cf. Dunn 1988: 602-607). We are not suggesting here what Paul should have done, but rather raising the question of why the mention of the curse from Deuteronomy was conjoined with blessing from Genesis, and not from Deuteronomy itself. On the importance of the motif of blessing in both Genesis and Deuteronomy, see Westermann 1978: 29.

A brief survey of recent interpretations of Gal 3.10¹⁵ will help to set the present study within the context of recent scholarship.¹⁶ This is necessary because this text has received considerable attention during the past two decades, and the need for another study of this well-worked text must be defended, and its contribution to the debate on what it means must be stressed. We will begin with the traditional interpretation both because it has occupied and continues to occupy pride of place since the time of Martin Luther and because virtually all of the recent suggestions have been against the backdrop of this interpretation. We will then consider several lines of investigation which have emerged to challenge this traditional interpretation.

The traditional interpretation of Gal 3.10 is that Paul has assumed an unexpressed middle in a syllogistic argument. This unexpressed middle may be assumed, this line of interpretation argues, because it was so widely acknowledged in Judaism or was so self-evident from human experience. The unexpressed part of Paul's argument is that the law demanded perfect obedience to each and every one of its precepts and no one can keep the law perfectly. Thus those who attempt to keep the law perfectly are doomed to failure because they cannot do so, and consequently fall under the curse of the law. T.

¹⁵A survey of interpretations of Gal 3.8 is not necessary since no one has attempted to place Paul's use of scripture within historical context and this text has received very little attention by scholars. To be sure, a number of scholars have recently pointed to the observation that according to Paul the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants was God's intention from the start (see, for example, Dunn 1993a: 164-166; Gordon 1987: 32-43; and Hays 1989: 105), but few have attempted to carry this insight through to an interpretation of Gal 3.10 which correlates with this covenant purpose. Instead, most recent works that discuss Paul's use of scripture here devote brief attention to Gal 3.8 as part of a wider interest. Cf. Koch; Stanley 1992; Scott 1995; and Eckstein. For a recent attempt to interpret the promise in 3.8 in the context of Paul's reference to "seed", see Pyne: 211-222. For a recent attempt to integrate the interpretation of Gal 3.8 with 3.10, cf. Morland: 198-211. Hansen 1989 has focused attention on the importance of the Abraham story for the interpretation of Galatians, but he does not devote sustained attention to the significance of the promise to bless the nations within the argument of Gal 3.8-10. For example, in the section which discusses Gal 3.6-9, Hansen 1989: 112-116 devotes most of his attention to the function of the citation of Gen 15.6 in 3.6.

¹⁶Scholars whose contributions to the debate have been published since Sanders 1977 will occupy our attention. For surveys of treatments of this text before this, see the bibliography cited in n. 8 above.

Schreiner has most actively defended the traditional view,¹⁷ but several other recent works have either defended or affirmed it.¹⁸ Several scholars have recently cast doubt on the accuracy of the traditional view, however. G. Howard, for example, has pointed to one of the principle weaknesses of this line of interpretation:

The problem with this assumption is that Paul, who by his own admission knew the law well (Gal. 1: 14), knew that the cultic aspect of the law implied the imperfection of the law...To keep the law then was, among other things, to find cultic forgiveness for breaking the law. For Paul to have argued that the law demanded absolute obedience and that one legal infraction brought with it unpardonable doom, would have been for him to deny what all the world knew, namely, that the Jerusalem temple stood as a monument to the belief that Yahweh was a forgiving God who pardoned his people when they sinned.¹⁹

The traditional interpretation thus assumed what Paul would not,²⁰ that the law demanded perfect obedience and cursed any who broke even one of its commandments.

E. P. Sanders has advocated the view that Paul's choice of Deut 27.26 to support his argument in Gal 3.10 was motivated merely by the fact that this text is the only one in the LXX which juxtaposed curse and law.²¹ Paul's choice of Deut 27.26 thus is merely terminological. According to Sanders, Paul did not argue from the premise of the impossibility of perfect obedience to the law,²² and the assertions he made are more important to his train of thought than are the scripture texts he cited.²³ Thus Paul cited

¹⁷Schreiner 1984: 151-160; idem 1991: 217-244; and idem 1993.

¹⁸Cf. Bruce 1982a: 159; Moo 1983: 73-100; Hübner: 36-42; Watson: 71; Fung: 141-143; Martin 1989: 86-88; Hansen 1989: 119-120; Longenecker: 118; Matera: 123; Hong 1993: 81-82, 137; George: 230-231; Morris: 103-104; Silva: 189; Amadi-Azuogu: 131-138; and Thielman 1994: 124-129.

¹⁹Howard: 53. Cf. also Cranford: 244-248; Wright 1992a: 144-145; Dunn 1993a: 171; idem 1993c: 75-77, 83-84; and Sanders 1983: 17-27.

²⁰Cf. Dunn 1990 226: "The idea that Paul in quoting Deuteronomy 27.26 presupposes the impossibility of fulfilling the law is hardly self-evident and has to be read into the argument." Cf. also Cranford: 249.

²¹Sanders 1983: 21.

²²idem: 20-21.

²³idem: 21-22.

this text because it contained the key terms of his argument, and consequently, little interpretive weight should be given to the meaning of the citation itself. Sanders' suggestion, however, has won little support.²⁴

J. D. G. Dunn has argued that a complete understanding of Paul's argument here is possible only within the framework provided by a proper understanding of the social factors and pressures in postbiblical Judaism. Hence, in Gal 3.10 the social function of the law must be kept in view.²⁵ His interpretation argues that τὰ ἔργα τοῦ νόμου refers to those obligations of the law which separated Jew from gentile.²⁶ Jesus' death on the cross as one cursed by the law and thus as an outsider to the covenant together with his vindication by God point to the fact that the covenant is now open to those formerly outside its boundaries.²⁷ Some scholars have criticized Dunn's view²⁸ as he applies it to Gal 3.10 in that the curse on ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is the "curse of a wrong understanding of the law."²⁹ This interpretation is typically viewed as a too narrow understanding of Paul's language concerning the significance of Jesus' death on the cross, both in Gal 3 and elsewhere in his letters. Dunn recognizes this criticism,³⁰ and he has clarified his position by stating that τὰ ἔργα τοῦ νόμου refers to the entire obligation of the law, an obligation which comes into particular focus on those aspects which distinguish Jew from gentile.³¹ Moreover, Paul's statement that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under a curse functions in the context of Gal 3.10 to indicate that they have failed to do all that the law requires.³² The present study attempts to build on Dunn's new perspective on Paul and

²⁴Cf. Stanley 1990: 485-486; Hong 1993: 135-138; and Scott 1993a: 190-191.

²⁵Cf. Dunn 1993a: 170-174; and *idem* 1990: 219-225.

²⁶Dunn 1993a: 172-174; and *idem* 1990: 215-241.

²⁷Dunn 1990: 228-230.

²⁸Cf. Scott 1993a: 192; Stanley 1990: 485; and Hong 1993: 145-148.

²⁹Dunn 1990: 229.

³⁰*idem*: 229-230.

³¹Cf. *idem* 1992: 99-117.

³²So also Cranford: 249-258. Cranford twice states that works of the law are "...accompanied by actual disobedience" (p. 249), and he also states that "...the law pronounces a curse on those who transgress its principal ordinances" (p. 250). But he

the law and on his understanding of the significance of the phrase τὰ ἔργα τοῦ νόμου. However, we will argue that the curse of the law in Gal 3.10 is the curse on those who have wrongly understood the significance of the law, which formerly had separated Jew from gentile, for gentiles who have believed in Jesus Christ within the context of the promise to Abraham to bless all nations through his descendants. This wrong understanding of the role of the law in the covenant community amounts to disloyalty to the gospel and unfaithfulness to God's covenant purpose to bless all nations.³³ It is, therefore, apostasy from the Lord and his covenant purpose.

N. T. Wright has recently stressed the redemptive-historical reality of the exile and its possible continuation into the first century of the common era as a key component of Paul's argument. His thesis is that Paul's argument is based on the common assumption in the first century Jewish world that Israel was still under the curse of the exile.³⁴ The argument for this potential background for Paul's statement in Gal 3.10 hinges on the claim that there was a widespread agreement among Jews in the first century of the common era that Israel as a whole continued under the curse of the exile and that no Jew, therefore, would have contested this point in Paul's argument.³⁵ Such a widespread assumption in first century Judaism is doubtful, however. For example, although the Qumran community may have described their foundation in terms of the end of Israel's exile (CD 1. 5-8), this text assumes that the exile ended in the

never identifies the specific disobedience to which Paul alludes, and more importantly, how those under the curse are guilty of this disobedience and transgression.

³³Dunn 1993a: 173 does recognize the close link between blessing for the nations and God's covenant purpose, a connection which he terms "...the foundational character of the covenant"; and he correctly understands that in Paul's view ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου have failed to do all that the Lord commands. This study will attempt to demonstrate how Paul may have supported his controversial statement from Deuteronomy and how other Jewish authors of this period used the same text or the same language to pronounce a curse on those who had turned from the Lord to other gods.

³⁴Wright 1992a: 145-148; idem 1992b: 299-301. For a critique of Wright's position, see Dunn 1993a: 171-172; and also George: 232-233. These two scholars, however, approach this text from very different perspectives.

³⁵Wright 1992a: 147-148; and idem 1992b: 268-272. Cf. also Thielman 1989: 68-69; and Scott 1993a: 214.

second century B.C.E.,³⁶ and it is framed within the context of sectarian controversy. Moreover, the text Paul cites states that the curse is on individuals, not the nation as a whole.³⁷ Thus it is doubtful that this text provides evidence of a widespread view within Judaism as a whole in the first century of the common era.³⁸

J. Scott has also recently argued for this understanding of the curse of the exile³⁹ which, he claims, continued into the Second Temple period.⁴⁰ Scott rightly emphasizes that the covenant in Deuteronomy did not call "...for sinless perfection, but rather for covenant faithfulness to Yahweh as opposed to national apostasy"⁴¹ and that the curse came upon Israel because of national apostasy:

The emphasis in this section (i.e. Deut 27-32), however, is clearly on the curse of exile which would come upon Israel for gross disobedience to the law in the form of national apostasy and fundamental covenant violations.⁴²

³⁶As Dunn 1993a: 171 has rightly observed, the key text which Wright 1992a: 141; and idem 1992b: 269-270 cites claims that the exile ended with the establishment of the Qumran community in the mid-second century B.C.E., and it is only those Jews who remain outside this 'new covenant' community who are cursed (CD 1.5-8). Thus at least one significant group of first century Judaism would not have shared this assumption. Wright also refers to Knibb 1987 in support of his argument. But Knibb (idem: 20) makes this same point: "The author of the Damascus Document drew on this tradition and was in effect saying that the events to which he was referring marked the end of the period of Israel's punishment, i.e. the end of the exile." It may not be assumed, however, that other Jewish groups shared this perspective that the Qumran community had returned from exile or even the assumption of a protracted exile on which this statement is based. Thus the significance that Wright has overlooked is that this text is the witness of one strand of postbiblical Judaism and that this witness is fully two centuries before Paul. Hence it is hardly a text which testifies to a widespread notion in first century Judaism. It is even less likely that the notion of a return from exile in this text informs our understanding of Paul's citation of Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10.

³⁷So Stanley 1990: 484-485; Matlock: 5; and Bonneau: 61-62.

³⁸For further details, see pp. 183-184 below.

³⁹Scott 1993a: 188-194.

⁴⁰See also idem 1993b: 645-665.

⁴¹idem 1993a: 195.

⁴²idem: 197. The parenthetical note is mine.

Moreover, Deuteronomy itself assumed that Israel would break the covenant and would be sent into exile.⁴³ Israel's prophets envisaged a day when Israel would be regathered and restored to the land, but this hope, according to Scott, was never realized.⁴⁴ As a result of this tension between expectation and reality, he argues that:

Thus the hopes of final restoration continued to be postponed throughout the Second Temple period and beyond...In the meantime, Israel was to remain under the curse of the law which had sent her into exile in the first place.⁴⁵

With this biblical context in view, Scott attempts to trace a Deuteronomistic perspective which thought that Israel as a whole continued in exile in the various literature of the Second Temple period.⁴⁶ However, although Scott's examples clearly point to the importance of the well established pattern of Sin-Exile-Restoration in postbiblical Judaism, it is not quite as clear that these point to a continuation of the exile and that Jews in this period thought that they were under a curse. While it may be true that, in particular, Diaspora Jews lived in anticipation of the day when they would be completely

⁴³idem: 196.

⁴⁴idem, 197-198. Scott cites Neusner 1990 in support of his argument. Neusner's thesis, however, does not support such a conclusion. Although Neusner does point toward the tension between the expected restoration in the Torah and the historical reality in the postbiblical period, this does not lead him to conclude that all Jews thought that the exile continued in their day. Instead, the experience of exile and return functions as a paradigm for what it means to be a Jew, even for those in the sixth century B.C.E. who did not experience exile from the land and restoration to it. Cf. Neusner 1990: xiii, xv, 10-11, and 32-61 (esp. 58-61). This, however, is a significantly different statement from Scott's suggestion (as also that of Wright's above and Thielman's below) that Jews continued under the curse of the exile in the Second Temple Period. If Neusner is correct, then those scholars who point to the pattern of sin, exile and return and suggest that Paul and most other Jews in the Second Temple period thought that Israel continued under the curse have misunderstood Paul's use of this well established, highly significant, and extensively influential motif in Second Temple Judaism. In at least one passage in his extant writings, Paul provides evidence that he understood the significance of Israel's history for his own readers in this manner. See I Cor 10.1-13 where Paul twice refers to Israel's history as an example or pattern for his present day readers (10.6: τύπος; 10.11: τυπικώς), which functions as a warning for them not to emulate Israel's behavior in several specific examples. In this connection see also Rom 15.4.

⁴⁵Scott 1993a: 198-199. Cf. also idem 1993b: 649.

⁴⁶idem 1993a: 198-213

restored to the land, this does not mean that all Jews thought that they were still under the curse which fell upon Israel in 586 B.C.E. and resulted in the exile.⁴⁷ The question is whether or not there is any evidence that Jews living in Palestine thought that they themselves were still under the curse. It is far from certain what value Scott's argument has for our understanding Paul's train of thought because it does not explain why Paul viewed the law as no longer necessary for believers in Christ (cf. Gal 3.23-29).⁴⁸ Even if the exile continued into the Second Temple period, this argument does not explain why faith in Christ, and not faithfulness to the Torah as would be the case in every form of Judaism in this period, was the necessary precursor for the promised restoration.⁴⁹ Thus in spite of Scott's attempt to demonstrate Paul's continuity with his Jewish heritage, he fails to account for the central role the law played in Judaism, especially against the backdrop of Israel's exile in 586 B.C.E. Hence, Scott's own caveat must be kept in view:

...from the perspective of the Old Testament, the curses of Deuteronomy had befallen the people of Israel in the past. Of course, it would be a quantum leap from recognizing this basic fact to saying, as Gal 3.10 does, that the curses of Deuteronomy applied to the people in Paul's day.⁵⁰

⁴⁷Cf. Ackroyd: 240-243. Ackroyd argues on the basis of the number of texts in the exilic and postexilic literature which link the length of the exile with the idea of an enforced Sabbath observance that although the idea that Israel was punished and sent into exile because of her sin is present in these texts, the emphasis, especially concerning the length of time in which Israel was in exile, lies rather on God's promise of restoration and the necessity of this rest for the land for the restored community after the exile ends. Thus Ackroyd 1968: 242 writes that "...the experience of exile *as such* has become the symbol of a period, viewed in terms of punishment but also in terms of promise"

⁴⁸In spite of his criticism of Thielman's position (Cf. Scott 1993a: 194), Scott 1993a: 215 appears to come to a similar conclusion: "the law did not bring the Spirit, but rather a long-term curse on Israel." According to Scott Paul's problem with the law is that it only brought a curse, and indeed a protracted one, on Israel and thus must be abandoned in the new covenant.

⁴⁹Throughout the exilic, post-exilic, and postbiblical period the dominant concern for Jews was faithfulness to the law and this was intensified when it was juxtaposed against Israel's covenant failure which led to the exile. Many strands of Jewish literature from this period describe the concern to keep the law faithfully, and this desire was fueled primarily by the desire not to repeat the exile.

⁵⁰Scott 1993a: 194.

Scott has not demonstrated that Paul has indeed made such a quantum leap.⁵¹

F. Thielman's contribution to the debate concerning Paul's view of the Law in general and to the interpretation of Gal 3.10 in particular is that Paul argued from plight to solution, rather than from solution to plight.⁵² Thielman's interpretation attempts to correct a common failure of all previous attempts to understand Paul's citation of Deut 27.26: the failure to appreciate the contribution "...of exploring the Old Testament context of Paul's quotation for insight into his meaning."⁵³ This context, Thielman argues, supplies clear evidence that the curses of Deut 28 had already occurred,⁵⁴ and thus

The context of Deut. 27.26, viewed from Paul's vantage, would have provided ample evidence that *the covenant could not be kept* and that those *ὑπὸ νόμου* (v. 23) were under a curse.⁵⁵

This understanding of Israel's history, according to Thielman, was widely held in Second Temple Judaism.⁵⁶ The noncontroversial assumption within Judaism was that "...the attempt to keep the law—to do its 'works'—in Israel's history had only led to failure and to the curse which the law pronounces on those who fail to do it."⁵⁷ Thielman's argument with respect to the common assumption in Judaism is similar to Wright's and Scott's argument and thus the criticisms detailed above would also apply to Thielman's thesis. However, Thielman goes beyond Wright and Scott with his argument that the law could not be kept and hence his thesis is a carefully nuanced version of the traditional

⁵¹For a more carefully nuanced treatment of the diversity of Second Temple Judaism, see Talmon: 16-43. For a balanced assessment of diaspora Judaism, see Collins 1983.

⁵²Thielman 1989 and *idem* 1994. Thielman's thesis directly confronts Sanders 1977. After he has argued that the pattern of movement from plight to solution is common in ancient Judaism, Thielman applies the insight from this study to the attempt to trace the same pattern in Galatians and Romans.

⁵³Thielman 1989: 68. He points to the widespread criticism of Noth 1966 on this text as the cause of this failure.

⁵⁴Thielman 1989: 68.

⁵⁵*ibid.* Emphasis is mine.

⁵⁶*idem*: 69; and *idem* 1994: 127.

⁵⁷*idem* 1989: 69. Cf. also *idem*: 71.

interpretation.⁵⁸ However, Israel's failure to obey the law prior to the exile did not cause it to be abrogated in the time of Israel's restoration either in Israel's prophetic tradition⁵⁹ or in Deuteronomy itself. In Deut 30.1-10 Israel's restoration from exile would lead to obedience to the law, especially with respect to all the commandments (Cf. 30.2: **אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי מְצַוְךָ** / κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι; and also 30.8: **אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי מְצַוְךָ** / τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ὅσας ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι).⁶⁰ Thus Thielman's argument that to come under the law is to be identified with Israel's plight, rather than the solution to that plight, in Jesus Christ is suspect. The historical fact that Israel failed to obey the law and consequently was sent into exile does not mean that the law itself was problematic and had to be jettisoned in the new covenant community. For Paul in Gal 3 the law is no longer the means of defining God's people because that was God's purpose from the first, not because Israel failed to keep it. Moreover, Paul's problem with the law in Galatians is that gentiles are being compelled to submit to the law in order to belong to the people of God, not that the law itself could not be fulfilled.

J. Braswell has argued that ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν refers to the Jewish people as a whole and that this phrase is not, in itself, a polemical statement.⁶¹ Instead, according to Braswell it refers to the fact that Jews lived under the

⁵⁸See especially idem 1994: 275-276. Thielman returns to the traditional interpretation with two important modifications. First, he stresses the redemptive-historical perspective in which Israel's failure in the past to do the law forms the ground for Paul's argument in his letter to the Galatians. Paul's argument in Gal 3.10 is then that since Israel failed to do the law, the Galatians must not attempt to do the law because they would merely share Israel's fate. Second, Thielman's argument that this covenant perspective was common in Paul's day implies that although repentance and atonement were available, Judaism recognized that everyone would violate the covenant and thus fall under its curse.

⁵⁹See esp. Jer 31.27-34.

⁶⁰It is important to note the omission of **נָא** in the LXX of 30.8. The law Moses gave to Israel is the one which would be kept in the restoration. Thus Thielman's thesis founders here because in spite of his attempt to read Paul's use of Deut 27.26 within the context of Deuteronomy, he fails to account for the fact that Deuteronomy envisages a day in Israel's restoration when the law would be kept. Hence Israel's failure to keep the law did not call the law's goodness or its positive role in Israel's history into question.

⁶¹Braswell: 73-91.

Torah. This had been true for Israel throughout her history and continued into postbiblical Judaism. According to Braswell, the phrase ἐξ ἔργων νόμου merely denotes that all Jews live under the threat of a curse due to their covenant relationship with the Lord. Braswell thus suggests that this phrase is the "...quite uncontroversial, and readily granted proposition that the ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (Jewish people) are under the *torah*."⁶² Braswell continues that Paul included this view in his argument because

Being "under a curse" therefore refers...to the situation of living with the real and abiding possibility of becoming accursed.⁶³

For Paul, therefore, the problem with the law is that it threatens a curse for those who live under its jurisdiction. Accordingly, the focus of Paul's argument in Gal 3.10 is that the gospel is to be preferred because it promises blessing whereas the law merely threatens a curse.

Several considerations serve to place a question mark next to this suggested interpretation, however. First, in Deuteronomy, the law was not too difficult and obedience would result in blessing,⁶⁴ not a curse (Deut. 30. 10-20). If the law threatens a curse as it certainly did, then it also "threatens" a blessing for obedience, and this blessing was a real possibility (Deut. 28. 1-14). Second, the prophetic hope for the restoration of Israel included renewed obedience to the law. This is especially clear in Jer 31.27-34, where we read that when Israel was restored the Lord would write the law on the hearts of the people and they would obey him. The threat of a curse within the law did not cause it to be abrogated in the time of Israel's restoration. Third, those who preached another gospel were under a curse, as was evidenced by Paul's twice repeated ἀνάθεμα in Gal 1.8-9 (Cf. also I Cor 16.22). Hence both the law and the gospel threaten a curse on

⁶²idem: 76. Italics are the author's. Braswell does state that this thesis is for Paul "...provocative and controversial..." (idem: 77).

⁶³ibid.

⁶⁴Segal: 119.

those who are disloyal. Paul's problem with the law in Gal 3.10 is not that it threatens a curse. This thesis, therefore, fails to account for the fact that Paul thought that to preach another gospel would lead to a curse (Gal 1.8-9) and for the fact that obedience to the law and its concomitant blessing was a viable option from the perspective of Deuteronomy (Deut 30. 11-14).

A challenge to the traditional interpretation has come from C. Stanley⁶⁵ who has argued that Paul's argument against works of the law in Gal 3.10 must be viewed within the framework of a rhetorical/reader response approach to the text and against the backdrop of the threat of a curse in the law itself, especially in the Deuteronomic code. Stanley thinks that Paul's principal problem with the law in this text is the threat of a curse and he includes it as a warning to the Galatians:

Anyone who chooses to abide by the Jewish Torah in order to secure participation in Abraham's blessing is placed in a situation where he or she is threatened instead with a 'curse', since the law itself pronounces a curse on anyone who fails to live up to every single one of its requirements.⁶⁶

Hence Paul mentions this threat of a curse in order to dissuade the Galatians from placing themselves under it. Stanley's interpretation thus is similar to Braswell's in its stress on Paul's objection to the Galatians acceptance of the law due to the threat of a curse for those who are under it,⁶⁷ and the objections mentioned above would also apply to Stanley's thesis. However, Stanley's thesis differs from Braswell's in that the intended reference in 3.10 is the Galatians, if they place themselves under the law, not Jews who as a group are under the law. Our study will help to confirm Stanley's thesis that ὅσοι ἐξ

⁶⁵Stanley 1990: 481-511.

⁶⁶idem: 500. Stanley appears to come back to the traditional view when he refers to failure to live up to every single requirement of the law. So also Bonneau: 73; Young 1998: 86-88; and Williams 1997: 89-90.

⁶⁷Thus both Stanley's and Braswell's interpretation focus our attention on the threat of a curse in the law itself and suggest that Paul's argument against the law in Gal 3.10 is directed at this threat of a curse on God's people.

ἔργων νόμου does not refer to Judaism as a whole, but rather it is more narrowly focused. However, we will argue that the primary focus of Paul's argument in Gal 3.10 is against the troublemakers who have intruded into the Galatian churches and who have preached another gospel to them which compelled them to accept circumcision.⁶⁸

Another contribution to the debate on Paul's understanding of and relationship with the Law comes from D. Boyarin, a Talmudic scholar.⁶⁹ His central thesis is that Paul employed a dualistic hermeneutic which understood that the historic, fleshly Israel prefigured in a positive way the present, spiritual church. The result of this hermeneutic in Gal 3.10 is that it permitted Paul to assert that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου do not uphold the whole law and thus are under its curse. This hermeneutic provided Paul with the key "...to the theological problem which troubled him most..."⁷⁰, even before his Damascus road encounter with the Risen Christ⁷¹: "How do the rest of the people in God's world fit into the plan of salvation revealed to the Jews through their Torah?"⁷² With this interpretive framework in place, Boyarin interacts extensively with Galatians and devotes considerable space to answer the charge that Gal 3.10 reveals that Paul was anti-semitic. His suggestion is that Paul employed a midrashic form of interpretation which was similar to a method found in rabbinic literature⁷³ in order to assert that in Paul's view those who do the law (i.e. ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου) are under a curse because they are "...not

⁶⁸The curse of the law on ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου thus is a present reality for the troublemakers. Gal 3.10 would also serve as a warning to the Galatians themselves if they become ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, but this is a secondary application of Paul's argument here.

⁶⁹His monograph is focused especially on Galatians (Boyarin: 4).

⁷⁰idem: 85.

⁷¹idem: 39-56.

⁷²idem: 85. Boyarin has certainly pointed to the central question with which Gal 3 is engaged, but his assumption that the driving force behind Paul's answer is a combination of Hellenistic and Jewish influences such that the central concern for him was the universal oneness of humanity without distinction is doubtful. For Paul himself never allowed himself to be absorbed into a universal humanity, but remained self-consciously a Jew who could even boast of his accomplishments, if necessary. Paul's vision was of a church in which unity was maintained through participation in Christ of very diverse members.

⁷³idem: 140.

upholding all that which is written in the book of the law...because 'all that is written' implies much more than mere doing!"⁷⁴ Boyarin is correct in this interpretation, but he has failed to identify how in Paul's view one has failed to do all that the law required. The present study will argue that Boyarin has the question exactly right, but that the answer for Paul comes from the Torah itself in its promise to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants. In Paul's argument he has linked closely the promise to bless the nations and the curse of the law on those who have violated the covenant. This for Paul is not an allegorical interpretation of scripture⁷⁵ which has been influenced by Hellenism, but rather the end for which God's plan and promise had aimed all along.

B. McLean has argued that Paul's concept of a Christ who was under a curse is best informed by an understanding of expulsion rituals in the ancient world. Within the context of his discussion of Gal 3.13, McLean devotes considerable attention to Paul's statement in 3.10a and his citation of scripture in 3.10b. McLean argues that "in Paul's mind, Christians who continue to observe the law (and thereby retain loyalty to the old creation) are 'under a curse.'"⁷⁶ This statement was intended primarily for "...the Galatian compromisers and those who listen to them."⁷⁷ McLean appears to vacillate between two solutions to this difficult text. On the one hand, he argues that Deut 27.26 is an indictment of the compromisers and their gospel because they preached a selective observance of the law, and thus they do not keep the whole law. Hence, McLean concludes that "...the transgression of but a single ordinance leads to bearing a curse."⁷⁸ This can hardly have been Paul's intention, however. If Paul's problem with the troublemakers' gospel was that it was selective and thus would inevitably have led to a

⁷⁴idem: 139-140.

⁷⁵Fowl 1996: 77-95 also argues for an allegorical interpretation of Gal 3-4.

⁷⁶McLean: 119.

⁷⁷ibid.

⁷⁸idem: 122. In this statement McLean appears to argue in a way similar to the traditional interpretation.

curse for failure to obey the whole law, the answer to this problem would be an exhortation to come under and keep the whole law. On the other hand, McLean argues that even if one were able to keep the whole law, one would be under a curse because it belongs to the old creation.⁷⁹ McLean's study which points toward the need for loyalty to the new creation and which suggests that Paul pronounced a curse on those who retained loyalty to the old creation is very helpful.⁸⁰ However, his explanation of how one comes under a curse (i. e. because one is associated with the old creation) fails to account sufficiently for Paul's use of scripture both in Gal 3.8 and in 3.10, and we are left with a Paul who has arbitrarily shifted from the old creation (i.e. Judaism) to the new creation (i.e. Christianity).⁸¹

N. Bonneau has argued that Gal 3.10 must be interpreted within the flow of the argument of Galatians itself and the situation which the Galatians faced.⁸² He argues further that the reference to ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is not aimed at Judaism as a whole, but is more restricted.⁸³ According to Bonneau, the non-acceptance of Gentiles represents a faulty interpretation of the gospel.⁸⁴ To maintain a distinction between Jews and gentiles "...is tantamount to saying that Christ has not been raised, that the Age to Come

⁷⁹idem: 123. See also idem: 122, n. 50.

⁸⁰E.g. idem: 122, n. 50: "Since loyalty to the law is the same as loyalty to the old unredeemed order, it offers not a blessing but a curse."

⁸¹McLean thus shares much in common with Sanders (see above). See idem: 113-119. An arbitrary shift on Paul's part is not impossible or to be ruled out in principle, of course, but our argument in this thesis will seek to demonstrate that Paul viewed his gospel and his ministry in continuity with Judaism's heritage. To this end we will argue that a necessary first step is to study the texts Paul cited in order to place him within the interpretive context of his time. Once this is done, Paul's argument may be more closely linked to Second Temple Judaism with respect to the significance of the gospel of Jesus Christ for the Lord's covenant purpose for his people and the significance of the curse of the covenant on those who violate the terms of the covenant. To be sure, Paul's argument most probably would not have convinced many Jews who lived in this period, but his argument would have made sense within the context of the sectarian debates which are so characteristic of this period in Jewish history.

⁸²Bonneau: 60, and 80.

⁸³idem: 73.

⁸⁴idem: 64.

has not been inaugurated, that the power of sin still reigns."⁸⁵ Bonneau's work is helpful in its attempt to interpret Gal 3.10 within the train of thought of the whole letter. However, his argument does not given sufficient weight to the importance of blessing for the nations as a key part of the context of Gal 3.10, and he does not attempt to interpret Paul's use of Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10b within the context of scripture. And his conclusion that for the Galatians to accept circumcision would place them in an impossible dilemma⁸⁶ because if they obeyed the law they would separate from gentiles, but if they fellowshipped with gentiles they would break the law. The former would mean "counterwitnessing to the truth of Jesus Christ"⁸⁷, and the latter would mean violating the law itself. According to Bonneau, "the curse of the law, then is the fear of transgressing the law that those who espouse the other gospel ... logically, but erroneously, think hangs over them."⁸⁸ But for Paul in Galatians, it is the acceptance of the other gospel which results in the curse (1.6-9) and the curse is a realized state which means exclusion from the community.⁸⁹

D. Garlington has recently argued that Gal 3.10 must be understood within the context of the categories of apostasy and perseverance and also within the context of Gal 2.18 in which Paul identifies the troublemakers as transgressors of the covenant.⁹⁰ His contribution to the debate is helpful because it has correctly identified idolatry and apostasy as main themes of Deuteronomy to which Paul refers in his citation of scripture in Gal 3.10-13.⁹¹ The present study shares a similar interpretive perspective. Within the confines of the limits of his article, his focus is however necessarily restricted to the

⁸⁵idem: 69.

⁸⁶idem: 74-75. Braswell: 79 comes to a similar conclusion from a different line of argument.

⁸⁷Bonneau: 80.

⁸⁸idem: 77-78.

⁸⁹Hence, the criticisms above with respect to Braswell and Stanley apply here.

⁹⁰Garlington 1997: 85-121.

⁹¹idem: 95-106.

interpretation of Gal 3.10 in the light of 2.15-21. Hence he does not attempt to provide a detailed examination of the scriptural and postbiblical context for the curse, to which the present study is devoted in part. Moreover, Garlington does not devote much attention to the importance of the promise to Abraham within the argument⁹² so that the important juxtaposition of blessing for the nations and the curse of the law is not discussed. Furthermore, Garlington appears to be sympathetic with the thesis of Wright and Scott,⁹³ which we have suggested above is doubtful.⁹⁴ Hence, although Garlington's contribution is very helpful, it does not address the task of this thesis which is an interpretation of blessing for the nations and the curse of the law in Gal 3.8 and 3.10 within the context of scripture and against the backdrop of the use of these traditions in postbiblical Judaism.

III. The purpose of this Thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to examine Paul's use of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10 against the backdrop of the Jewish scripture and within the context of the literature of Second Temple Judaism. As we have briefly surveyed above, the interpretation of Gal 3.10 has been a hotly contested in recent years. And although we argued above that the idea that Paul's statement in Gal 3.10 is best explained by the suggestion that Israel's continued existence under the curse of the exile was a common assumption in the first century is doubtful, the claim that the curse of the law in Gal 3.10 must be understood within the context of Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord is

⁹²Only a brief mention on p. 94. To be sure, Garlington emphasizes the importance of faith in Christ as the focal point for covenant loyalty, but he does not explicitly link this with the promise in Gal 3.8, and he does not emphasize clearly that the gospel is God's covenant purpose from the start (cf. e.g. *idem*: 112).

⁹³*idem*: 86-87, 109, 116-177.

⁹⁴Garlington never makes clear how his interpretation, which is a sharply polemical statement for Paul, is compatible with the attempt for a non-polemical interpretation by Wright and Scott.

certainly headed in the right direction.⁹⁵ Moreover, if the covenant between Yahweh and Israel as it is explicated in Deuteronomy provides the necessary framework within which to understand Paul's argument in Gal 3.10, then we must address a simple question, and in view of the controversy surrounding Gal 3.10, it is surprising that it has not been addressed before. Is it possible, then, to define more precisely what it meant in Deuteronomy to fail to live within all that the Lord had commanded Israel and thereby fail to remain faithful to the covenant? What did not doing all that the Lord commanded mean? It is to these questions that this thesis is principally addressed as we seek to demonstrate the connecting links in the flow of thought both between 3.10a and 3.10b and between 3.10 and 3.8.⁹⁶ This thesis will demonstrate that the relationship between the gospel of Jesus Christ in 3.8 and the curse of the law on those who fail to remain within the law in 3.10 is crucial to Paul's train of thought both from 3.8 to 3.10 and from 3.10a to 3.10b.

This thesis has several ancillary purposes. First, we will explore the crucial role that the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants played in Paul's thought. The promise to Abraham in Genesis had three primary strands: land, descendants, and blessing for the nations. Israel's covenant and the law through which she expressed loyalty to the Lord had formerly excluded gentiles from participation in the life of the covenant people in order to protect the people of God from their corrupting influence. Hence in Israel's history the law rightly inhibited the fulfillment of the third strand of the promise. But the law itself also testified concerning the day when blessing would be extended to the gentiles. In Paul's argument this promise plays an important role in God's covenant purpose for his people. Gentiles who were formerly excluded are

⁹⁵Much of the recent effort to understand Paul here has occurred within the context of Judaism's concept of a covenant relationship with the Lord. However, several have attempted to demonstrate that Paul was influenced by magical traditions. See Betz: 52-54, 144-146; and Dewey: 27-41.

⁹⁶The former is typically the focus of recent scholarship, the latter has rarely been given proper weight in the interpretation of Gal 3.10.

now included based on faith in Christ, not works of the law.⁹⁷ This for Paul becomes the primary basis upon which covenant loyalty is expressed in the churches he founded.

Second, the curse of the law in Gal 3.10 is often referred to in the context of the punishment of sin, either on the individual or corporate level. However, this thesis will argue that the primary role of the curse is to exclude polluting influences in order to protect the community from harm, especially the danger posed by those who would lead the people of God away from the Lord and into apostasy. This is true especially with respect to an individual or a small group; the curse functions to separate the corrupting influence from the community as a whole. But this function is also evident in the curse of the exile in which the nation was sent into exile in order to purify it for the promised restoration to the land.⁹⁸ This protective function of the curse is rarely mentioned, and we will explore its implications for the interpretation of Paul's use of Deuteronomy in Galatians.

Third, another of the aims of this study is to allow Paul's Jewish heritage to be appreciated more fully in the interpretation of Galatians. Although Paul's Damascus road experience was certainly a crucial turning point in his life, he remained nevertheless a Jew who thought that his own ministry was an extension of the first century Judaism of which he was a part.⁹⁹ D. Boyarin has stressed this point:

...I would like to reclaim Paul as an important Jewish thinker. On my reading of the Pauline corpus, Paul lived and died convinced that he was a Jew living out Judaism. He represents, then, one option which Judaism could take in the first century.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷On the meaning of this phrase in Galatians, see pp. 181, n. 8 below.

⁹⁸It may be significant that in the Babylonian exile the whole nation was not, in fact, removed from the land, but rather the leadership, which led the nation into apostasy, was sent into exile. Thus even in the exile the corrupting influence was removed from the land and from the majority who remained in the land.

⁹⁹Cf. Kuschel: 78; Dunn 1993b: 36-41; and Segal: 6-7, 12. For a discussion of points of continuity and discontinuity between Paul's gospel and his Jewish heritage, see Barclay 1988: 96-105; Gaventa: 156-159; and Dunn 1994: 367-388.

¹⁰⁰Boyarin: 2.

Whatever the relative strengths and weaknesses of Boyarin's work, he is certainly correct on this point. This thesis will argue that Paul thought that in his ministry as an apostle to the gentiles he remained a faithful Jew in continuity with his Jewish heritage.

And fourth, within the context of Paul's heritage as a Jew, one of the principal contributions that the present study may make to the history of the interpretation of this text and by extension of Paul's understanding of the law in his letter to the Galatians is the importance of Jewish monotheism¹⁰¹ and its concomitant categories of expression and its polemical edge for our understanding Paul's argument in Galatians. We will argue that this foundation for Second Temple Judaism supplies the basis for our understanding Paul's argument in Gal 3.10 and that Paul's use of Deuteronomy in particular points in this direction. We may thus ask if it is possible that the apostasy of Deuteronomy, which is designated as failure to do all that the law requires, has influenced Paul's argument in Galatians, especially with respect to those who preach another gospel in Galatia (1.8-9) and those who are of works of the Law (3.10).

IV. The organization of this thesis.

The thesis will be organized into three parts. Part One will seek to place Paul's use of Gen 12.3/18.18 and Deut 27.26 into the context of the Jewish scripture¹⁰² Chapter two will be devoted to the examination of the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's seed which Paul cited in 3.8. Chapter three will examine the various terms

¹⁰¹On the importance of Jewish monotheism, cf. Sanders 1992: 242-247; Dunn 1991b: 19-21; and Wright 1992b: 244-259. The central role monotheism played in Jewish thought in this period is widely acknowledged. Many strands of evidence point to the conclusion that some Jews in this period thought of themselves as guardians of their monotheistic traditions.

¹⁰²Since the Jewish scripture functioned as the theological soil from which all Jewish literature in this period grew, we will first trace the interpretive contexts of the two texts Paul cited before we turn to examine how these biblical traditions were employed in the Second Temple period.

for curse in the Jewish scripture, and we will argue that they are regularly linked with idolatry and the failure to do all the law.

Part Two will focus on the use of the Gen 12.3/18.18 and Deut 27.26 in the various strands of postbiblical Jewish literature.¹⁰³ Chapter four will examine the third strand in the promise to Abraham in the postbiblical literature. The various ways in which this promise to Abraham is interpreted in the Second Temple period will be explored. Chapter five will argue that the perspective traced in chapter three that the covenant demands exclusive loyalty to the Lord alone and the curse of the covenant falls on anyone who violates the covenant by turning to other gods is widespread in the Second Temple period.

Part Three will apply the results of the first two parts to an exegesis of Gal 3.8 and 3.10. Chapter six will examine Paul's use of Gen 12.3/18.18 in his argument in the letter to the Galatians within the context traced above. Chapter seven will offer a similar examination of Paul's use of Deut 27.26. Chapter eight will argue that the juxtaposition of the motifs of the lack of faithfulness to Paul's gospel and the curse occur elsewhere in Galatians and that these occurrences impact the interpretation of Gal 3.10.

¹⁰³Our purpose is not to point to parallels with Paul's thought which possibly or probably influenced him, but rather to sketch the broad interpretive context within which Paul lived. The promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is well represented in this period, but there are also several important omissions. We will then turn our attention to the Jewish literature of the postbiblical period which also provides evidence that the curse of the covenant is understood within the framework of the Deuteronomistic tradition. If this last task is successful, we will have demonstrated that a Deuteronomistic understanding of the curse of the covenant which falls upon those who do not remain within everything written in the book of the law is widespread in the first century of the common era. If a consistent pattern is discernable, then we will have a useful historical context within which to compare and contrast Paul's use of scripture.

Part One

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Covenant in the Jewish Scripture

Chapter Two

Blessing for the Nations in Genesis and elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture.

I. Introduction

In the history of the interpretation of Paul's use of God's promise to bless¹ the nations in Gal 3.8, scholars have thus far not fully appreciated the function of this promise within the argument of the letter. It is the task of this chapter to examine the scriptural context in which the promise to Abraham occurs.² We will confirm what is commonly recognized, that the promise contains three primary strands (i.e. land, descendants, and blessing for the nations³) and that this third strand which promised blessing for the nations is a key aspect of God's promise to Abraham in the patriarchal narrative.⁴ We will also point to the significance of the rare occurrences of this third strand outside the patriarchal narrative, especially with respect to its occurrence in connection with messianic and restoration motifs. This brief examination will establish the context within which any discussion of Paul's use of this scripture must function, and it will fill out the common background against which every Jewish author in this period who cited the third strand must be placed.

¹On the history of "blessing" and its significance in the Jewish scripture, see Westermann 1978; Wehmeier; and Mitchell.

²The various aspects of the promise in the Jewish scripture are consistently presented as blessings from God, and are passed on to successive generations by means of God's renewed promise. Cf. Mitchell: 29-36.

³Cf. eg. Alexander: 9-10; Clements: 15; and Kuschel: 17-23.

⁴Other aspects of the promise to Abraham are that he would be a great nation (12.2; 18.18), that his name would be great (12.2), that he would receive blessing (12.2; 22.17), that he would be a blessing (12.2-3), that he would father a multitude of nations (17.4-5), that the Lord would be God to Abraham and his descendants (17.7, 22), and that his descendants would possess the gates of their enemies (22.17). Moreover, although the promise to be with Isaac (26.3, 24) and to be with and protect Jacob (28.15) are not part of the promise to Abraham, they are clearly linked with it through the repetition of aspects of that promise.

II. The Promise in the Patriarchal Narrative

To make the observation that Paul cited Gen 12.3/18.18 in Gal 3.8 may be merely to state the obvious.⁵ However, the important place that the promise⁶ to bless the nations through Abraham and his seed occupies within the Genesis narrative has not been adequately traced and appreciated by modern scholars who have attempted to follow Paul's argument in Gal 3.⁷ The present study thus will briefly survey the first two strands of the promise to Abraham: the land and the multiplication of descendants. Then the five occurrences in Genesis of the third strand of the promise that all nations would be blessed through Abraham's descendants will be examined.

A. The Promise of Land and the Promise of Descendants in the Patriarchal Narrative

The promise of land⁸ to Abraham is, of course, a dominant strand in the patriarchal narrative⁹:

Within the covenantal context the Land promise may appear without direct reference to the promises of special blessings and/or peoplehood.

⁵Two monographs have been published recently which detail Paul's citation of scripture, and they discuss Paul's use of Gen 12.3 in Gal 3.8. Cf. Koch: 162-163; and Stanley 1992: 236-238.

⁶The patriarchal narrative never employed the term 'promise', the regular term which is often translated 'promise' is נָשָׂא, which the LXX translated with ὑπαίχετο. Cf. Davies 1974: 15; and Cosgrove: 94. On the theological significance of the promise, see Westermann 1980: 119-163.

⁷Hansen 1989: 175-199 has recently traced Abrahamic traditions in Judaism, but his work focuses more on texts which link Abraham with the observance of the law and on texts which demonstrate Abraham's righteousness. Hansen devotes little attention to the motif of the third strand. Cf. also Vermes 1973: 67-126.

⁸On the significance of the land in the patriarchal narrative in particular and in Biblical theology in general, see Westermann 1980; Davies 1974; idem 1982; Turner; Boorer; Brueggemann; Kallai; Orlinsky; Perlitt; Wright 1990; Kuschel: 17-18; and Halpern-Amaru: 8-12.

⁹Cf. Westermann 1980: 143.

Never, however, is the patriarchal covenant presented without some reference to the promise of the Land.¹⁰

This position of dominance continues throughout the Jewish scripture, especially in Deuteronomy.¹¹ In Gen 12.1-3 Abraham is told to go to the land that the Lord would show him, and in 12.7 it is this land (אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן/τὴν γῆν καύτην) that the Lord promised to his descendants (לְזֶרַעךָ/τῶ σπέρματι σου). In 13.14-17 this promise of the land to Abraham's descendants is an eternal gift (13.15: עַד-עוֹלָם/ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος)¹² and is conjoined with the first explicit reference to the repeated image of Abraham's descendants multiplied like the dust of the earth (13.16). In the context of the ratification of the covenant in Gen 15, the promise of the land is repeated twice (15.7, 18).¹³ The promise of the land (אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן/τὴν γῆν) is especially prominent in Gen 17.8 within the context of the establishment of the covenant of circumcision¹⁴ and in the repetition of the various strands of the promise to Isaac (26.3-4: כָּל-אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן/πάσαν τὴν γῆν καύτην)¹⁵ and to Jacob (28.13: אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן/τὴν γῆν).¹⁶ The first strand of the promise to Abraham

¹⁰Halpern-Amaru: 9. This leads her to conclude that although the promise contained "a triad of assurances" (i.e. land, people, and blessing), "within the triad, however, the Land holds a primary position." Halpern-Amaru's thesis, however, fails to account for one exception (Gen 18.18), in which the promise of descendants and blessing for the nations are joined without explicit reference to the promise of land.

¹¹idem: 13.

¹²In 13.17 Abraham is commanded to walk through the whole land because the Lord would give it to him. On the promise to give the land, cf. also 12.7; 15.18; 17.8; 26.3-4; and 28.13.

¹³In 15.7 the land is further qualified as Abraham's possession or inheritance (אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן לְרִשְׁתָּהּ/ἀποδοθήσεται σοι). Significantly, the statement in Gen 15.6 that Abraham believed God and it was credited to him as righteousness, which Paul cited in Gal 3.6, is bracketed by the promise of descendants (15.5) and the promise of the land (15.7).

¹⁴The land is further qualified here as the land of Canaan. It is important to observe that the promise concludes with a statement of the eternal possession of the land (אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן לְרִשְׁתָּהּ/εἰς κατάσχεσιν αἰῶνιον) and the nature of Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh (וְהָיִיתִי לָהֶם לְאֱלֹהִים/καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς θεός).

¹⁵In 26.3 the promise is both to Isaac and his descendants, but in 26.4 the promise is to his descendants.

¹⁶Compare this verse with 28.15, in which the promise appears to be more the safe return of Jacob to the land, rather than the promise of the land to him and his descendants.

is the promise of the land, and this strand is featured continually throughout the patriarchal narrative.

The promise to Abraham that the Lord would multiply his descendants is perhaps equally important to the biblical narrative.¹⁷ Indeed, the promise of land and the promise of descendants are regularly juxtaposed, and they logically cohere. This is clear from 12.7: *אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ אֶתְּהָרָר אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ אֶתְּהָרָר אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ אֶתְּהָרָר* / *τὸ σπέρματί σου δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην*.¹⁸ The promise of descendants functions then as the second strand of the promise to Abraham. The importance of the promise of descendants is clear from Gen 12.2, where we read that the Lord would make Abraham into a great nation (*וְאָנֹכִי אֶעֱשֶׂה לְךָ אֶתְּהָרָר* / *καὶ ποιήσω σε εἰς ἔθνος μέγα*). This element of the promise, which is greatly elaborated elsewhere in the Genesis narrative,¹⁹ refers both to the increase in number and significance of Abraham's descendants.²⁰ Gen 15 describes the covenant the Lord made with Abraham, and this covenant is described exclusively in terms of descendants and especially the land.²¹ The concern with the former is clear in 15.13-14, in which the Lord assured Abraham that although his descendants (*אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ אֶתְּהָרָר* / *τὸ σπέρμα σου*) would be mistreated for 400 years, the Lord would judge the nation that oppressed them and his descendants would be very prosperous. The concern with the latter is clear in 15.18b-20, in which the boundaries of the promised land are delineated. In various texts in the

¹⁷Westermann 1980: 149 draws a distinction between the promise of a son, which he thinks is primary, and the promise of the increase of descendants. For a recent attempt to trace the significance of the promise of nationhood which comes into focus in the promise of an heir through this narrative, see Turner: 61-95. Cf. also Alexander: 10; and Kuschel: 18-19.

¹⁸This statement is repeated with some variation in the precise wording in 13.15; 15.18; 17.8; 26.3-4; and 28.13. On this clause as formulaic, see Westermann 1980: 146.

¹⁹Cf. Gen 12.7; 13.16; 15.5; 17.4-6; 18.18; 22.17; 26.4, 24; 28.14. It is important to note, however, that the promise to increase Abraham's descendants is regularly linked with blessing for the nations (cf. 18.18; 22.17-18; 26.4; 28.14). Paul makes this same link in Gal 3.

²⁰Sarna: 89. Gen 12.2 also states that the Lord will bless Abraham, and he will increase or make great his name. Cf. also Westermann 1980: 152-153, who draws our attention to the observation that the promise of increase of descendants is often linked with the promise of blessing.

²¹Westermann 1980: 143-144.

patriarchal narrative the promise of the increase of descendants is quite often compared to the vast number of stars (15.5; 22.17; and 26.4), the limitless grains of sand on the seashore (22.17), or the countless dust of the earth (13.16; and 28.14).²² One text describes the many descendants of Abraham as spreading out to the four corners of the earth (28.14). The promise of many descendants is obviously a key feature of the promise to Abraham, and this strand of the promise is often linked with another dominant strand: the promise of the land. Together they function as two major strands of the promise in the patriarchal narrative.

B. The Promise of Blessing for the Nations in the Patriarchal Narrative

The third strand of the promise to Abraham is that all the families (or nations) of the earth will be blessed²³ through Abraham.

1. Gen 12.3b

This promise to Abraham is first expressed in Gen 12.3b:

וּנְבָרְכֻךָ בְּכָל מִשְׁפַּחַת הָאָדָמָה

"All the families of the earth will be blessed²⁴ in you."

²²idem: 151.

²³The third strand is part of a larger motif of blessing, which is dominant in Genesis. Cf. Mitchell: 29-78, 165-167.

²⁴נְבָרְכֻךָ may alternatively be translated 'will bless themselves.' This is not a crucial point for our investigation, however, because every ancient version in the Second Temple period, including the LXX which Paul cited, took the verb as a passive. However, even in Hebrew the niph'al usually functions as the simple passive. See Weingreen: 100. On this translation issue in the text see Ellington; Alexander: 13; Mitchell: 31-33; Allis; Turner: 55-57; Sarna: 89; Cassuto: 315; Thuruthumaly: 19-20; Westermann 1985: 151-152; idem 1980: 157-159; and von Rad 1961: 155-156.

The LXX translation is:

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.

"And all the tribes of the earth will be blessed in you."

This promise follows the Lord's command that Abraham leave his homeland and go to the land the Lord would show him. In Gen 12.1-3 it is perhaps the last expression, the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants, which is the dominant concern of the narrative: blessing for others.²⁵ To be sure, the promise of increased posterity is an important part of the promise, but it will be given special emphasis and will be further clarified later in the narrative. The promise of land, moreover, is only implicit in the narrative,²⁶ although it quickly becomes explicit in 12.7. But as important as the promise of the land and descendants is, the promise of blessing for all the families of the earth is the dominant motif in Gen 12.1-3.²⁷

The importance of this strand of the promise to Abraham is highlighted by the two clauses which precede it. First, the Lord declares that Abraham will be a blessing.²⁸ The assertion that Abram will be a blessing (וְיִרְיֶה בְרַכָּה) is translated in the LXX with a predicate adjective (ἔσῃ εὐλογητός) instead of a predicate nominative (ἔσῃ εὐλογία).²⁹

²⁵Westermann 1980: 156; Kuschel: 20; and Alexander: 12.

²⁶Scholars have noted that the text does not promise the land here, but merely states that the Lord intended to show the land to Abraham. See the discussion in Turner: 58-60. On the significance of the expression לָךְ-לָךְ, see Cassuto: 309-311. It is significant that although Abraham is commanded to leave his homeland and his father's house, the text explicitly states that these 'promises' will be the result of the effort of the Lord (וְאֵנִי/καὶ ποιήσω σε), not Abraham. Alexander: 12-13, on the other hand, thinks that the fulfillment of the promises are "...conditional upon Abraham's obedience."

²⁷Alexander: 13. However, blessing and the curse are firmly linked in this text.

²⁸On Abraham as a source of blessing here, see Mitchell: 30.

²⁹The LXX translation thus significantly shifts the focus from the statement that Abraham will be a blessing, presumably for others, to the statement that he will be blessed or praised. Hence the LXX shifts the meaning of the text so that Abraham becomes the object of blessing. The targums are divided on this translation issue. Tg. Neof. has a reading similar to the MT ("you will be blessings"). Both Tg. Onq. and Tg. Ps.-J., however, agree with the LXX. Cf. McNamara: 86; Aberbach: 78; and Maher: 52. Translations in this chapter are taken from these editions unless otherwise indicated. Although the targums

Some scholars understand this promise to refer to Abraham becoming the standard of blessing³⁰ or an example of blessing.³¹ However, the most natural reading of this text may be that because Abraham has been blessed (12.2: מְבָרַכְךָ /εὐλογήσω σε), he will become a means of extending blessing to others.³² Second, the text states that blessing or cursing from God is based on whether one blesses or curses Abraham (12.3a).³³ G. von Rad notes that מְבָרַכְךָ is singular and מְבָרַכְיָךְ is plural.³⁴ The implication of this observation is that the narrator may have expected that many would bless Abraham and thus be blessed, but less prominently only few would curse him and be cursed.³⁵ Thus von Rad writes that "the thought of judgment...is here almost overarched by the words of blessing" and that God is viewed "...as a source of universal blessing."³⁶

It is therefore likely that the dominant pattern in the various elements of the promise recorded in Gen 12.2-3 is blessing for others:

God's promises to Abram would then proceed in three stages from the particular to the universal: a blessing on Abram personally, a blessing (or curse) on those with whom he interacts, a blessing on the entire human race.³⁷

were composed in their present form after the New Testament period, they are included in the present survey for three reasons. First, the evidence from the targums provides us with a clearer picture of the trajectories of these traditions. Second, many of the interpretive traditions embedded within the targums may go back to the first century C. E. And third, Paul provides us with evidence that he may have known and used targumic traditions of Genesis (e.g. Gal 4.21-31).

³⁰Sarna: 89.

³¹Cassuto: 314.

³²So Westermann 1985: 150; and von Rad 1961: 155-156.

³³The first section of verse three receives extensive comment by the targums. First, the harsh expression "I will curse" is softened by one targum to "will be cursed" (Tg. Neof.), and thereby distances the Lord from actively cursing people. Second, this oath to bless and curse is expanded to indicate that the priests are the prototype of blessing while Balaam is the prototype of the wicked who are cursed (cf. Tg. Ps.-J and Tg. Neof.).

³⁴von Rad 1961: 155. On the significance of the difference of verbs here, see also Sarna: 89. This distinction in number, however, is obscured by the LXX which translated מְבָרַכְךָ with τοὺς καταρωμένους and מְבָרַכְיָךְ with τοὺς εὐλογοῦντάς .

³⁵Mitchell: 31-32.

³⁶von Rad 1961: 155. Such an interpretation, however, is denied by Cassuto: 315.

³⁷Sarna: 89.

Most scholars, even those who argue for a reflexive translation of וַיְבָרֶכְנוּ, recognize the universal impact of the Lord's promise to Abraham.³⁸ It is important to note that in this initial declaration of the Lord's intention concerning Abraham, the promise of land is merely implicit in the imperative of verse one and the promise of many descendants is referred to indirectly (לְנוֹי גְדוֹלָה). Only the promise of blessing for all the families of the earth in or through Abraham is referred to directly. Moreover, the aspect of the promise that receives the most detailed attention is the blessing of others (12.2d-3), not the blessing of Abraham or his descendants. The other elements of the promise are treated in a crisp manner which contrasts with the detailed attention given to the blessing of others motif found here. Hence it is crucial to note that the first formulation of the promise to Abraham contains six elements,³⁹ all of which focus on the term "blessing".⁴⁰ The first three of these focus on promises which directly affect Abraham and his descendants; the final three indicate that Abraham will have a positive affect on others. Hence, "God's long range purpose for issuing the blessing promises was to bless all people."⁴¹ Moreover, in Gen 12.3a a blessing for others is juxtaposed with a curse, and both blessing and curse are stated to be a result of one's relationship to Abraham.⁴² In Gen 12.1-3, therefore, blessing for all the peoples of the earth is at the heart of God's

³⁸So Westermann 1985: 152; von Rad 1961: 156; Cassuto: 315; and McComiskey: 55-57.

³⁹Or seven elements, if the promise to bless and to curse in v. 3a is divided into two separate promises. Such a division is followed by Cassuto: 312; and Sarna: 89. Westermann 1985: 149, however, states that the promise is divided into three parts.

⁴⁰Cf. von Rad 1961: 155; and Westermann 1978: 30. For a philological study of בָּרַךְ and a survey of its use in the Hebrew Scriptures, see Wehmeier: 67-226; and Thuruthumaly: 13-27, 56-67.

⁴¹Mitchell: 30.

⁴²This is a vital link for our study in Gen 12.3 because the same link is made in Gal 3.8-10.

promise to Abraham and thus is presented as a central concern for the Lord's covenant purpose for his people,⁴³ as this covenant relationship takes form in Gen 15.⁴⁴

2. Gen 18.18

In Gen. 18.18 the Lord repeats two of the elements of the promise as first recorded in 12.1-3:

ואברהם היו יהיה לגוי גדול ועצום ונברכו בו כל גויי הארץ

Abraham will surely be a great and mighty⁴⁵ nation,
and all the nations of the earth will be blessed⁴⁶ in him.

The LXX translation is:

Αβρααμ δὲ γινόμενος ἔσται εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ, καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς.

And Abraham will become a great and large nation, and all the nations of the earth will be blessed in him.

Thus the elements of the promise from 12.1-3 concerning Abraham being a great nation and blessing for the nations are repeated here. The text of 12.2 concerning the promise of a great nation differs from 18.18⁴⁷ most significantly with respect to the difference of verbs chosen (יהיה לגוי/γινόμενος ἔσται in 18.18 for וַאֲנִי/ποιήσω in 12.2) and the

⁴³Mann: 341-353 has recently argued that this promise forms the theological unity of Genesis. Cf. also Crüsemann: 73. On the importance of Gen 12.3 for the interpretation of the entire Abraham narrative, see the bibliography in Alexander: 12, n.9.

⁴⁴For a discussion of the theological significance of the observation that the ratification of the covenant between the Lord and Abraham in Gen 15 followed the declaration of the promise in Gen 12, see McComiskey: 59-64.

⁴⁵ועצום may be translated "mighty" or "vast", referring to the numerical increase of Abraham's descendants, and the LXX clearly understood the text this way. See Holladay 1971: 280.

⁴⁶On the translation of ונברכו, see n. 24 above.

⁴⁷On the modifications of 12.2-3 here, see Wenham: 50.

addition in 18.18 of the adjective $\text{בְּרָכָה}/\text{πολύ}$. The change from the pronominal suffix or personal pronoun ($\text{ָ}/\text{σε}$) to the personal name in 18.18 ($\text{אַבְרָהָם}/\text{Αβρααμ}$) is due to the shift from direct address in 12.2 to a statement about Abraham in 18.18. The text of 12.3 concerning blessing for the nations differs from 18.18 most significantly with respect to the change of the object of the blessing (in 12.3 $\text{הַגּוֹיִם}/\text{αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς}$ to $\text{יְהוּדָה}/\text{τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς}$ in 18.18).

The juxtaposition of the multiplication of Abraham's descendants and the blessing of the nations through them is a recurring motif in the patriarchal narrative. Yet it is also crucial to note that in this text the Lord does not speak to Abraham, but rather deliberates with himself.⁴⁸ Hence this text is not a declaration of promise to Abraham, but rather is a statement of purpose concerning the Lord's intention on behalf of Abraham and his family.⁴⁹ And the Lord's purpose for Abraham is moving toward the time when his descendants would be a great nation and the time when all nations would be blessed through Abraham. Therefore, in the statement of the Lord's intention for Abraham in Gen 18.18, only the strands of many descendants and blessing for all nations are explicitly mentioned.

These two promises are grounded ($\text{יָדָע}/\text{γάρ}$) in 18.19 on the knowledge that⁵⁰ Abraham will command ($\text{וְצִוָּה}/\text{συντάξει}$)⁵¹ his sons and his household after him and they will keep ($\text{וְשָׁמְרוּ}/\text{φυλάξουσιν}$) the way of the Lord ($\text{וְיָרֶךְ}/\text{τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου}$),⁵²

⁴⁸Westermann 1985: 288 attributes this to a late stage in the history of the promise in that this material is "...part of the traditional material which has travelled a long way and is thought through in its various theological applications." Cf. also von Rad, 1961: 204.

⁴⁹We will return to this observation in chapter six. For now we only note that it is commonly recognized that Paul has conflated Gen 12.3 and 18.18, and these observations may prove fruitful for our exegesis of Gal 3.8-10.

⁵⁰It is possible, however, to translate $\text{וְיָדָעְתִּי לְמַעַן}$: "I have chosen him in order that...". Cf. von Rad 1961: 204; Westermann 1985: 284; Wenham: 34; and Sarna: 131.

⁵¹Sarna: 131 takes וְצִוָּה in the sense of 'instruct.' Similarly, von Rad 1961: 205 writes that "the reason for God's amazing intention is given particularity in v. 19: Abraham has the position of teacher for his descendants, and the event at Sodom will contain a special admonitory significance for all time." See also Wenham: 50.

⁵²Both Tg. Onq. and Tg. Ps.-J. read: "...the ways that are right before the Lord."

so that they might do what is right and just (לעשות צדקה ומשפט/ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν), in order that the Lord might do what he has spoken to him (i.e. he might keep his promise to him). In this text the motif of covenant loyalty is linked clearly and firmly with the promise to Abraham. On the one hand, Abraham's faithfulness in the instruction of his descendants so that they might remain faithful to the way of the Lord is the ground of the Lord's choice of him.⁵³ On the other hand, the continuation of covenant loyalty on the part of Abraham's descendants results in the fulfillment of the promised blessing to all nations. In this respect, Gen 18:18-19 expresses a covenant perspective which it shares with Deuteronomy.

3. Gen 22:18

In Genesis 22:18 the Lord responds to Abraham's obedience to his commandment concerning the sacrifice of Isaac⁵⁴ by repeating the promise,⁵⁵ including the promise of blessing for the nations:

והתברכו⁵⁷ בזרעך⁵⁶ כל גווי הארץ

All the nations of the earth will be blessed in your descendants

The LXX translation is:

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς

⁵³In Tg. Ps.-J. Abraham's piety is manifest before the Lord, and it is this piety that is transmitted to his descendants that results in the Lord bringing upon him "...the good things he has promised him."

⁵⁴The Aqedah, or the "Binding (of Isaac)," which is described in Gen 22, has always had an important place in Jewish thought. For a select bibliography on the traditional Jewish understanding of the Aqedah, see Maher: 77 n.1.

⁵⁵Sarna: 154 thinks that the promises have been reaffirmed.

⁵⁶According to Westermann 1985: 364, the difference between בזרעך here and בך in 12:3 "...indicates that the concern is more for Israel and her meaning for the nations."

⁵⁷On the significance of the hithpael here, see Wenham: 112. Allis: 263-298 has argued that both the niph'al and hithpael verb forms should be understood as passive forms. The targums reflect a future passive translation here.

And all the nations of the earth will be blessed in your descendants.

In this context the promise to bless the nations is only one part of the promise. In 22.16 the statement of the promise is preceded by the Lord's oath which is grounded on Abraham's obedience to the Lord. In 22.17 the promise is that the Lord will certainly bless Abraham, that the Lord will certainly expand his descendants like the stars in the sky and the sand on the seashore, and that Abraham's descendants will possess or inherit (שָׂרִי/κληρονομήσει) the gate⁵⁸ of their enemies. (22.17). In 22.18 the statement of the third strand completes the promise to Abraham in this context. Once again the promise of many descendants is conjoined with the promise to bless all nations, while the promise of the land is only implicit, perhaps in the statement of the possession of the the enemies' gate.⁵⁹ Gen 22.16-18 is the final instance of the promise to Abraham himself, and thus this text "...forms a frame or inclusio with Abraham's call in 12.1-3 and so brings to a conclusion the main section of the Abraham narrative."⁶⁰

The promise in this text is grounded on Abraham's obedience to the Lord (שָׂרִי/ὕπηκουσας τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς) in his willingness to sacrifice of his son, Isaac.⁶¹ One of the targums understood the obedience of Isaac in submitting to death in terms of circumcision.⁶² In this tradition, Ishmael and Isaac dispute the matter of who

⁵⁸The LXX translated שָׂרִי with τὰς πόλεις.

⁵⁹This perhaps explains the LXX translation in which the inheritance of cities would more explicitly refer to the promise of land.

⁶⁰Alexander: 18.

⁶¹Abraham's obedience to the Lord thus forms an inclusio, enclosing the various aspects of the promise. Cf. Sarna: 154; Westermann 1985: 364; Wenham: 111; and especially von Rad 1961: 239-240. Alexander: 18 argues that Abraham's obedience in Gen 22 functions to demonstrate that he has fulfilled the condition in 17.1 in that his obedience shows "...his willingness to walk before God and be blameless."

⁶²Cf. Tg. Ps.-J. Although this targum probably reached its final form in the seventh century C. E., it probably contains many traditions which date to the first century. See Hayward 1991: 215-246; and idem 1989: 77-93. This long addition in Tg. Ps.-J., unique among the Targums, functions to explain why God should have "tested Abraham," as the biblical text states. According to Tg. Ps.-J., Isaac's declaration of his readiness to offer his whole body to the Lord led to God's commandment to Abraham to offer Isaac as a sacrifice.

should be their father's heir. During the course of this dispute, Isaac states that although he was too young to concur with his own circumcision, he would gladly surrender his whole body to the Lord, if so asked.⁶³ When the Lord heard this statement, he tested Abraham. Isaac's devotion to the Lord is thus stressed because although he himself did not voluntarily submit to circumcision, he would gladly surrender his whole body to the Lord, if asked.

4. Gen 26.4

After Abraham's death, the promise of blessing for the nations is confirmed to Isaac in Gen 26.4:⁶⁴

והחברכו בזרעך כל גווי הארץ

"And I will bless all the nations of the earth in your descendants."

The LXX translation is:

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς

"And all the nations of the earth will be blessed in your descendants."

Sarna writes that

the well-being of humanity at large is intertwined with the destiny and fate of Israel. This is one of the major themes of Genesis, and it is repeated to each of the patriarchs in turn.⁶⁵

⁶³The text states that Isaac answered and said, "Behold, today I am thirty seven years old, and if the Holy One, blessed be He, were to ask all my members I would not refuse" (Tg. Ps.-J. 22.1.).

⁶⁴Westermann 1985: 424 writes: "The purpose of this elaboration is obviously to join Isaac to the Abraham tradition by means of a theological clamp."

⁶⁵Sarna: 183.

In this context the three strands are present:⁶⁶ the land⁶⁷ (26. 3-4 [2x]), many descendants⁶⁸ (26.4), and blessing for the nations through his descendants (26.4). Hence Gen 26.3-4 is the restatement of the promise to Abraham, and it points to the significance of the three strands of land, descendants, and blessing for the nations. The continuation of these promises is based in 26.5 upon Abraham's prior obedience to the Lord and his loyalty to the covenant stipulations.⁶⁹ Blessing for the nations⁷⁰ thus is based in this text on Abraham's faithful obedience to the Lord and his requirements, and this blessing is once again in context with the multiplication of his descendants. However, in 26.3-4 the twice repeated promise of the land brackets the other two strands of the promise.

5. Gen 28.14

After Jacob had been blessed by Isaac⁷¹ and while he was on his way out of Canaan,⁷² he had his famous dream of a stairway into heaven, during which the Lord himself confirmed the promise made to Jacob's fathers.⁷³ In Gen 28.14 the promise

⁶⁶Other elements of the promise here in 26.3 are the promise of the Lord's presence and blessing for Isaac.

⁶⁷Sarna: 183 notes the unusual plural for the land in 26.3. The LXX, however, refers to the singular.

⁶⁸These descendants will be as numerous as the stars of heaven.

⁶⁹On the possible link between Gen 26.5 and Deuteronomy, see Westermann 1985: 424-425. Wenham: 190, however, argues that this language is more typical of priestly texts. Wenham further argues for the significance of the fact that in spite of the fact that Gen 26.4-5 is a virtual citation of Gen 22.17-18a, it is Abraham's obedience that is mentioned as the ground for the promise, not Isaac's willingness to be sacrificed.

⁷⁰As also the promise of land and descendants.

⁷¹Cf. 28.3-4. The elements of this blessing are God's blessing, many descendants, and the blessing of Abraham to him and his descendants, which is the land. On the significance of the identification of the "blessing of Abraham" with the land, see Halpern-Amaru: 11.

⁷²Cf. Wenham: 223: "the promises were first made to Abraham as he was settling in the land, but they are reaffirmed to Jacob as he is fleeing from it."

⁷³Cf. 28.13. The LXX appends $\mu\eta\ \phi\omicron\beta\omicron\theta\omicron$. Cf. Sarna: 198

given to Abraham that all the nations would be blessed through his descendants is stated:⁷⁴

וּבְרַכּוּ בְךָ כָּל־מִשְׁפַּחַת הָאָדָמָה וּבְזַרְעֶךָ

"And in you all the families of the earth will be blessed,
and in your descendants."

The LXX translation is:

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς,
καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου

"And in you all the tribes of the earth will be blessed,
and in your descendants."

In this context the promise to Jacob also includes land (28.13), God's presence and protection (28.15), and the safe return to the land (28.15). Gen 28.14 expands the text found in Gen 13.14-17,⁷⁵ with the addition of the promise to bless all the families of the earth through Abraham's descendants. For Jacob is told that his descendants will be like the dust of the earth, and they will spread out to the west and to the east and to the north and to the south.⁷⁶ In its final form, Gen 28.14 is probably intended to refer back to 13.14, but two important modifications have occurred. First, Gen 28.14 envisages a time when the descendants of Abraham would spread out to the four corners of the earth. And second the promise to bless all the tribes of the earth through Abraham's descendants has been included. The order of these may provide the foundation for a theme, which in

⁷⁴This passage is most often linked back to Gen 13.14-16 (e.g. Wenham: 222-223; and Sarna: 198). The key addition to the promise in Gen 28 which is not found in Gen 13 is, of course, blessing for the nations.

⁷⁵Both the MT and the LXX have different verbs in the two texts, while the LXX has ἡ ἄμμος in 28.14 and τὴν ἄμμον in 13.16.

⁷⁶Westermann 1965: 455 argues that this mention of the four corners of the earth refers back to 13.14.

chapter four we will argue is common in the postbiblical period, in which the ubiquitous presence of diaspora Jews is the means of fulfillment for the promise to bless all nations.

6. Summary

The third strand to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is a key aspect of the promise in Genesis. It is the focal point of the original formulation of that promise, is always associated with the multiplication of Abraham's descendants, and is explicitly stated to all three patriarchs. Moreover, in Gen 18.18, a text that Paul has conflated with Gen 12.3, only the strands concerning descendants and blessing for the nations are present, and these are presented in the form of a declarative statement from the Lord which details his intention for Abraham.

The promise to bless all families (or nations) of the earth is therefore a fundamental part of the covenant God made with Abraham,⁷⁷ and as such it functions as one of three primary strands of the promise to Abraham. The Lord may express other aspects and dimensions of the promise to Abraham,⁷⁸ but the three strands of the land, descendants, and blessing for the nations are repeated throughout the narrative both to Abraham himself and to his descendants, Isaac and Jacob.⁷⁹ The Lord's covenant relationship with Abraham and his descendants and his covenant purpose for them from the start is centered on the promise of land, descendants, and blessing for the nations. But it is especially the promise of blessing for the nations which is highlighted first in Gen 12.1-3 and which is repeated in Gen 18.18.

III. The promise to bless the nations elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture.

⁷⁷Cf. Kuschel: 22-23.

⁷⁸See n. 4 above.

⁷⁹Clements: 15.

Most of the references to Abraham in the Jewish scripture are focused on Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord.⁸⁰ The promise to Abraham to bless the nations in his seed⁸¹ is relatively rare in the Jewish scripture,⁸² but is referred to at least two times outside of Genesis.⁸³ In Ps 72.17 this promise is connected with messianic motifs. In Jer 4.2 the promise occurs in the context of a discussion of the restoration of Israel.⁸⁴ We will suggest, further, that the promise is alluded to⁸⁵ in Zech 8.13 in connection with

⁸⁰Cf. Hansen 1989: 178-179.

⁸¹On the significance of the promise of land and the promise of descendants elsewhere in the Jewish scripture, see n. 8 above. The close relationship between the promised land and the people who would inhabit that land is the frequent theme of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history. The relationship between the land and the people in the restoration is a frequent topic of the prophetic literature.

⁸²The third strand is absent from Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history. Cf Mitchell: 36-37: "The covenantal blessings do not develop the patriarchal theme of Israel being a mediator of blessing. Instead, they emphasize that the reason God blesses is to give Israel dominion over other nations." He does not think that this reflects conflicting theologies, but rather Israel "...could only mediate blessing when they themselves enjoyed abundant blessings and were in a position of authority over those to whom they mediated blessing."

⁸³So Mitchell: 186. Hansen 1989: 178-179 does not discuss any of these texts in his survey of Abraham in Old Testament because the proper name is not present in any of them. The key term in the promise in the LXX is perhaps the future passive of ἐνευλογεῖν or εὐλογεῖν. Only the latter occurs outside of Genesis. In several texts the future passive of εὐλογεῖν is employed in contexts which speak of blessing for Israel, and it is unclear if this is intended as an echo of the promise to Abraham. If so, it has been significantly interpreted within the Biblical text. See Gen 48.20 in which this clause is applied to the blessing of Israel. In II Sam 7.29 (LXX=II Kgs 7.29), within the context of a key messianic text, David prayed that his house be blessed by God forever. In Ps 49 (LXX 48).19 the verb is used once for the rich man who has been blessed in life, but twice it is used with reference to those who fear the Lord (Ps. 112 [LXX 111]2; and Ps. 128 [LXX 127]4.)

⁸⁴According to Mitchell: 52 blessing in the prophetic literature "...results from God's dramatic intervention in the course of history."

⁸⁵Other possible allusions to the third strand of the promise include Isa 19.24-25; Ps 47.9; and Mal 3.12. However, in Isa 19.24-25, Israel is referred to as a blessing in the earth (עַם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם / εὐλογημένος ἐν τῇ γῆ). Moreover, both Egypt and Assyria are blessed and Mitchell: 166 thinks that this means that they both share a covenant relationship with God which is similar to Israel's. This is a possible, perhaps even a probable, allusion to the third strand, but there is no explicit mention of all the nations in this text. In Ps 47.10 the MT juxtaposes the statements that the princes of the earth have gathered (נְדִיבֵי עַמִּים נֹאסְפוּ) and the people of the God of Abraham (עַם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם) without making clear the connection between them. The LXX (=46.10) understands the relationship between these two statements to be the preposition μετὰ, which vocalises the

restoration motifs and in Isa. 65.16 in connection with blessing for those who are faithful to the Lord and the covenant, while those who are apostates are under a curse.

A. Psalm 72.17

The third strand of the Abrahamic promise is mentioned in connection with king Solomon.⁸⁶ This psalm is a prayer of the people of Israel for the king so that he might reign righteously. In the MT of 17a the psalm declares the hope that both Solomon's reputation would endure forever (יְהִי שִׁמּוֹ לְעוֹלָם) and that it would increase as well (לְפָנַי־שִׁמְשׁ יִגֵּךְ שִׁמּוֹ). The LXX (71.17a) translated ἔστω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας and πρὸ τοῦ ἡλίου διαμενεῖ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ respectively.⁸⁷ The LXX explicitly incorporates the verb εὐλογεῖν into its translation of 17a, probably under the influence of 17b.⁸⁸

In 17b we encounter the reference to the third strand of the promise:

וַיִּתְבְּרָכוּ בּוֹ כָּל־גּוֹיִם יְאֹשְׁרוּהוּ

"And they will be blessed in him,

consonantal Hebrew בָּרַךְ differently from the MT. Hence the LXX perhaps understands that the princes of the nations are not considered to be included in the people of God, but rather are merely gathered with the God of Abraham, perhaps even in judgement (Cf. vv. 3, 8). In Mal 3.12 we read that if Israel would obey the Lord, the land would be blessed, and then all the nations would call her blessed. Although the MT clearly refers to "all the nations" (כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם), it uses a different verb from the third strand of the promise (וַיִּשְׂאֵר: a piel stem verb). The LXX likewise employs the same noun (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) but a different verb (μακαρισθῆναι). Hence the difference in terminology makes a possible allusion less clear. Mitchell: 166, however, thinks this is an allusion to the promise to Abraham.

⁸⁶On this text as a citation or allusion to the promise, see Mitchell: 103; and Westermann 1980: 158-159.

⁸⁷This language may echo the promise to Abraham of a great name in Gen 12.2. If this language is an echo of the patriarchal promise of a great name, perhaps the last clause in Gen 12.2 has been conflated into the echo: וַיְהִי בְרָכָה/καὶ ἔσῃ εὐλογητός.

⁸⁸It is especially striking that the same verb form occurs in the LXX of Gen 12.3 and Ps 72.17a.

and all nations will bless him."

In verse seventeen we thus find a reference to the promise to Abraham which is applied to the king of Israel: **בְּלִבְרַכּוֹ**. The explicit mention of the subject of the plural verb **בְּלִבְרַכּוֹ** is withheld until the last line of verse seventeen: **כָּל־גּוֹיִם יְבָרְכּוּ**. All the nations are thus envisioned as blessed in or through the righteous king of Israel⁸⁹ and consequently they call him blessed.

The LXX translation clarified the relationship between Ps 72.17 (LXX=71.17) and Gen 12.3/18.18:

καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς,
πάντα τὰ ἔθνη μακαριοῦσιν αὐτόν.

"And all the tribes of the earth will be blessed in him,
all the nations will bless him."

The LXX understood the hithpael verb form **בְּלִבְרַכּוֹ**⁹⁰ as a future passive (εὐλογηθήσονται) and furthermore it made explicit the subject of this verb: **πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς**. The combination of this subject with **πάντα τὰ ἔθνη** in the following line of the poetic structure would be unmistakable for the reader who was well acquainted with the Genesis narrative, especially with the future passive form εὐλογηθήσονται. The resulting text is thus clearly intended to echo the language of the promise to Abraham in Genesis 12.3, 18.18, etc. This psalm, therefore, links the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham to the king of Israel, who mediates the Lord's blessing to the nations. This link in Ps 72.17 (LXX=71.17) between the promise to Abraham and the king of Israel perhaps gives this psalm a messianic connotation.

B. Jer 4.2

⁸⁹On the king as the one who mediates blessing, see Westermann 1978: 9, 30-32; and Mitchell: 103.

⁹⁰Mitchell: 103 takes this as a clear reference to the patriarchal promise.

The third strand of the Abrahamic promise is also mentioned in Jeremiah 4.1-2. Jeremiah called for unfaithful Israel to return to the Lord (4.1-2a), and in 4.2b referred to this event as the time when the promise to Abraham to bless the nations would be fulfilled⁹¹:

והתברכו בו גוים ובו יתהללו

"And the nations will be blessed in him
and in him they will glory."

The LXX translation is:

καὶ εὐλογήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῷ ἔθνη
καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ αἰνέσουσιν τῷ θεῷ ἐν Ἱερουσαλῆμ⁹²

"And nations will bless in him
and in him they will praise God in Jerusalem."

The MT text of Jer 4.2b is a clear reference to the third strand of the promise to Abraham (והתברכו בו גוים).⁹³ Thus in this text Israel's return from her idolatrous practice and a return to faithfulness to the Lord is the condition for the promised blessing for the nations to occur. Israel's role as mediator⁹⁴ of the covenant blessings to the nations thus

⁹¹In context, faithless Israel is called to return to the Lord, after which Israel will be multiplied and increased in the land (3.16) and Jerusalem will be called the Throne of the Lord and all the nations (כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם/πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) will be gathered to it (3.17). When Jeremiah discussed the restoration of Israel, he brought together the three strands of the promise. Although blessing for the nations is implicit in this context, it becomes explicit in 4.2. Cf. Mitchell: 56.

⁹²The LXX inserts ἐν Ἱερουσαλῆμ into its translation, perhaps under the influence of Jer 3.17.

⁹³Cf. Westermann 1985: 151. Since the Genesis narrative used either the niphāl form (12.3; 18.18; 28.14) or the hithpael form (22.18; 26.4), the choice of the hithpael form here may not have much significance. Mitchell: 55-56 points out that Jer 4.2 is not an exact citation of any of the passages in the patriarchal narrative.

⁹⁴There is some ambiguity, however, concerning the antecedent for the phrase בּוֹ; it could refer either to the Lord or to Israel. This ambiguity is retained in the LXX, although the phrase τῷ θεῷ was inserted into the following line of the poetic couplet, an

is dependent upon her covenant faithfulness, as prescribed especially in Deuteronomy. It is curious that the LXX, which consistently translated either Hebrew form with the future passive in Genesis, chose the future active in Jeremiah (i.e. εὐλογήσουσιν). Since the targum of this text understood the verb to be a future passive,⁹⁵ this curious reading found in the LXX may be due to a mistranslation. It may, on the other hand, reflect a perspective of the translator in which the promise of blessing for the nations has been transposed into a promise that the nations would bless Israel.

C. Zech 8.13

The promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is alluded to in Zech 8.13b:

כִּן אֲשִׁיעַ אֶתְכֶם וְהִייתֶם בְּרָכָה

Thus I will deliver you and you will be a blessing.

The LXX translation is:

οὕτως διασώσω ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔσεσθε ἐν εὐλογίᾳ·

Thus I will save you and you will be in blessing

In this context, Israel's covenant failure to remain loyal to the Lord led to her exile from the land, which Zechariah terms a curse among the nations (בְּגוֹיִם קָלְלָהּ / ἦτε ἐν κατάρα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). This historical reality provides Zechariah with the occasion to contrast it with the Lord's intention to deliver Israel from captivity and to use this act of deliverance as the opportunity to fulfill the promise to Abraham that the nations would

addition which may indicate that the antecedent of ἐν αὐτῷ was understood to be Israel, by whom the nations glorify God. The targum of Jeremiah cleared up any possible ambiguity; the blessing comes through Israel. See Hayward 1987: 58.

⁹⁵See the translation in Hayward 1987.

be blessed through his descendants. For just as Israel had been a curse among the nations (קל/οὐτως), she would also be a means of blessing among the nations (ברכה/καὶ ἔσεσθε ἐν εὐλογία).⁹⁶ Zechariah does not quote the promise in Genesis, but clearly alludes to it. In the parallelism between 13a and 13b, the phrase בְּגוֹיִם/ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is implied in the second line of the poetic structure. The resulting clause clearly points to the Abrahamic promise concerning blessing for the nations (ברכה בְּגוֹיִם/ἔσεσθε ἐν εὐλογία ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). This mediated blessing to the nations would occur after Israel's salvation (אֲשֶׁר יַשִּׁיעַ אֶתְּכֶם/διασώσω ὑμᾶς). In Zech 8.13 Israel's deliverance from the curse thus would result in blessing being extended to the nations. Hence this text alludes to the third strand of the promise.

D. Isa 65.16

An allusion to the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants may occur in Isa 65.16, especially in the LXX translation:

אֲשֶׁר הִמְחַבֵּר בְּאֶרֶץ

"The one who is blessed (or blesses himself) in the land."

The LXX translation is:

ὁ εὐλογηθήσεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

"The one who will be blessed in the land."

In Isa 65 the repeated theme is that those who are idolators will be judged and those who remain faithful to the Lord will not be punished with the guilty. The MT employed a text which echoed Gen 22.18; and 26.4 in the use of the Hithpael form of בָּרַךְ. The LXX may have understood this as a reference to the promise to Abraham and used the future

⁹⁶Mitchell: 59-60, however, takes this to mean that Israel will become a proverbial blessing among the nations.

passive form in its translation.⁹⁷ This blessing refers back to the new name for the servants of Israel (65.15b), who have remained faithful to the Lord. This blessing is contrasted with the curse on those who are apostates (65.13-15a).⁹⁸ Thus in Isa 65.16, those who would be blessed are those who remain faithful to the Lord, and those cursed are those who turn to other gods. And if both the MT and the LXX have indeed echoed the language of the promise in Genesis, this is a significant interpretation of the promise to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants because those who are blessed are not the nations but ethnic Israel.⁹⁹ It may be argued that Isa 65.16 has echoed the language of blessing and curse in Deuteronomy, esp. Deut 28-32. But Deuteronomy never employs the future passive of εὐλογεῖν, so at least in the LXX this is hardly clear.

E. Summary

Although the third strand does not occupy a dominant place elsewhere in the Jewish scripture, it is significantly restated in connection with the king of Israel, perhaps giving it a messianic connotation (Ps 72.17), and with Israel's restoration from exile (Jer 4.2). Moreover, the curse is conjoined with blessing in Zech 8. Furthermore, it is perhaps alluded to in Isa 65.16 in a context which detailed the respective response from the Lord on those who turn to idols, who are under a curse, and those who remain faithful to the Lord, who are blessed.

IV. Conclusion

⁹⁷The verb in the next clause (יְבָרֵךְ בְּאֵלֵהי אֱמֹן), which is the same stem in the MT, is translated with the future active in the LXX (εὐλογήσουσιν γὰρ τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν). Hence, rather than the 'true God' or the 'God of truth' as the agent of blessing, the LXX transforms the sense so that he is the object of blessing.

⁹⁸Cf. esp. 15a. The cursed name of the apostates thus is juxtaposed with the new name, which is blessed, of the servants.

⁹⁹Cf. Mitchell: 53.

The promise to Abraham involves three primary elements: land, descendants, and blessing for the nations through Abraham's descendants; and the third strand of the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is an important part of that promise. It is featured in the first formulation of the promise in Gen 12.1-3, is repeated throughout the patriarchal narrative, and is restated to both Isaac and Jacob. In the statement of the promise in Gen 18.18 it occurs only with the promise of increase of descendants; and in Gen 26.3-5 the promise of these three elements is based on Abraham's faithfulness to the Lord's commandments, in which typically deuteronomistic language is employed. The third strand of the promise therefore functions as an integral part of the three-fold promise to Abraham of land, descendants, and blessing for the nations.

Although the promise to bless the nations is relatively rare outside of the patriarchal narrative, it does occur in several texts in the context of messianic and restoration themes. On the one hand, the promise and its fulfillment is identified with the king of Israel; on the other hand, another text envisages the day when Israel would be restored to the land and would return to the Lord in faithfulness to him, and at that time the promise of the third strand would be realized.

Chapter Three

The Curse in Deuteronomy and elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture.

I. Introduction

Several recent attempts to trace Paul's argument in Gal 3.10 and his use of scripture there have pointed to the significance of the context of Deuteronomy for our understanding Paul's intention.¹ The purpose of this chapter is to explore the use of the various terms for curse in Deuteronomy and in several texts in the Jewish scripture. First, our study in Deuteronomy will indicate that curse functions as a motif in Deuteronomy which is conjoined with its dominant concern for loyalty to the covenant² in order to stress repeatedly that the curse of the covenant comes upon those who abandon the Lord and turn to other gods. Second, our study of several texts from the Deuteronomistic history and from Israel's prophetic literature will demonstrate this same covenant perspective.

II. The Curse in Deuteronomy

Deuteronomy uses four different terms to refer to the curse: ארר, אלה, קללה, and ארר, which are translated in the LXX with κατάρα, ἀρά, ἐπικατάρατος, and ἀνάθεμα respectively.³ Although the four terms are used several dozen times in Deuteronomy,

¹Cf. Noth 1966; Thielman 1989; idem 1994; Scott 1993a; idem 1993b; Wright 1992a; and Dunn 1993a.

²For a recent study which details the importance of the covenant in several important strands of Second Temple Judaism and the implications of covenant for the people of God, see Christiansen.

³For a general study of the terms 'curse' in the Hebrew Bible, and an attempt to delimit the precise semantic nuances of each term, see Brichto. For a collection of parallels between the curses in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern treaties, see Hillers 1964: 43-79.

they tend to occur in clusters, focused especially on Deut 7; 11; 13; and 27-30. The term קללה/κατάρα is used in 23.6 in the context of the transformation of Balaam's curse into a blessing for Israel. In 23.5 the verb קללה is translated with καταρᾶσαι. The term חרם/ἀνάθεμα is used in 20.17. In 2.34; 3.6; and 7.2 חרם is used, but it is not translated by the LXX.

A. The use of קללה/κατάρα in Deuteronomy.

The terms קללה⁴ and κατάρα are used three times in Deut. 11, a chapter in which the results of obedience (ברכה) and disobedience (קללה) are repeated frequently.⁵ The motivation for obedience is both God's redemptive action in the past and his continued blessing of the people in the future.⁶ The first section of this chapter (11.1-15) details the blessings for those who love the Lord and always keep the law. In 11.1 the admonition is to keep the commandments throughout one's lifetime (כל הימים/πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας), and in 11.8 it is to keep every commandment (את כל המצוה/πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ).⁷ In 11.22 blessing in the land is conditional upon obedience to "all these commandments" (את כל המצוה הזאת/πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας).⁸ This blessing is presented primarily in terms of prosperity and long life in the land (11.9-12, 14, 21). The second section of this chapter details the curse for those whose hearts⁹ are deceived and who have turned to other gods (11.16: אלהים אחרים/θεοῖς ἑτέροις). The curse is

⁴For a comprehensive survey of this term in the Hebrew Bible, cf. Brichto: 118-199. He argues that in the passages from Deuteronomy discussed below, there is no reason for translating it "...by any term which possesses more than the general force of misfortune, harm, disaster." (idem: 186).

⁵Brichto: 182-183.

⁶Olson: 58.

⁷The LXX of 11.8 adds αὐτοῦ to its translation.

⁸Here the LXX adds σήμερον, which links this text with 11.8, but the translation omits the relative pronoun after ποιεῖν.

⁹The LXX translates the second masculine plural לבבכם in 11.16 with the singular ἡ καρδία σου, but retains the plural with the verb forms.

presented primarily in terms of the desolation of the land and death which results from the lack of production from the land (11.17). The focus of the chapter, at least in terms of the space devoted to the topic, is on the blessing in the land which stems from obedience to the commandments, especially exclusive devotion to the Lord.¹⁰ The three occurrences of the term קללה, and its translation in the LXX with κατάρα, are in the final section of Deut 11. First, Deut 11.26 states that the blessing and curse (ברכה וקללה/εὐλογίαν καὶ κατάραν) were both placed equally before Israel. Second, in Deut 11.28 Israel would receive the curses, if she did not obey the Lord's commandments¹¹ and instead turned from the way (מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ וסִרְתֶּם/πλανηθήτε ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ) she had been instructed. Third, in 11.29 the blessing is pronounced from Mount Gerizim and the curse from Mount Ebal. The specific way in which this fundamental covenant failure would occur is through devotion to other gods (11.28: אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים/θεοῖς ἑτέροις). This covenant failure is consistently presented within the framework of the obligation to keep all the law.¹² In 11.32 when Israel entered the land, she must keep all the commandments and ordinances (וְאֵת־הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים וְאֵת־כָּל־הַחֻקִּים/πάντα τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς κρίσεις ταύτας).¹³ In Deut 11, therefore, the connection between the obligation to do all of the law, the curse for failure to do so, and devotion to other gods is firmly established.

The terms קללה and κατάρα are used in Deut 27.13 and 28.15, 45. In Deut 27-28 the recitation of the covenant blessings and curses are described in which the blessings for obedience are pronounced from Mount Gerizim and the curses for disobedience from Mount Ebal (27.11-13). This covenant ceremony is prefaced in Deut 27.1 with the command to the people of Israel to keep "all these commandments" (וְאֵת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוֹה/

¹⁰This is the converse of the commonly noted point that the curse receives disproportionate attention in Deut 28. Cf. e.g. Noth 1966: 120.

¹¹On the other hand, in Deut 11.27 Israel would receive the blessing, if she obeyed the Lord's commandments.

¹²Cf. Olsen: 59.

¹³Cf. also 11.8, 22.

πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας). The entire covenant structure thus is set within the framework of keeping all the commandments. Moreover, the covenant ceremony on Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal is clearly in view in Deut 11.29 and its structure is detailed in Deut 27-28. This literary parallel indicates that the major motif of Deut 11 may also be a major strand of Deut 27-28, a conclusion which an examination of Deut 28 bears out.

Moses' address in Deut 28.1ff. is an exhortation to the Israelites which is based on the covenant renewal ceremony of Deut 27.¹⁴ Within this hortatory address, we read of the specific way in which the Israelites would fail to keep all the commandments contained in the book of the law¹⁵ (Deut 28.14): Israel would turn aside¹⁶ from all of the words of the law (מכל־הדברים/ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν λόγων)¹⁷ and would turn to the service of other gods (אלהים אחרים/θεῶν ἑτέρων). The penalty for going after other gods is that all these curses (כל־הקללות האלה/πάσαι αἱ κατάραι αὐται) would come upon them (28.15). These curses would come because Israel failed to obey the Lord (28.15), and this failure is presented in 28.15 as the negative counterpart of Israel's positive obligation to obey all the commandments (לשמר לעשות את כל מצותיו וחקתיו/φυλάσσειν καὶ ποιεῖν πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ).¹⁸ Deut 28.14-15, therefore, functions as the pivot upon which the blessings (28.1-14) and the curses (28.15-68) turn.¹⁹ Blessings would come upon Israel because she was careful to do all the commandments; the curses

¹⁴Weinfeld: 147 argues that the anathemas of Deut 27 focus on excommunication and the curses of Deut 28 focus on the threat of physical calamity. It is not clear that these are mutually exclusive categories, however.

¹⁵Hillers 1964: 32 writes that "the reference to stipulations written in a 'book' is normal treaty terminology."

¹⁶The issue is transgression (ולא תסור/οὐ παραβήση).

¹⁷The expression ימיך ושנאול (LXX: δεξιὰ οὐδὲ ἀριστερά) indicates that Israel was to walk on a singular path of devotion to the Lord alone.

¹⁸Cf. also 28.1: לשמר לעשות את כל מצותיו וחקתיו/φυλάσσειν καὶ ποιεῖν πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ.

¹⁹For a discussion of the various ways in which the curse is described in these verses and for possible influence by other Ancient Near Eastern treaties, see Weinfeld: 116-129.

fall. Israel would experience the curse of the covenant because she had abandoned the covenant and had not done all the words of this law. The specific failure of Israel's covenant obligation is devotion to other gods.²⁶ Deut 29.28 also states Israel's covenant obligation to do "all the words of this law" (אֶת־כָּל־דְּבַר־יְהוָה/πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου). Therefore, in Deut 29 the curse which resulted in Israel's exile is due to her failure to maintain covenant loyalty by turning to other gods,²⁷ and this failure is the negative corollary to the obligation to do all the commandments written in the book of the law.

The terms קְלָלָה and κατάρρα are used in Deut 30.1, 19 in conjunction with the term blessing to indicate the choice (הַבְּרָכָה וְהַקְּלָלָה/ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ κατάρρα) which Moses laid before Israel. Deut 30 details the restoration promised Israel after she had been exiled among the nations. More specifically, it outlines the choice to remain faithful to the Lord which leads to life and blessing and the choice to abandon the Lord and turn to other gods which leads to death and the curse.²⁸ At the time of Israel's restoration the Lord would return Israel to the land (30.5) and would circumcise their heart and the heart of their descendants (30.6).²⁹ The purpose of this circumcision is to produce the love for the Lord which is the goal of the law (cf. Deut 6.5). The result would be that all the curses would be on Israel's enemies (30.7) and Israel would do all the commandments (30.8: וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתָיו/καὶ ποιήσεις τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ)³⁰ and the things written in the book of the law (30.10: תָּסֵבֵן בְּסֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הַזֶּה/τάς

²⁶Cf. also 29.14-21. von Rad 1966: 180 states that here the writer "...considered this curse on disobedience to be the real purport of Deuteronomy."

²⁷For a discussion of parallels between Deut 29 and Ancient Near Eastern treaties which describe rebellion against the king, see Weinfeld: 100-116.

²⁸In 30.19 the blessing and the curse were בְּחַיִּים/τὴν ζωὴν and מוֹת/τὸν θάνατον respectively. Cf. Buchanan: 131; and Thuruthumally: 59.

²⁹Note that the LXX translates the verb כָּרַךְ with the verb περικαθαρίζειν. Hence, it interprets the significance of this expression, rather than merely using the Greek verb περιτέμνειν.

³⁰Note the curious absence of πάς in the LXX.

γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου). This obedience is focused on love for the Lord (30.6b),³¹ which would be produced when the Lord circumcised the heart of his people and their offspring (30.6a). Obedience was not too difficult (30.11-14), and consequently the Israelites are exhorted to choose life by keeping the Lord's commandments (30.15-16). They are warned in 30.17-18b, however, that if they do not obey and are drawn away to worship other gods (לֵאלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים/θεοῖς ἑτέροις), they would surely perish (וְאָבְדוּ/ἀπολείψαι ἀπολείσθε). Apostasy from the Lord through the worship of idols thus means not keeping all the commandments of the Lord or not remaining within the things written in the book of the law. Stated positively, the message of Deuteronomy is that the Lord requires covenant faithfulness from his people, a faithfulness which in Deut 28-29 is expressed in terms of keeping all the commandments which are written in the book of the law.

B. The use of אֵלֹהִים/ἀρά in Deuteronomy.

In Deuteronomy the terms אֵלֹהִים³²/ἀρά are used exclusively in Deut 29, the only exception occurring in Deut 30.7, where we read that all these curses (אֵת כָּל־הָאֲלֹתֵי הָאֱלֹהִים/τὰς ἀρὰς ταύτας) would be placed upon Israel's enemies after her restoration from exile.³³ In two instances the sense appears to be that of an 'oath', which indicates a positive usage in light of its explicit connection with that which had been spoken to the patriarchs. In 29.11 the reference is to the entrance into the Lord's covenant and his oath (וּבְבְרִית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וּבְאֵלֹהֵי/ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀραῖς

³¹Cf. Baltzer: 35 writes that "unconditional loyalty renders it impossible to worship foreign gods."

³²For a comprehensive survey of this term in the Hebrew Bible, cf. Brichto: 22-71.

³³Again, the LXX does not translate כָּל.

אֲנִי וְאַתָּה),³⁴ This covenant and oath are the establishment of Israel as the people of God as he had promised to the patriarchs (29.12). Four times in Deut 29 these terms are used with reference to the curse on those who turn to the worship of other gods. Deut 29.18 refers to the words of this curse (אִתְּךָ דְּבַר יְהוָה הַזֶּה / τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ἀρχῆς),³⁵ which the one who turns from the Lord to the gods of the nations (29.17: אִתְּךָ אֱלֹהֵי הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּים / τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν ἔθνῶν ἐκείνων) hears, but who falsely thinks that he would walk in peace (29.19). Deut 29.19-20 states the punishment from the Lord on the one who turns from him to serve these other gods, a punishment which is summarized in 29.19 as כִּלְהַלְלֵךְ אֱלֹהֵי הַכּוֹכָבִים בְּסֵפֶר הַחַוְלָה. The LXX inserts 'of this covenant' (πάσαι αἱ ἀραὶ τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης αἱ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου).³⁶ The terms אֱלֹהֵי/ἀρα then are used in the context of the apostasy to the gods of the nations.³⁷

C. The use of אָרַךְ/ἐπικατάρατος in Deuteronomy.

The terms אָרַךְ³⁸/ἐπικατάρατος are used twelve times in Deut 27.15-26 and six times in 28.16-19. Its usage follows a fixed form, in which the Qal passive participle (אָרַךְ) is employed to pronounce a curse on an individual.³⁹ This is especially clear in

³⁴The statement of the establishment of the covenant and the oath in 29.11 is repeated in 29.13. However, see Brichto: 28-31, who argues that the language in Deut 29.11 and 29.13 refers not to a covenant and an oath, but rather to a "curse-enforced covenant."

³⁵Compare with 29.14. Since the terms אֱלֹהֵי/ἀρα are translated 'oath' in the preceding context, it may be preferable to render them similarly here, without the pejorative sense of 'curse.' This may enhance our understanding of 29.18-19, a text in which one has falsely placed his confidence in the covenant and its 'oath' in spite of the fact that he has turned from the Lord to serve other gods. However, See Brichto 1963: 28-31.

³⁶This is probably under the influence of the text of 29.20, which includes this phrase.

³⁷For the motif of failure to do all the law in Deut 29, see pp. 54-55 above.

³⁸For a comprehensive survey of this term in the Hebrew Bible, cf. Brichto: 77-115.

³⁹Brichto: 114-115 concludes that אָרַךְ "...in both its verbal and nominal occurrences has the force of 'curse' only in the operative sense of the word. As such, its basic sense is best rendered by 'spell.' Brichto distinguishes between an "imprecation", which anyone has the power to pronounce, and "...the power to bind with a spell or to

27.15-26, but is equally so in 28.16-19, which the singular form demonstrates. The LXX consistently uses the adjective ἐμκατάρατος, with an implied form of the verb εἶναι. Within the chain of curse statements in 27.15-26, with respect both to the Hebrew and the Greek text, 27.26 functions as a summary statement of those who are under the curse and 27.15 perhaps functions as the principle cause for the curse.⁴⁰ In 28.16-19, the curse functions both to remain on the individual⁴¹ and to apply to the entirety of life in the land.⁴² It is especially clear in Deut 28 that the principal cause for the curse on an individual is apostasy, when one turns from the Lord to the service of other gods,⁴³ but the literary relationship between Deut 27 and Deut 11 makes this implicit also in Deut 27.15-26.⁴⁴

D. The use of אָרֶץ/ἀνάθεμα in Deuteronomy.

The terms אָרֶץ and ἀνάθεμα are used two times in Deut 7.26.⁴⁵ These two occurrences are at the end of an extended section in which the danger of gentile contact in the promised land (7.1-5),⁴⁶ the election of Israel to be the people of God (7.6-11) and the promise of the Lord to give the land to Israel are stressed (7.12-26). A repeated theme

impose a ban...", which is not a power given to everyone, but rather is a power reserved for the a deity. Brichto grounds this assertion by the observation that "...the subject of the active verb אָרֶץ is always the Deity or an agency endowed by God..." (idem: 115).

⁴⁰The LXX includes the indefinite pronoun ὅστις in its translation of this verse, thus introducing a conditional element into the text.

⁴¹The forms are consistently singular in 28.16 and 28.19 both in the MT and the LXX.

⁴²The curse extends from daily sustenance (28.17) to descendants (28.18a) and to wealth from the land (28.18b). Cf. Brichto: 78-79.

⁴³On this point, see pp. 53-54 above.

⁴⁴See pp. 51-53 above.

⁴⁵The expression אָרֶץ אָנָּתֶם אָרֶץ אָנָּתֶם is used in 7.2, but is translated by the LXX with ἀφανισμῶ ἀφανιεῖς αὐτούς.

⁴⁶With respect to the gentile nations in the land, the Israelites were commanded to destroy them, to make no covenant with them, to show no favor to them, and not to intermarry with them.

in this chapter is the destruction of the gentiles in the land so that they might not entice the Israelites to turn to other gods (7.1-5, 16, 20, 22-26). It is this particular concern which is the immediate context for 7.26. In 7.25 the Israelites are commanded to burn the idols of those gentile nations (אלהיהם/τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν) because they are an abomination to the Lord. According to 7.26 it is such abominations which are under the ban (חרם הוא/ἀνάθημά ἐστιν). The Israelites are warned not to take them into their houses and so also come under the ban (חרם כמהו/καὶ ἔση ἀνάθημα ὡσερ τοῦτο). Deut 7.26, therefore, refers to the curse which come upon those who take idols into their houses.⁴⁷

Deut 13 contains a threefold warning to the community which concerns those who attempt to seduce God's people away from loyalty to him.⁴⁸ The chapter thus divides into three major sections⁴⁹: 13.2-6 addresses the prophet (נביא/προφήτης) who seduces the people, 13.7-12 the relative or close friend (קרוב/ὁ ἀδελφός σου) who is the seducer, and 13.13-18 the small group (בני בליעל/ἄνδρες παράνομοι) which entices a whole community to turn to other gods.⁵⁰ The two uses of the terms חרם and ἀνάθημα both occur in the last section, in 13.16 and 13.18. The three sections of Deut 13 follow a pattern. First, each section begins with a conditional statement.⁵¹ Second, each states that the enticement is to turn to other gods.⁵² Third, each apodosis states the proper response for the faithful in the given situation.⁵³ And fourth, each section details

⁴⁷Deut 7.26 does not mention keeping the whole law, however. In 7.11 we read the exhortation to do the commandments, statutes and judgments, which is similar to Deut 27.26, especially in its use of the final infinitive to summarize the covenant obligation.

⁴⁸For parallels between Deut 13 and covenant documents in the Ancient Near East which describe political treason, see Weinfeld: 91-100.

⁴⁹The versification followed here is that found in BHS and Rahlf's, which both agree against the versification found in standard English translations.

⁵⁰Hence the first situation concerns an individual who seduces members of the community, the second concerns an individual who seduces another individual, and the third addresses a group which seduces a whole city.

⁵¹The MT reads כִּי, which the LXX translates ἐὰν. Cf. 13.2, 7, and 13.

⁵²The MT reads אלהים אחרים, which the LXX translates θεοῖς ἑτέροις. Cf. 13.3, 7, and 14.

⁵³The proper response is focused on rejecting the enticement and thus remaining faithful to the Lord. Cf. 13.4, 9, and 15.

the punishment for the crime of apostasy. For the prophet or the dreamer who seduces⁵⁴ the people of god to turn to other gods, the penalty is death, whose purpose is the protection of the community from idolatry (13.6: **דְּבַר מִקְרָבֶךָ**/καὶ ἀφανίεις τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν). The relative or close friend suffers the same fate (13.10-11),⁵⁵ whose purpose is to inhibit future infractions and elicit faithfulness to the Lord (13.12). If the report concerning the worthless men proves true and they have indeed seduced an entire city to abandon the Lord for other gods, then that city would be under the curse (13.16: **הָרַב הָרַב/ἀναθέματι ἀναθεματιέιτε**; and 13.18: **מִן הָרַב/ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναθέματος**).⁵⁶

Deut 13, therefore, exhibits a threefold structure in which similar crimes are punished by death, a punishment which culminates in the curse in 13.16 and 13.18. The crime in each instance is the abandonment of the Lord for other gods.⁵⁷ It is significant for the present study to observe that both Deut 13.1 and 13.19 positively prescribe Israel's covenant obligation, which is contrasted with the three instances of apostasy in Deut 13.2-18. In Deut 13.1 we read that Israel must do "all the words" (**כָּל דְּבַר**/πάν ῥήμα) that the Lord commanded. And in Deut 13.19 we read that Israel's obligation by which she would avoid the curse discussed in Deut 13 is obedience to all the Lord's commandments (**כָּל מִצְוֹתָיו**/πάσας τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ). Thus the commandment

⁵⁴Weinfeld 1972: 99 writes that the use of **דְּבַר מִקְרָב** in 13.6 "...appears to be an expression taken from the political vocabulary of the period.

⁵⁵The LXX translates **וְהָרַב** with ἀναγγεῖλαι, thus softening the penalty from death to a report to the authorities. This translation is curious in light of the translation of 13.11, which prescribes the death penalty. On the common tendency in scholarship to amend the MT to agree with the LXX, see Weinfeld: 94-95. For a recent defense of the reading of the MT and its harsh punishment, see Levinson.

⁵⁶The curse is clearly a death sentence, as the context of 13.16-18 makes clear.

⁵⁷In light of the parallels with Ancient Near Eastern treaties, Weinfeld: 100 argues that "...although the passage in Deut. 13 seems to be concerned only with religious loyalty to the God of Israel, the laws actually served to guarantee the political-national allegiance of the people no less than their religious allegiance—a fact exemplified by the law of the rebellious city." Weinfeld thus argues that **הָרַב** originally functioned as a socio-political restraint, rather than a religious one

to do all the law forms an inclusio for the threefold structure traced above in Deut 13, in which the curse based on devotion to other gods forms the negative counterpart to the positive commandment to keep the whole law.

E. Summary.

The theme of covenant has occupied much attention recently, and the investigation into the influence of Ancient Near Eastern treaties on the biblical covenants has borne much fruit. A consistent feature of the covenant between the Lord and Israel in Deuteronomy, which it shares in common with other Ancient Near Eastern treaties, is that the covenant requires exclusive loyalty to the Lord alone.⁵⁸ This requirement is often juxtaposed with the requirement to keep all the commandments. Moreover, the failure to remain loyal to the Lord through the worship and service of other gods is referred to as the failure to do all the commandments of the law,⁵⁹ and it is this failure with which the curse of the covenant is associated. These three themes, therefore, are integral to the way in which Israel would fail in her covenant relationship with the Lord: the failure to do all that the law requires, the service of other gods which violates the central requirement of the covenant, and the curse of the covenant for that covenant failure.

III. The Curse elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture.

⁵⁸Cf. Weinfeld: 81-91; Baltzer: 12-13, 35; Hillers 1969: 62-63; McCarthy 1978: 160-162; von Rad 1953: 71; Olson: 49-61; and Kline: 14-15.

⁵⁹It is also referred to as failure to do all this law and failure to do all things written in the book of the law.

A comprehensive study of the motif of curse in the Jewish scriptures is not possible within the confines of the present study.⁶⁰ However, we will examine several texts within the record of Israel's history⁶¹ which are especially clear examples of the connection between the service of other gods, the failure to do all that the law required and the resultant curse of the covenant.

A. The Deuteronomistic History

1. Josh 23-24

In Josh 23 Joshua addresses the Israelites before his death and in 23.6 he commands them to obey תורה משה בספר כל־הכתוב (LXX: πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσῆ), a clause which provides a direct link with Deuteronomy.⁶² This link between Josh 23.6 and the text of Deuteronomy is confirmed by the expression לבלתי סור־ממנו ימין ושמאל.⁶³ The result of obedience to all things written in the book of the law of Moses would be separation from the nations which were in the land of Canaan (23.7) and the preservation of loyalty to the Lord. In 23.7 the way Israel would fail

⁶⁰For such studies of curse in the Jewish scripture, see Brichto; Hillers 1964; Schottroff; and Morland.

⁶¹The connection between failure to remain within all that the law required, the worship of other gods, and the curse of the covenant is a motif which is featured in the Deuteronomistic history, modern scholarship's designation for the section of the Hebrew canon from Joshua to II Kings because it displays a thematic unity both as a literary unit and in connection with the text of Deuteronomy. This connection is especially prominent in the record of Israel's monarchy. See Lowery: 31; and Ackroyd: 74-75. The classic presentation and defense of the designation 'Deuteronomistic History' is Noth 1981. For an overview of critical issues involved in date and place of origin for the Deuteronomistic History see Ackroyd: 62-73. A recent attempt to suggest a revision of Noth's theory is McKenzie. For an attempt to argue for two editions of the Deuteronomistic history, one Josianic and the other exilic, see Friedman: 1-43.

⁶²Although here it is identified as תורה משה.

⁶³LXX: ἵνα μὴ ἀσπλίνητε εἰς δεξιὰν ἢ εὐάνωμα. Cf. also Deut 5.32; 17.11, 20; 28.14.

to do all that is written in the book of the law is the service of other gods.⁶⁴ Four prohibitions are mentioned in the MT of 23.7: do not mention the name of their gods (ולא תשביעו), do not swear in their name (ולא תשבעו), do not serve them (ולא תעבדום), and do not worship them (ולא תשתחוו להם). The LXX includes only three: καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν οὐκ ὀνομασθήσεται ἐν ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ μὴ προσκυνήσητε αὐτοῖς, and οὐδὲ μὴ λατρεύσητε αὐτοῖς.⁶⁵ In this passage we find the clause אַתָּה כָּל־הַכְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה used as a positive exhortation to Israel within the context of the danger of idolatry, and thus loyalty to the Lord which meant love for him to the exclusion of devotion to other gods is at the heart of the meaning of the clause לְשָׁמֵר וּלְעֲשׂוֹת אֶת כָּל־הַכְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה.⁶⁶ This farewell address by Joshua is followed by the renewal of the covenant in chapter 24.⁶⁷ Baltzer writes that 24.14 is the focal point of this covenant: "The point is absolute loyalty toward Yahweh. This loyalty presupposes rejection of the service (i.e., the cult) of 'foreign gods.'"⁶⁸ And although none of the terms for curse traced above are used in Josh 24, the curse is implicit here in the statement in 24.20 that the Lord would do the Israelites harm and consume them.⁶⁹

⁶⁴Cf. Baltzer: 12-13, 64.

⁶⁵The latter two are in inverse order of the MT.

⁶⁶The exhortation not to associate with the nations in the land clearly reflects the concern of Deuteronomy that such contact would lead to the worship of other gods. Cf. Deut. 7.1-5, 16; 8.19-20; 12.1-4, 29-32; 20.17-18. Cf. Boling: 523-524; and Butler: 253-257. However, Josh 23.16a introduces a prophetic element into the text in which Joshua predicts that Israel would, in fact, fail to remain faithful to the Lord and would transgress the covenant by serving other gods. Hence, the service and worship of other gods is the explicit occasion for the transgression of the covenant. In fact, verse sixteen is the rhetorical climax of this passage. Cf. Boling: 524-525. Moreover, in this context (cf. Josh 23.6-7), transgression of the covenant is the failure to do all that is written in the book of the law of Moses, and both are connected explicitly with the worship of other gods.

⁶⁷Baltzer: 19-27; and Hillers 1978: 58-65. McCarthy 1978: 234-242, however, rightly draws attention to several important divergences from the covenant form; and thus we refer to Josh 24 as following the pattern of a covenant ceremony, rather than the fixed form of such a ceremony. Nevertheless, he does conclude that the purpose of Josh 24 was to issue to the Israelites "...a summons to make a firm choice between Yahweh and other gods. If one is to be a Yahwist, one must give Him unswerving devotion...this dedication was expressed in the stipulations demanding total fidelity." (idem: 235).

⁶⁸Baltzer: 21. On this basic point, see also Hillers 1969: 58-65.

⁶⁹Baltzer: 25.

if they abandon the Lord and serve other gods (אלהי נכר/θεοῖς ἑτέροις, Cf. also 23.16: אלהים אחרים/θεοῖς ἑτέροις). The term blessing is also implicit in this text, as the clause אלהים אשר הטיב לכם in 24.20 indicates.⁷⁰ The important point here is the juxtaposition of the curse motif with idolatry, an idolatry which is the failure to do all the things written in the book of the law of Moses.

2. I Kgs 9

In I Kgs 9.4 the Lord appears to Solomon and restates the conditions of the covenant, which are that he walk with the Lord,⁷¹ that he do all the commandments (אשר צויהיך ככל/κατὰ πάντα ἃ ἐνετείλαμην αὐτῷ⁷²), and that he obey the Lord's statutes and ordinances. Hence Solomon's obligation before the Lord is clearly that he do all the commandments. The Lord promises that if he walks before the Lord as David did, Solomon's throne would be established forever.⁷³ However, in I Kgs 9.6 we read that the

⁷⁰On the Deuteronomistic nature of this language, see McCarthy 1978: 229-230.

⁷¹Solomon is commanded to walk with the Lord as his father David had done. Cf. I Kgs 15.5, where David is described as one who did not turn aside from all God's commandments throughout his whole life. In I Kgs 15.1-7 the conduct of Abijam, king of Judah, is contrasted with that of David. Abijam followed the conduct of his father, Rehoboam, in that he provoked the Lord to jealousy and worshipped other gods (I Kgs 14.21-24). This disloyalty to the Lord is contrasted with David who did what was right before the Lord. It is striking that the narrator could state that David did not turn aside from anything that the Lord had commanded throughout his entire life, even though he had sinned in the matter of Uriah the Hittite (cf. II Sam 11.1-27). The LXX omits a reference to this in its translation, and thus it sharpens the contrast between David and Abijam. The twice repeated ככל/πᾶς indicates clearly that David did not have to be sinless in order for the narrator to state that he had done all the commandments during his whole lifetime. Instead, this statement in context meant that David remained loyal to the Lord and demonstrated this loyalty by refraining from the worship of other gods.

⁷²The LXX translates the second person singular suffix with the the third person personal pronoun. Perhaps this reflects a tendency to connect explicitly the commandments that Solomon was expected to keep with the received Mosaic tradition. Indeed, this appears to be the case even more clearly in verse six where the LXX includes Μωσῆς in its translation.

⁷³Cf. also also I Kgs 11.38. After Solomon had failed, this covenant requirement was repeated to Jeroboam, but he too failed to remain faithful to the Lord. Cf. I Kgs 14.8b-9.

the Lord warns him that if he or his sons do not, but turn from them, do not keep the commandments and ordinances, and serve other gods (אלהים אחרים/θεοῖς ἑτέροις),⁷⁴ then he and his descendants would be cut off from the land (9.7). Thus the admonition to Solomon to do all the commandments is set against the failure to do so, which is the worship of other gods.⁷⁵

3. II Kgs 17

When the kingdom of Israel was sent into exile through the hand of the Assyrians, the text states several times that the reason this happened was due to the fact that Israel failed to remain within the whole law when she worshipped other gods. For example, in II Kgs 17.13 the Lord exhorts his people to turn from their evil ways and to remain faithful to the whole law (כל־התורה/πάντα τὸν νόμον). The Deuteronomist states that the reason for exile into Assyria was due to Israel's idolatry (17.7-11, 15-17).⁷⁶ Israel is repeatedly warned to remain faithful to the Lord (17.13), and II Kgs 17.16 explicitly states how Israel failed to observe the entire Law: they had forsaken all the commandments (אח־כל־מצוות/τὰς ἐντολάς⁷⁷) through devotion to other gods. The specific way in which Israel had forsaken all the commandments of the Lord was through her manufacture and worship of other gods.⁷⁸

⁷⁴The reason given in verse nine for the curse which would fall on Israel was that they abandoned God and worshipped other gods (אלהים אחרים/θεῶν ἄλλοτριῶν).

⁷⁵Cf. DeVries: 127.

⁷⁶Cf. II Kgs 18.12. On the link between this verse and II Kgs 17.7-23, see Hobbs: 254.

⁷⁷The LXX omits the adjective πᾶς.

⁷⁸On the connection here between keeping the law and the covenant and the worship of other gods, see also II Kgs 17.37-38. In the midst of the narrative concerning the nations that the Assyrians settled in Samaria after Israel had been sent into exile, Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh is described. This covenant stipulates that Israel's everlasting obligation is to remain faithful to the covenant. The specific way in which she would fail to do so is through the worship of other gods.

4. II Kgs 21

During the course of listing the multiple offenses of Manasseh in which he extended the worship of other gods in Judah, the narrator repeats the Lord's warning that they must do all the Lord's commandments (21.8: ככל אשר צויתים / πάντα, ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην), and that they must do all the law (21.8: ולכל החורה / κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐντολήν). But II Kgs 21.9 records that Israel did not obey and Manasseh led them astray into idolatry.⁷⁹ Manasseh even placed the image of Asherah in the house of the Lord (21.7-8). Israel would have dwelt in peace and security (21.8), if they had kept the basic covenant stipulation:⁸⁰ remain faithful to the Lord to do all the commandments and the whole law. Israel failed to obey, however, and continued in the worship of other gods, and thereby they did not do all the commandments.

5. II Kgs 22-23

This text records the series of events during the reign of Josiah which took place shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem. During the repair of the temple which Josiah had ordered, the book of the law was discovered.⁸¹ In II Kgs 22.13 the connection between that which was written in the book of the law (על דברי הספר הנמצא הזה) / περὶ

⁷⁹Cf. Lowery: 170; and Hobbs: 306. Lowery: 171, 182-185 argues that the catalogue of Manasseh's cultic sins is closely related both to Deut 18 and 2 Kgs 17, and thus he highlights the Deuteronomistic character of this passage.

⁸⁰On the link between the promise to Israel of rest in the land and her obedience to the commandments, see Hobbs: 306.

⁸¹Scholars usually associate this law book with some form of the book of Deuteronomy. Cf. Hobbs: 325. According to Baltzer: 52-54, the attempted reform, however, is not centered on the repairs of the temple, but rather "...is directed more to the purging of shrines of Canaanite religious practices." Cf. also Lowery: 203-206, who argues that Josiah purged elements of idolatrous worship which were both of Palestinian and Assyrian origin. This reform resulted in a kingdom of Judah in which imperial constraints had been thrown off for the first time in a century. Thus Josiah's purge of foreign deities had nationalistic consequences.

τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ εὐρεθέντος τούτου) and the impending wrath of the Lord (הוה ירהם בנדר לה/μεγάλη ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου) is clear. Equally clear is the ground for this wrath, because Israel did not obey the words of this book (הזה הספר הזה/τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου), to do all that was written in it (עליון/כל הכתוב/πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα καθ' ἡμῶν). This book of the law, then, detailed the impending exile for the people of Judah because of their failure to do everything written in it. II Kgs 22.17 records that the specific way in which the people of God had failed to do all of the Law was their abandonment of the Lord for the worship of other gods (אלהים אחרים/θεοῖς ἑτέροις).⁸² This covenant failure resulted in the rapid approach of the wrath of the Lord⁸³ which is designated the curse (22.19: ולקללה/εἰς κατάραν). This prophetic oracle⁸⁴ indicates that the apostasy of the people resulted in the curses of Deuteronomy because they had failed to do all the law.

B. Israel's Prophetic Literature

1. Jeremiah

⁸²This connection between doing all that the law required and idolatry is also made explicit in II Kgs 23.24-25 in connection with Josiah's faithfulness to the covenant when he removed the idols from the temple. This action meant that Josiah confirmed the words written in the book of the law and that he was faithful to the whole law of Moses (ככל תורת משה/κατὰ πάντα τὸν νόμον Μωσῆ). Josiah's faithfulness to the covenant with the Lord thus focuses on his removal of every element of idol worship, and he thereby confirms (הקים/στήσῃ) the law. This concern with the elimination of the gods of Canaanite religion is stressed in the Deuteronomistic History. See Ackroyd: 41.

⁸³On the translation of נצרה to refer either to impending or existing judgment see Baltzer: 53-54. If the verb refers to an impending judgment, as Baltzer prefers, then it "...provides the explanation for what would otherwise be inexplicable disaster." (64).

⁸⁴Hobbs: 327 notes the link between this oracle in 22.16 and the oracle given to Manasseh in 21.12. Manasseh's idolatrous behavior results in divine punishment because he led the people astray into idolatry (21.1-18) and they did not do the all the law (21.8). Moreover, according to Hobbs the style of this text is in the pattern of Deut 27-28.

Jeremiah is perhaps the most commonly cited example of the link between the Deuteronomistic tradition and Israel's prophets.⁸⁵ Nowhere is this link more evident than in Jeremiah's use of Deut. 27.26 in Jer 11.1-17.⁸⁶ Jer 11.3b-4 is a citation of Deut 27.26:

אָרוּר הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמַע אֶת־דְּבַר־יְהוָה הַבְּרִית הַזֹּאת
 אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה הוֹצִיאתִי אֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ־מִצְרַיִם מִכּוּר הַבְּרִזְלָה
 לֵאמֹר שְׁמַעוּ בְּקוֹלִי וְעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־אֶצְוֶה אֹתְכֶם
 וְהִייתֶם לִי לְעָם וְאֲנִי אֶהְיֶה לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים

Cursed is the one who does not obey the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers on the day I brought them out from the land of Egypt, from the iron furnace, saying, obey my voice and do them, according to all that I command you. And you will be my people, and I will be your God.

The MT is clearly a citation of Deut 27.26. The slight modifications in Jer 11.3b-4 are, first, the inclusion of the noun הָאִישׁ; second, the use of the verb יִשְׁמַע instead of יִקְרָא; third, the reference to הַבְּרִית הַזֹּאת instead of הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת; and fourth, the citation of לְעֲשׂוֹת אֹתָם in verse four, which provides Jer 11.4 with a link back to the citation of Deut 27.26 in 11.3.

The LXX translation is:

ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὃς οὐκ ἀκούσεται τῶν λόγων τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης
 ἧς ἐνετείλαμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ἣ ἀνήγαγον αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς
 Αἰγύπτου ἐκ καμίνου τῆς σιδήρας
 λέγων ἀκούσατε τῆς φωνῆς μου καὶ ποιήσατε πάντα, ὅσα ἐὰν
 ἐντείλωμαι ὑμῖν, καὶ ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς λαόν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς θεόν

Cursed is the one who does not obey the words of this covenant which I commanded your fathers in the day which I led them up from the land of Egypt, from the furnace of iron, saying, obey my voice and do all the things, whatever I command you,

⁸⁵Lowery: 29.

⁸⁶For the Deuteronomistic character of Jer 11.2-5, see Craigie 1991: 168; and Holladay 1986: 350.

and you will be my people, and I will be your God.

The Greek translation of Jer 11.3b-4 thus evidences a close correspondence to the Hebrew text of Jeremiah. Furthermore, when the Greek text of Jeremiah diverges from Deut. 27.26, it does so in correlation with the Hebrew text of Jeremiah. For example, the verb ἀκούσεται corresponds to the verb ישמע in Jer 11.3, rather than either term found in Deut 27.26 (יקים/ἐμμενεῖ). Moreover, the Greek translation of Jer 11.3 refers to τῶν λόγων τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης, which corresponds to אַתָּה דַּבַּרְתָּ הַבְּרִיתִּי הַזֹּאת, rather than the text of Deuteronomy (אֲתָּוֶרֶתְךָ הַזֹּאת/τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου). The Greek text of Jer 11.3, therefore, depends on the Hebrew text of Jeremiah, rather than either the Hebrew or Greek text of Deuteronomy. There is no evidence to suggest that the LXX modified its translation with Deut 27.26 in view.

The clause ועשיתם אותם/καὶ ποιήσατε πάντα links the content of verse four to the citation in 11.3, because this clause corresponds to that part of Deut 27.26 which is omitted in Jer 11.3. This conclusion is strengthened by the observation that the verb שמע/ἀκούειν is repeated in verse four (שמעו בקולי/ἀκούσατε τῆς φωνῆς μου). Thus the resumptive nature of verse four is clear in which the citation from Deuteronomy is further explained. Those who are cursed are those who do not do "all that I commanded you" (אשר־אצוה אתכם/πάντα, ὅσα ἐὰν ἐντείλωμαι ὑμῖν). Even though the adjective כל is absent from the MT of Deut 27.26, it is present in both the MT and LXX of Jer 11.4. This is significant for the present study in light of Israel's specific sin and its covenant implications.⁸⁷ The curse in Jer 11.3b-4 thus is applied to those who fail to do all the commandments.⁸⁸ Yet Israel did not obey the terms of the covenant, but instead

⁸⁷Jeremiah's response in verse five corresponds to the proper response of the people to the pronouncement of cursing on disobedience to the terms of the covenant. Cf. Deut 27.26. This response is due after each of the twelve curses recorded in Deut 27.15-26.

⁸⁸For other passages in Jeremiah which either in the immediate or in the wider context link failure to obey the Lord with Israel's idolatry see 2.8, 29; 3.13, 25; 4.17; 5.4-7; 7.23-24, 28, 30-31; 8.8-9; 9.13-14; 16.11; 22.9, 21; 24.6-8; 26.4-6, 13; 32.23, 29-35; 33.8; 35.14-15; 44.10, 23.

they stubbornly walked with an evil heart (11.8). In 11.10 we read that Israel went after other gods (אלהים אחרים/θεῶν ἄλλοτριῶν). Idolatry is the specific way in which Israel broke the covenant (11.9-13),⁸⁹ and this idolatry is termed "a conspiracy" (קִשְׁרָה) against the Lord. This term elsewhere designates political treason.⁹⁰ In Jeremiah it is employed in reference to the people of Israel who have abandoned Yahweh for other gods, and thus have rebelled against him.⁹¹

2. Hosea

The prophet Hosea functioned as the messenger of the Lord to the kingdom of Israel in the eighth century B.C.E.,⁹² and his message was evidently influenced by the Deuteronomistic school.⁹³ In 8.1b, an oracle in which Israel's impending destruction is announced, the prophet declared the impending judgment:

יֵעַן עָבְרוּ בְרִיתִי וְעַל-תּוֹרַתִי פָשְׁעוּ

...because they have transgressed my covenant,
and rebelled against my law

ἀνθ' ὧν παρέβησαν τὴν διαθήκην μου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ νόμου μου

⁸⁹The structure of Jer 11.1-15 clearly indicates that idolatry is the specific means by which Israel broke the covenant. See Craigie 1991: 169. In Jeremiah, idolatry thus is designated as failure to keep all of the commandments.

⁹⁰Craigie 1991: 170-171. The political dimension of Israel's apostasy may be emphasized in Jer 17.5-8, where the curse is pronounced on those who trust in man. This trust may refer either to political treaties and alliances, especially with Egypt, or to one's own personal strength. Cf. Craigie 1991: 226; and Holladay 1986: 489-493.

⁹¹Holladay 1986: 354. Compare also Jer 17.5 which states that the one who trusts in man and whose heart turns away from the Lord is cursed (קִשְׁרָה/ἐπικατάρατος). This contrasts with 17.7 which pronounces a blessing on the one who trusts in the Lord. In 32.23 (=LXX 39.23) Jeremiah prays and states that Israel failed to do all that God commanded them. The specific way in 32.29-35 (=LXX 39.29-35) that they had failed is idolatry (cf. esp. v.29).

⁹²Stuart: 9.

⁹³idem: 6-8; and Weinfeld: 366-370. One of the dominant metaphors with which Hosea characterized the sin of Israel is "to prostitute" (זָנָה), on which see Stuart: 16.

Because they have transgressed my covenant and my law.

The transgression of the covenant in Hosea's day involved the conscious and willful disobedience to the law of Yahweh,⁹⁴ and Israel thereby abandoned the covenant, which "...is tantamount to forgetting it and its sponsor God."⁹⁵ The specific way in which Israel transgressed the covenant is idolatry (8.4-6, 11).⁹⁶ This violation of the covenant is described as the violation of thousands of commandments of the law (8: 12: רבו חורתי/πληθος και τὰ νόμια). This passage does not employ the term כל in reference to Israel's disobedience of the law, but the neglect of "ten thousand" commandments may be the functional equivalent to this Deuteronomistic expression. Although the term curse is not used here, the consequences of Israel's idolatrous behavior in verse seven and eight is described within the framework of the curse of Deuteronomy.⁹⁷ Hosea thus announced that because Israel transgressed the covenant and broken the law through the worship of other gods, they would fall under the curse of the covenant.⁹⁸

C. Summary

Based on our survey of several passages from the Deuteronomistic History, one of its consistent features is the association of the failure to do all that the law required and

⁹⁴Cf. 6.7. The transgression of the covenant is tantamount to treason against Yahweh. See also Stuart: 131.

⁹⁵Weinfeld: 367.

⁹⁶Stuart: 131 rightly notes that Israel's arrogating to themselves the right to install or depose kings is also condemned (8.4a). Israel thus is condemned for assuming the God's role in the governance of the kingdom. This, however, is not the focal point of the oracle; Israel's idolatry is.

⁹⁷idem: 133-134.

⁹⁸Cf. also Hos 4.1-19, where these three motifs are again combined in an indictment of Israel. In connection with this passage, cf. Stuart: 85-86.

transgression of the covenant with the worship of other gods.⁹⁹ Throughout the record of these kings of Israel and Judah, we read of the consistent failure of the majority of those kings to remain faithful to the covenant because they consistently worshipped other gods,¹⁰⁰ and thereby failed to do all that the law required.¹⁰¹ Thus the Deuteronomistic history is focused on the question of whether the kings of Israel will remain faithful to Yahweh and thereby remain faithful to the covenant. Furthermore, the curse of the covenant is the result of this covenant violation both for Israel (II Kgs 17) and for Judah (II Kgs 22-23). The worship of other gods is the primary cause for the curse which fell upon those who violated the covenant, and this violation of the covenant, which consistently involved idolatry as the focus of attention, is often designated as failure to do everything that the Lord commanded. The Deuteronomistic history, therefore, presents a view of Israel's history in which her unfaithfulness to the covenant with Yahweh through the sin of idolatry is typically designated as failure to do all the commandments of the law of Moses. Moreover, Jer 11.3b-4 is the only place in the Jewish scripture where the language of Deut 27.26 occurs. It is significant that the context for the citation of the failure to do all that the Lord commanded is Israel's idolatry and covenant unfaithfulness.

IV. Conclusion

Our study began with an examination of Deuteronomy in order to determine the meaning of the curse which fell on those who failed to do everything in the law. We discovered that a strikingly consistent pattern emerged from Deuteronomy; when the curse and failure to do the whole law are juxtaposed, the worship of other gods is often

⁹⁹Cf. Ackroyd: 65.

¹⁰⁰Furthermore, many of the kings of Israel were said to have walked in the ways of Jeroboam and thereby perpetuated his idolatrous behavior (cf. I Kgs 15.26, 34; 16.3, 7, 13, 19, 25-26, 30-33; 21.22-26; 22.52-53; II Kgs 13.2-3, 11; 14.24; 15.9, 18, 24, 28; 17.22).

¹⁰¹von Rad 1953: 75-76.

the focus of attention. Although the law certainly contains many other commandments, the breach of the covenant that is idolatry is consistently stated as the ground for the curse of the covenant in Deuteronomy. Covenant loyalty, not sinless perfection, is the primary and fundamental issue in Deuteronomy. We thus concluded that failure to do the whole law functions in Deuteronomy as an idiomatic expression which means to abandon the covenant with Yahweh and to serve other gods. This conclusion was confirmed by our examination of several texts from the Deuteronomistic history and from the prophetic literature. Since we have found such a consistent link in this literature between the curse, failure to keep the commandments, and devotion to other gods, we are compelled to examine Paul's letter to the Galatians to see what light this motif in Deuteronomy sheds on Gal 3.10. This task will be taken up in Part Three.

Part Two

Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Covenant
in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism

Chapter Four:

Blessing for the Nations in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism.

I. Introduction

It is important for the present study to understand as fully as possible the significance of the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants in the literature of Second Temple Judaism. It is the task of this chapter to locate the various places in the postbiblical literature which pick up and develop this third strand of the promise. On the one hand, a significant number of documents in this period include the third strand, both in connection with the citation and interpretation of the patriarchal narrative and also in connection with expansions of the text into which the third strand has been inserted. On the other hand, we have several important witnesses in this period which are silent with respect to the third strand of the promise, and the implications of this silence for our study must be explored.

II. The Apocrypha

A. Ben Sira

The promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is not a common theme in the Apocrypha;¹ however, it does occur in a significant passage in the Wisdom of Ben Sira, and is perhaps alluded in Tobit. Ben Sira 44.1-50.24 is known as

¹Cf. Hansen 1989: 188, with reference to the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha: "Only in Sirach 44.21 is any hope extended to the Gentiles on the basis of the Abrahamic covenant." Hansen is correct with respect to the former corpus, but is incorrect with respect to the latter. See n. 11 below.

"The Praise of Famous Men," and within this section the third strand of the promise is mentioned (44.19-23).² The statement of the promise is prefaced by Abraham's obedience to the law and his covenant relationship with the Lord.³ Hence, the promise is based on Abraham's obedience and the covenant (cf. 44.21: *διὰ τοῦτο*). Ben Sira highlights four aspects of the promise which the Lord has sworn⁴ to do for Abraham because he has been faithful to the Lord: the nations would be blessed in his seed (*ἐνευλογηθῆναι ἔθνη ἐν σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*), his offspring would be multiplied like the dust of the earth, they would be exalted as the stars (*καὶ ὡς ἄστρα ἀνυψῶσαι τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ*), and they would inherit (*καὶ κατακληρονομήσαι αὐτοὺς*) from sea to sea and from the river to the end of the earth. Hence Ben Sira drew together the three strands of the promise to Abraham: blessing for the nations, many descendants, and the land. It is significant that the promise of the land has been universalized to the ends of the earth, perhaps under the influence of Gen 28.14.⁵

²Elsewhere in Ben Sira blessing is closely associated with the fear of the Lord and with wisdom. In 34.13-17 those who fear the Lord (*ὅτι*) will live (*ζήσεται*), will be saved (*ἡ γὰρ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν σώζοντα αὐτούς*), and are blessed (*μαρκαρία ἡ ψυχῆ*). According to Skehan 1987: 410, Ben Sira has drawn on strands from the Jewish scripture which include Gen 15 and Ps 121 in order to illustrate the blessing from the Lord on those who fear him. In verse 17 the Lord gives to those who fear him health (*ἰασιν*), life (*ζωὴν*), and blessing (*εὐλογίαν*). Hence, in Ben Sira 34.13-17 blessing, stated in a variety of forms, is juxtaposed with the fear of the Lord, and it is this fear which is the precondition for blessing. Cf. also 40.27 and 1.13. Blessing is also associated with wisdom (4.13; and 37.24), the knowledge of God (36.10-13), and the reign of Solomon (47.15).

³For Ben Sira Abraham was a great father of many nations (44.19: *μέγας πατὴρ πλήθους ἔθνων*), a man who had more glory than any other person (44.19: *καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη ὁμοίος ἐν τῇ δοξῇ*), a person who kept law of the Lord and was in covenant with him (44.20: *ὡς συνετήρησεν νόμον ὑψίστου καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ*), the person in whose flesh the covenant was established, a reference to circumcision (44.20: *ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἔστησεν διαθήκην*), and a person who was found faithful when tested (44.20: *καὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὐρέθη πιστός*). On Abraham's obedience to the covenant as the presupposition for this text, see Kuschel: 33; and Lührmann: 57.

⁴Ben Sira stated that the Lord confirmed these things to Abraham by an oath: *διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὄρκῳ ἔστησεν αὐτῷ*. This expression is an echo of Gen 22.16, and Gen 22.16-18 appears to have been the source of Ben Sira's statements here. Cf. Skehan: 505.

⁵On the sources for these expressions, however, see Skehan: 505.

Ben Sira continues his discussion of famous men with Abraham's son, Isaac and his grandson, Jacob (44.22-23). The Lord established for Isaac the same sworn oath as his father, Abraham.⁶ Ben Sira mentions two aspects of this oath, one of which was not explicit in the preceding context (44.23: καὶ διαθήκην). It is striking that of the four elements listed previously, the one element of the promise that is repeated is the blessing of all people (44.23: εὐλογίαν πάντων ἀνθρώπων). Through Isaac the promise came to rest on the head of Jacob,⁷ Abraham's seed (44.23: κατέπαυσεν ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν Ἰακωβ). Jacob thus becomes the focus both of the blessing and of the covenant.

Several observations concerning Ben Sira's understanding of the promise to Abraham may be offered.⁸ First, Ben Sira has cited the three strands of the promise to Abraham, and he has apparently done so from Gen 22.16-18. Second, the blessing for the nations is obviously of importance for the author of Ben Sira, since he places it at the head of the list of God's promises to Abraham, an inversion of the order in Gen 22.16-18, and thereby places it in a position of emphasis (44.21). This blessing, however, is founded on Abraham's prior obedience to the law and the covenant made with him. Third, the promise of the land has been universalized to include the whole earth (44.21). The connection between blessing for the nations and Israel's role as inheritor of the whole earth is left unstated, however. It may be that as Israel fills the whole earth, this presence is the blessing for the nations. Fourth, the blessing of all people and the covenant are closely connected, and it is the promise of blessing for the nations that is repeated in Ben Sira's brief account of the continuation of the covenant with Isaac. This repetition thereby suggests its importance for him (44.22). And fifth, the inheritance is given to Jacob through whom it is passed to the twelve tribes of Israel (44.23).

⁶Ben Sira states that the Lord did this for the sake of Abraham his father (44.22: δι' Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ).

⁷Ben Sira states that the Lord gave Jacob an inheritance (44.23: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἐν κληρονομίᾳ) which he divided among his twelve sons.

⁸On Ben Sira's interpretive method, see Stadelmann.

B. Tobit

Although Ben Sira is the only document in the apocrypha which contains a clear citation of the third strand of the promise to Abraham, a text from Tobit perhaps also is intended as a reference to the promise with a significantly different application. Tobit instructs his son on the need to marry a Jewish woman, and as part of his argument he refers to the blessing which came to those who had done so in the past, specifically the patriarchs Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (4.12).⁹ From the very beginning (ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος) Jewish men always married from their own race (ὅτι αὐτοὶ πάντες ἔλαβον γυναῖκας ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν), the result of which for the patriarchs was that εὐλογήθησαν ἐν τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν and τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν κληρονομήσει γῆν. Tobit thus clearly refers to the first two strands of the promise: descendants (τὸ σπέρμα) and the land (γῆν). And in this context, with the mention of Abraham and his sons which preceded, the use of the future passive of εὐλογεῖν with the preposition ἐν would almost certainly alert the reader familiar with the Genesis narrative to the third strand of the promise.¹⁰ However, in Tobit those who are blessed are the patriarchs in their children and by extension faithful Jewish men in the Second Temple period who married Jewish women in order to protect their Jewish heritage.

III. The Pseudepigrapha

⁹Tobit refers to the Jewish people as υἱοὶ προφητῶν and to the patriarchs as οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν.

¹⁰Tobit also may refer to the third strand in 13.11-14 where we read that many nations (ἔθνη πολλὰ) would come to worship the Lord and offer him gifts. These nations would be cursed if they hated the Lord (ἐπικατάρατος πάντες οἱ μισοῦντες σε), but blessed if they loved the Lord (εὐλογημένοι ἔσονται πάντες οἱ ἀγαπῶντες σε εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα/ὦ μακάριοι οἱ ἀγαπῶντες). On this text and its relationship with Deuteronomy, see Weitzman.

A. Introduction

The promise to Abraham to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is featured in several documents of the pseudepigrapha. This is especially the case in documents which attempt to reproduce the patriarchal narrative, in part or in whole.¹¹ Attention will be devoted to three such texts: Jubilees, Pseudo-Philo, and the Ladder of Jacob.

B. Jubilees

The book of Jubilees, which dates to the middle of the second century B.C.E.,¹² claims to be the revelation to Moses at Sinai of "...the primeval history of mankind and the subsequent history of God's chosen people until the time of Moses."¹³ The author of Jubilees, moreover, adapted the text and inserted new material into it¹⁴ in order to express his viewpoint, which was that

...Israel was holy, and that sanctity was to find expression in both an uncompromising adherence to God's Law and in strict separation from the nations.¹⁵

In spite of Jubilees' concern for a strict separation from gentiles, the text at times betrays an interest in the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants both in

¹¹ *Pace* Hansen 1989: 188, who concludes that the promise to bless the nations is present only in Ben Sira 44.21.

¹² Nickelsburg 1984: 101--103; *idem* 1981: 78-79; Wintermute: 43-44; Schürer 1986: 311-313; VanderKam 1985: 115-116; and Endres: 13.

¹³ Wintermute: 35. See also Nickelsburg 1984: 97-104; *idem* 1981: 73; VanderKam 1985: 111; and Delcor: 432-436.

¹⁴ Endres: 2-7, 15-17; and VanderKam 1985: 113.

¹⁵ VanderKam 1985: 113.

its account of the Abraham story and in other sections of the narrative. Our survey of Jubilees thus will divide into two parts. First, we will consider how Jubilees handled the Abrahamic narrative concerning the promise to bless the nations through him or his descendants,¹⁶ looking especially at those places where the promise narrative is modified and at the significance of these modifications.¹⁷ Second, we will identify the places where the third strand of the promise is woven into the literary fabric of other sections of Jubilees, and we will evaluate how this motif is used there.

Jub 12.22-23 contains the rewritten record of Gen 12.2-3. The context before Abraham's call as recorded in Gen 12.1-3 is significantly expanded in Jubilees. The central thrust of this expansion is the elaboration of Abraham's piety and his singular devotion to the Lord (Jub 11.16-17; 12.2-5, 12, 19-20). Abraham thus is presented as a man who was not ensnared by the idolatry which was so prevalent in his day.¹⁸ In Jubilees the divine promise to Abraham thus is preceded by a narrative in which Abraham is portrayed as a man who is faithful to the Lord alone and the Lord's promise which follows comes in response to Abraham's piety:¹⁹

...and I shall establish you as a great and numerous people. And I shall bless you and I shall make your name great, and you will be blessed in the

¹⁶On the promise of land and descendants in Jubilees, cf. Halpern-Amaru: 25-55; and Mendels: 57-88.

¹⁷Jubilees contains a translation and modification of Gen 12.1-3; 22.18; 26.4; and 28.14. However, the promise of blessing for the nations found in Gen 18.18 is part of a section of the Jewish Scriptures (Gen 18.16-19.20) which is highly condensed by Jubilees (16.5-6) and thus is omitted from the translation. The significance of the omission of this section of the Genesis text may lie in the observation that this mention of God's promise to Abraham is embedded within a narrative that Jubilees chose to condense. Thus its omission is due to an editorial decision concerning the narrative as a whole, rather than an intention to ignore or omit the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants. This conclusion is strengthened by the observation that a similar decision to shorten the Genesis narrative occurs in Jub 19.10-14 resulted in the omission of the promise of descendants and the land in Gen 24.7.

¹⁸Halpern-Amaru: 31 argues that Abraham is presented as the spiritual protege of Noah.

¹⁹*ibid.*

land and all the nations of the earth will bless themselves²⁰ by you. And whoever blesses you I shall bless and whoever curses you I shall curse.
(12.22-23)

Several significant modifications may be noted. First, the promise that **וואעשק לגוי גדול** is translated "I shall establish you as great and numerous people."²¹ Second, **והיה ברכה** is rendered "you will be blessed in the land." While other ancient versions also read "you will be blessed" rather than "you will be a blessing,"²² the most significant modification is that the blessing to Abraham and the land are bound tightly together in a manner which is foreign to the original text.²³ Third, the promise of blessing for the nations is transposed before the promise of blessing or cursing based on one's response to Abraham. And fourth, the Hebrew term **גוים** is translated "nations". Jubilees expands this promise to include a statement of the Lord's special relationship with Abraham and his descendants, and it thereby extends the promise to unending generations of Israelites (12.24).

Jubilees highlights Abraham's faithfulness in testing, especially his faithfulness in offering Isaac as the Lord commanded.²⁴ Thus Jubilees renders Gen 22.18:

²⁰It is uncertain if a reflexive translation is required here or if the ambiguity of the Hebrew verb form has rather been translated with a passive. The translation of Jubilees in Charles consistently translates each of the four occurrences of the promise with the future passive.

²¹This aspect of the promise to Abraham has been modified in three ways. First, the verb **וואעשק** is translated "I shall establish you." Second, the insertion of the adjective "numerous" may be intended to recall Gen 18.18, a passage which is omitted by Jubilees. And third, the noun **גוי** is translated "people."

²²Cf. LXX, Tg. Onq. and Tg. Ps.-J..

²³Cf. Halpern-Amaru: 32 argues that this change functions to strengthen the election aspect of the covenant which is so important to the author of Jubilees. Her thesis is that the author's central concerns are Israel's election to a special relationship with the Lord and the retrojection of the allocation of the land into the rewritten version of Gen 1-11 (*idem*: 25-30).

²⁴This test came when Mastema questioned whether Abraham was faithful in everything (Jub 17.16). The Lord, however, knew Abraham's faithfulness to him (Jub 17.15, 17-18). See also 23.10.

And all of the nations of the earth will bless themselves by your seed because you obeyed my word. (Jub 18.16a)²⁵

The modifications of this text and other aspects of the promise to Abraham in its context in Jubilees are slight. First, Jubilees inserts a reference to "your firstborn son, whom you love" (Jub 18.15).²⁶ Second, Abraham's descendants will inherit the cities of their enemies.²⁷

The promise of God to Abraham found in Gen 26.4 and other aspects of the promise in its context are translated in Jubilees with only minor modification.²⁸

And all the nations of the earth will bless themselves by your seed because your father obeyed me and observed my restrictions and my commandments and my laws and my ordinances and my covenant. And now, obey my voice, and dwell in this land. (Jub 24.11)

First, Jubilees refers to the singular "land" rather than the plural (Jub 24.10).²⁹ Second, the list of divine imperatives to which Abraham was obedient is expanded to include his obedience to "my covenant" (Jub 24.11). Through this subtle addition to the text Jubilees is thus able to make covenant faithfulness a vital part of God's promise to the patriarch. And third, Jubilees repeats the divine imperative of 26.3 to remain in the land (Jub 24.11).³⁰

The promise of God to bless the nations found in Gen 28.14 is recorded in Jubilees:

²⁵Abraham's obedience is stressed in 18.16b.

²⁶MT: אֶת־בְּנֵךְ אֶת־יְחִידֶךָ; LXX: τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ.

²⁷MT: אֶת־שְׂעָרַי אֲבִיבֵי; Jubilees and the LXX share the same plural reading.

²⁸Endres: 66.

²⁹MT: כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֶּה; Jub.: all of this land; and the LXX: πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην.

³⁰Endres: 66 refers to the linkage of obedience and dwelling in the land as "...a characteristic addition" on the part of the author of Jubilees. In this way "Jubilees reinforces the notion that Isaac's encounter involved adherence to the covenant, and that this functions as a prerequisite for continued habitation of the land." Cf. also Halpern-Amaru: 35.

And your seed shall be like the sand of the earth. And you shall increase in the West and the East and North and South. And all the peoples of the nations will be blessed in you and in your seed. (Jub 27.23)

First, the change in Jubilees from "earth" (אֶרֶץ/τῆς γῆς) to "nations" is the one significant modification³¹ in this verse, and it appears to make the text refer more directly to gentiles.³² Second, the only other change in the other aspects of the promise in this context appears to be the insertion of "...and I shall bring you back into this land in peace..." (Jub 27.24).³³ This concern for peace in the promised land may reflect a time in the Second Century B.C.E. when peace in the land of Palestine was an ideal to which the pious Israelite aspired.

Although we must note that Jubilees provides evidence of the postbiblical Jewish motif that the descendants of Abraham would inherit the earth and rule the nations,³⁴ the promise of blessing for the nations through the descendants of Abraham is evident in several passages where it is not present in the Jewish Scriptures.³⁵ Indeed, as early as

³¹Endres: 99 states that "the oracle thus shows some evidence of retouching, but not of significant rewriting."

³²ibid.

³³Cf. ibid. This expression "...may have been a characteristic second century expression."

³⁴Cf. Jub 22.14; and 32.16-19.

³⁵In one significant text in which the promise to bless the nations might have been expected, Jubilees instead mentions the promise of the land (Jub 25.16b-17). In this text Rebekah pronounces a blessing upon Jacob, the holy seed of Abraham, and her blessing makes an explicit connection between Jacob, his descendants, and the land. It is very important, however, to note the language that Jubilees places into her mouth by which she requested that the sons of Jacob "be more numerous and greater than the stars of heaven; and more than the sand of the sea." Although Genesis uses several metaphors in describing the extent of the growth of Abraham's offspring (e.g. "the dust of the earth" and "the stars of the heaven."), the precise expression used in Jub. 25.16 occurs only once in the Genesis narrative (cf. Gen 22.17-18). The combined metaphor of stars and sand led the Biblical text into the promise of blessing for the nations; however, for Jubilees this same metaphor brought to mind the promise of the land given to Abraham's seed. We may therefore suggest that for the author of Jubilees the language of the Biblical text, in this text at least, brought to mind the promises of land and seed, to the exclusion of the promise to bless the nations. It is not necessary to speculate that this was a conscious decision to ignore the promise to bless the nations. What we are suggesting is that the perspective of Jubilees was shaped by its nomistic environment. Consequently, the imagery which the Biblical texts brought together with the promise of blessing for the nations in Jubilees led to a connection with God's promise of land and the seed. To be sure, the third strand is

the flood narrative, Jubilees indicates that Noah would be a blessing on the earth (Jub 6.5).³⁶ Moreover, when Abraham was about to die, Jubilees records a speech to his children in which he exhorts them to guard the way of the Lord (Jub 20.2-3),³⁷ which meant, in effect, to avoid fornication and idolatry and to worship the Most High God alone (Jub 20.6-9). If Abraham's children listen to this instruction, they

...will become a blessing upon the earth, and all of the nations of the earth will desire you, and they will bless your sons in my name, so that they might be blessed just as I am. (Jub 20.10)

Obedience to the Lord's commandments by Abraham's children thus results in a blessing for those who dwell upon the earth. It is significant that this motif occurs in the midst of a section in which the author of Jubilees expanded the Biblical text.³⁸

Furthermore, the blessing for the nations that is envisioned by Jubilees comes into focus most clearly in the person of Jacob:³⁹

And he (Abraham) said to her (Rebecca), 'My daughter, guard my son Jacob because he will be in place of me upon the earth and for a blessing in the midst of the sons of men and a glory to all the seed of Shem... (Jub 19.17)

Abraham is concerned for Jacob's welfare because although Isaac loves Esau, Abraham knows that the chosen people will come from Jacob and that he will be a blessing upon the earth (Jub 19.20). Although the text of Jubilees does not indicate the nature of this

faithfully translated when it occurs in the text and the concept of Israel being a blessing in the world is mentioned in several places, with significant modification. Halpern-Amaru: 39-41 argues that the author's concern for the land here represents an expansion of the original promise to include the inheritance of the whole earth.

³⁶Cf. Halpern-Amaru: 28-29.

³⁷This involves living a just lifestyle, circumcision, obedience to all the Lord's commands, rejection of idolatry, and separation from fornication and impurity. Hence this tradition which is not found in the biblical text reflects concerns directed at a second century Jewish audience. Cf. Endres: 28.

³⁸ibid.

³⁹In one text the blessing comes through Levi and Judah (31.7). In another text the blessing comes through Isaac and his descendants (21.24-25).

blessing, it is possible the author understood that the ubiquitous presence of the descendants of Abraham would mediate blessing for the nations (Jub 19.21b-24a). The statements in this text concerning Abraham's descendants being as numerous as the sand of the earth and the blessing of Abraham's name are clear references to aspects of the promise to Abraham. Jacob is important for Jubilees because it is only through Jacob that the promised blessing for the sons of men comes, and this blessing may be realized through the ubiquitous presence of Israelites as they inherit the earth in fulfillment of God's promise.⁴⁰

Jubilees, therefore, consistently cites the promise to bless the nations in its rewritten narrative. The expansion of the text which precedes the patriarchal narrative clearly places the promise within the context of Abraham's prior response of faith in the Lord, the rejection of idolatry, and obedience to the commandments. Moreover, the third strand of the promise is regularly cited, but it never is elaborated or expanded in connection with its citation in the patriarchal narrative as other elements of the promise are (e.g. the land in 12.23, and 27.24). The motif of the third strand is woven into the text elsewhere in Jubilees in connection with its fulfillment in the children of Abraham, and especially Jacob. Moreover, in the occurrences of this motif elsewhere in Jubilees, blessing for gentiles may be subsumed under the motif of the expansion of Abraham's descendants throughout the whole world.

C. Pseudo-Philo

Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities is a rewriting of the history of Israel from Adam to David which dates to the first half of the first century C.E.⁴¹ In this rewriting

⁴⁰Halpern-Amaru: 37 suggests that this is an expansion of the promise of the land.

⁴¹Harrington 1985a: 8; idem 1985b: 297, 299; and Murphy: 6. See, however, Nickelsburg 1984: 109 who dates Pseudo-Philo to the late first century of the common era.

the author summarized, deleted, paraphrased, quoted, and interpolated new material into his narrative.⁴² The message of Pseudo-Philo is located primarily in the speeches which the author attributed to his central characters:

The content of the many speeches put on the lips of the leaders of Israel functions as a kind of kerygma: Israel is God's chosen people, chosen already before creation; therefore, even when their very existence is threatened, God's covenant fidelity will deliver them.⁴³

The Lord's faithfulness to his chosen people thus is a central feature of Pseudo-Philo.⁴⁴

The narrative in Pseudo-Philo concerning Abraham is quite brief.⁴⁵ The Abraham story (Ps.-Philo 8.1-3) and the Isaac story (Ps.-Philo 8.4) are quickly passed over so that the narrative might focus on the descendants of Jacob and their arrival in Egypt. Pseudo-Philo thus summarizes the entire story of Gen 12-50 in the space of one short chapter.⁴⁶ Three aspects of the Genesis narrative are stressed in Ps.-Philo 8.1-3: God's provision of a child,⁴⁷ Abraham's separation from the nations, and the covenant between the Lord and Abraham.⁴⁸ Thus the brief narrative which is concerned with the story of Abraham stresses the second strand of the promise (i.e. many descendants)

See also idem 1981: 267-268; and James: 59. Schürer 1986: 326-329 dates Pseudo-Philo to the first century C.E.

⁴²Nickelsburg 1981: 265-266; idem 1984: 107; and Murphy: 13, 20-25.

⁴³Nickelsburg 1984: 108-109. Cf. also Harrington 1985a: 7.

⁴⁴Cf. also Halpern-Amaru: 69-70.

⁴⁵In fact, Pseudo-Philo devotes more space to the legend of Abraham in the furnace (Ps. Philo 6.1-18) than to the entire Abrahamic narrative of the Hebrew Bible. Halpern-Amaru: 70-71 notes that elements of the promise to Abraham first occur in 4.11, in which Abraham is "the father of nations," the recipient of an unbroken covenant, and promised many descendants.

⁴⁶James: 45-46 thinks that this brevity is due to Ps.-Philo's awareness of Jubilees and his intentional avoidance of duplicating material. However, Halpern-Amaru: 69-70 is certainly correct to note the different emphases in the two works. Cf. also Murphy: 50.

⁴⁷Halpern-Amaru: 72 argues that Ps.-Philo is "...primarily concerned with the promise of peoplehood and numbers, and that the Land is significant insofar as it is necessary to the fulfillment of that promise."

⁴⁸ibid.

within the context of Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord which very much centered on separation from gentiles.

Although Pseudo-Philo never explicitly quotes or alludes to the promise to bless the nations, there are several hints in the text which suggest that this promise of a blessing for the gentiles may not be completely obscured. First, in 11.1 the Lord provides a light for the world and establishes a covenant with Israel which places her in a special relationship with the Lord and exalts her above all nations.⁴⁹ Hence, in this text blessing for the nations may be implicit, but both Israel's covenant with the Lord and her unique position in the world are explicit. Any blessing in this text for the nations is mediated through the Torah.⁵⁰ Thus the Torah, not Abraham's descendants, is the mediator of light to all people. Second, in 21.5b we read that the Lord's faithfulness to his covenant people in providing a leader to follow Joshua would have as its result that the nations learn of the Lord's eternal nature. Although the term blessing is not used here, it may be implied in that the nations would have the possibility, at least, to give up their devotion to other gods and worship the one true god. Third, in 23.12 the motif of a blessing for the nations may lie in the role assigned to Israel as a model of righteousness which would attract the attention and the envy of the gentiles. Faithful Israel was intended to be a special nation placed in the midst of all peoples and consequently was intended to be the object of desire for these nations because of Israel's special relationship with the Lord.⁵¹ And fourth, in the narrative of the birth of Samuel, Eli states that Samuel's birth would have the result that "...you might provide advantage for the peoples..." (51.2). This clause

⁴⁹Murphy: 65 thinks that the author here has interpreted Ex 19.5 ("then you shall be My own possession among all the peoples) to refer to Israel's glorification above all nations.

⁵⁰Murphy: 65. In commenting on Ps.-Philo 9.8, Murphy (idem: 58) writes: "The point of the text is that Moses is God's ultimate mediator and judge. Before the Flood, God's spirit was available to all humanity, but now one can approach God only through Moses and the Torah."

⁵¹Cf. Murphy: 112; and Halpern-Amaru: 79.

may refer to other nations, rather than the people of Israel. But this is not very clear.⁵² A more clearly defined role for Israel in terms of blessing for other nations occurs in Hannah's prayer (51.2-4).⁵³ Hannah's call to all nations indicates that her hymn has significance not only for Israel, but also for all people.⁵⁴ Her statement that the Lord would show the nations the statutes⁵⁵ points toward the Torah as the means by which the nations are enlightened. And especially her statement that all will find the truth points toward a universalism which corresponds to the motif of blessing for the nations.⁵⁶ For the author, then, a blessing for the nations comes through knowledge of the Torah. Moreover, the correspondence between these elements and the motif of blessing for the nations is more clearly seen when we remember that this blessing is mediated through the leader of Israel, Samuel.

In the text of Pseudo-Philo, therefore, the promise to Abraham is omitted from the brief account of the patriarchal narrative precisely because most of that narrative had been condensed. The few instances in which the third strand may be alluded to elsewhere in the text place the blessing for the nations within the context of Israel's covenant with the Lord, especially in connection with the blessing the gentiles would receive which was mediated through the Torah. Hence, for Pseudo-Philo, gentiles would be blessed when they learned who the Lord truly was and learned to obey him as was detailed in the Torah.

⁵²Harrington 1985b: 365 suggests that "this may refer to the gentiles, but the parallelism of the next line suggests that the peoples of Israel are being discussed. However, Murphy: 191 argues that a universal reference may be intended: "...the parallelism need not be synonymous, and Hannah's song seems to claim that Samuel will make Torah known to the Gentiles." The fact that in this context the fear that the promise to Abraham might be broken is explicit (49. 1-8) may suggest that other elements of the patriarchal narrative are in view.

⁵³Pseudo-Philo has significantly recast Hannah's prayer of thanksgiving for the birth of Samuel (I Sam 2.1-10). Cf. Murphy: 191.

⁵⁴idem: 192.

⁵⁵Lit. "boundaries," cf. 15.6.

⁵⁶Murphy: 192.

D. The Ladder of Jacob

The first century C. E. work entitled the Ladder of Jacob is an elaboration of Jacob's dream at Bethel (Gen 28.11-22). The Lord's promise to Abraham which is repeated to Jacob is recorded in the Ladder of Jacob with significant modification:

And he said to me, "The land on which you are sleeping, to you will I give it, and to your seed after you. And I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven and the sand of the sea. And through your seed all the earth and those living on it in the last times of the years of completion shall be blessed. My blessing with which I have blessed you shall flow from you unto the last generation; the East and the West all shall be full of your tribe." (1.9-12)

The blessing for the nations is here understood as a blessing for all those living on the earth at the end of the age (i.e. "the last times of the years of completion...unto the last generation").⁵⁷ This blessing is mediated by Jacob's offspring ("through your seed"; "shall flow from you") and the blessing itself is Israel's blessing flowing to the inhabitants of the earth. The whole world will be filled with Jacob's tribe and this ubiquitous presence may be the author's implicit suggestion concerning the form in which this blessing for all the earth is realized. Israel's expansion to fill the earth may therefore be the blessing in view.

⁵⁷When the dream is interpreted by the angel Sariel, the blessing for all who are living on the earth is not discussed, but rather the interpretation focuses on the coming judgment of Israel's enemies, the nations (6.1-9). Israel's salvation in the end of the age is accomplished through the judgment of her enemies and her presence among the nations is pictured as a means of divine judgment. Hence, it is not entirely clear that this discussion of a blessing for the nations is in a positive context. Although chapter seven contains images of blessing for the nations (cf. 7.14, esp. 33-34: "And all creation will bow to him who was wounded, and many will trust in him. And he will become known everywhere in all lands"), it is commonly acknowledged to be a later Christian polemic against Judaism and thus is of little value for our study.

E. Summary

The third strand of the promise occurs in those documents which attempt to rewrite Israel's history, and especially that history which pertains to the patriarchs. This promise is faithfully included in Jubilees's record of the divine promises⁵⁸ and is woven into the literary fabric of other sections of Jubilees. In these sections, Jubilees stresses that blessing for the nations is mediated through Jacob and suggests that this blessing comes through the ubiquitous presence of his descendants throughout the whole earth. This blessing which comes from the presence of the descendants of Abraham in the whole world is also featured in The Ladder of Jacob, but this document also clearly envisaged a day when the gentiles who had oppressed Israel would be destroyed by the restored sons of Abraham. Moreover, although Pseudo-Philo's narrative involving Abraham is very brief and thus the promise to bless the nations is never explicitly stated, several texts allude to a blessing for the nations which is mediated through the Torah.

IV. The Qumran Literature

The promise to bless the nations is never cited in the Qumran literature.⁵⁹ Abraham is presented as the model for those who enter into the covenant with respect to his obedience to the law of Moses.⁶⁰ The members of the community are the true heirs of the Abrahamic covenant, and thus the promises apply directly to them.⁶¹ The

⁵⁸With the exception of Gen 18.18 which is part of a broader section of Genesis that is condensed in Jubilees.

⁵⁹Scott 1995: 47-48 has argued that 4Q252 2.6-7 is an exception, in which the blessing of Gen 9.26-27 applies to all three sons of Noah, not just Japheth. According to Scott, this is based on the interpretation of Gen 9.27 in light of Gen 12.1-3. This is a very obscure reference, however. And even if it is an obscure reference to the promise to bless all nations, it is one which evidently did not have a wider impact elsewhere in the Qumran literature.

⁶⁰Hansen 1989: 188-189.

⁶¹idem: 189.

dominant concern with respect to gentiles is separation from them in order to preserve purity and the destruction of them by the righteous remnant, as is especially clear in the War Scroll. Thus the third strand of the promise to Abraham that the gentiles would be blessed in his descendants evidently is not a concern for the community or communities which produced the Qumran literature. This may simply be due to the fact that the interpretation of Genesis⁶² is evidently not as important to the Qumran community as the interpretation of Deuteronomy and other parts of the Jewish Scripture.

V. Philo

Philo of Alexandria lived and wrote at the turn of the eras.⁶³ It is especially important for the present work to make the observation that Philo devotes much attention to the interpretation of the Pentateuch,⁶⁴ and in particular to Genesis; indeed, his exposition of the five books of Moses is the focal point of his extant works.⁶⁵ Philo thus provides an important example of the way in which a first century Jew understood Genesis.⁶⁶ Philo cites Gen 12.3 in Migr. 1, 118; Gen 26.4 in Heres 8 and Qu. Gen. IV.183; and Gen 28.14 in Som. I.3. Philo never cites or discusses Gen 18.18 in any of his extant

⁶²The only text which is concerned primarily with the Genesis narrative (The Genesis Apocryphon) is fragmentary, and thus does not contain a reference to the third strand. It does, however, refer to the promise of land and of descendants (1QapGen 21.12-13).

⁶³On the life and literary works of Philo, see Borgen: 233-282; Sandmel: 3-46; Schürer 1987: 813-826; and Seland 1995: 75-82.

⁶⁴For a discussion of Philo's exegetical method, see Mack: 227-271; and Borgen: 259-264. For a recent study on Philo's interpretive method in historical context, see Dawson.

⁶⁵In the ten volume LCL the first five volumes along with most of the sixth contain Philo's interpretation of Genesis. Cf. Schürer 1987: 826.

⁶⁶This is not to say that Philo's interpretation of Genesis is normative for the whole of Judaism at this time, but rather his writings offer scholarship an insight into the interpretive method and exegetical fruit of one Jewish writer of this period. In fact, Philo's record of the Abrahamic narrative is influenced greatly by hellenism. Cf. Hansen 1989: 190-192; and Kuschel: 40-44.

works, even though he discusses Abraham's entertaining angelic visitors (Abr. 107-146=Gen 18) and comments extensively on this passage elsewhere (Qu. Gen. IV. 1-29=Gen 18); and he never cites or discusses Gen 22.18 in any of his extant works, even though he discusses the sacrifice of Isaac (Abr. 167-207=Gen 22).

A. Migr.1=Gen 12.3

Philo began this work with a citation of the LXX of Gen 12.1-3⁶⁷ in which he cites, of course, the third strand of the promise to Abraham:

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς

And all the tribes of the earth will be blessed in you.

In his exposition of verse three,⁶⁸ Philo notes that the Lord blesses and curses based on the intention of a person. Balaam provides a negative example in that although he blessed Israel, he was judged by God because his intention was to curse her (Migr. 115).⁶⁹ Philo thus concludes that the intention to bless or curse Abraham is the criterion upon which blessing and cursing would come to other people. Furthermore, the promise which followed (Migr. 118: ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς) is highly

⁶⁷Philo's text differs from the LXX only in Philo's reading of ἄπελθε in place of ἔξελθε in verse one.

⁶⁸During the course of his exposition, Philo notes that Gen 12.1-3 refers to a future blessing (Migr. 43), which he deduced from the intentional use of the future tense (δειξω). Philo is able, therefore, to demonstrate that faith is the natural response to the divine promise. Philo strengthens this conclusion by another reference to Abraham's response to God's promise: ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ (Migr. 44.) Two points of significance emerge for the present study. First, Philo links faith and promise in the context of his discussion of Gen 12.1-3. Second, Philo drew together Gen 12.1-3 and Gen 15.6 (Cf. also Philo's extended discussion of this statement in Abr. 262-276) in his exposition of God's promise to Abraham. These two points may indicate that when Paul made these same two exegetical points in his letter to the Galatians, he was aware of and drew upon an established interpretive tradition.

⁶⁹Conversely, Philo indicated that one may seem to intend to do harm, but the intention is to bestow blessing (Migr. 115).

significant (Migr. 119). This promise, on the one hand, refers to the well-ordered mind of the individual (Migr. 119).⁷⁰ On the other hand, it refers to the righteous man who is the foundation upon which humanity rests (Migr. 121: τῷ γὰρ ὄντι ἔρεισμα τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶν ὁ δίκαιος). Everything the righteous has he brings for the common good and his abundant gifts benefit all. Whatever he does not possess, the righteous petitions God on behalf of the community. This results in the opening of the treasures of heaven, which pour down every good thing on all. The Lord always answers the prayer of the righteous and he is anxious to bestow all good things in response (Migr. 122). The promise to bless all the tribes of the earth in Abraham thus refers to the blessings which come from the presence of the righteous man whose character and intercessory prayers are the foundation upon which this blessing is based. Moses (Migr. 122)⁷¹ and Noah (Migr. 125) provide examples of this blessing for the nations. Philo's hope is that the individual's mind might remain sound like the central pillar which holds up a house (Migr. 124: τὸν ὡς ἐν οἰκίᾳ στῦλον νοῦν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ) and that in a similar manner that the righteous man might remain in the community (Migr. 124: ἄνθρωπον δὲ ἐν τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν δίκαιον διαμένειν). Philo, therefore, interprets the third strand of the promise to refer to a mediated blessing for the community, especially a gentile community, that comes through the actions of a righteous person within that community.

B. Heres 8=Gen 26.4

⁷⁰Philo offers a similar interpretation in Qu. Gen. IV. 183, in which he discusses the allegorical interpretation of Gen 26. 4c.

⁷¹In fact, in Migr. 122 the Lord's gracious response to Moses intercessory prayer on behalf of Israel (Num 14.11-19) is equated with the third strand of the promise. Moses interceded on behalf of Israel when the people rebelled against Moses' leadership. Hence Philo thought, in this text at least, that the promise to bless the nations might have application to Israel.

Philo mentions the third strand of the promise in this work when he quotes Gen 26.3-5 in support of his assertion that Abraham was loyal in his service to God:

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς.

and I will bless all the nations of the earth through your descendants.

Since Philo cites this text to support his assertion that Abraham was a loyal servant of the Lord, his attention is focused on verse five. He thus never expounds his thoughts on the third strand of the promise here.⁷² However, it is very significant that of the various elements of the promise in Gen 26.3-5,⁷³ Philo chose to cite both the promise to give the land to Abraham's descendants (δώσω σοι καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην) and the promise to bless the nations through them.

C. Som. I.3=Gen 28.14

Philo refers to the third strand twice in this work in which he discusses Jacob's dream of the ladder at Bethel. The first occurrence of the promise to bless the nations is located within Philo's quotation of the LXX of Gen 28.13-15⁷⁴ at the beginning of his treatise, which includes the citation of the third strand:

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου.

⁷²Philo does discuss the interpretation of this verse in Qu. Gen. IV. 183, in which he applies this promise to the well ordered mind of the individual by which he is able to restrain his passions. This interpretation is similar to ones offered in Migr. 119 and Som. I.175a.

⁷³On the various elements of the promise in Gen 26.3-5, see pp. 38-39 above.

⁷⁴The only differences between the LXX and the text that Philo cites in Som. I. 3 are minor. They are first the change in Philo from ἐγὼ κύριος to ἐγὼ εἰμι, but this reading is uncertain (Cf. the note in LCL V, 294), second Philo's omission of ἐπ' αὐτῆς, third his omission of the preposition ἐπὶ before λίβα, βορρᾶν and ἀνατολάς, his change of the relative pronoun from οὗ to ἧ in order to agree with its antecedent (ὁδός), and his change of the conditional particle from ἐὰν to ἂν.

And all the tribes of the earth will be blessed through you and through your descendants.

When he later explains verse fourteen, Philo declares this promise means that the Jewish race is a beneficial influence on the world. He argues this first by the application of the language of Abraham's descendants being multiplied like the sand of the earth both to their increase in number and to their moral influence on the world (Som. I. 175). The text in Genesis indicates that Abraham's descendants would become numerous, but the reference to the restraining of sin by wisdom's race is Philo's interpretation of the significance of the statement of the increase of Abraham's descendants. Moreover, Philo continues that this moral influence is part of God's promise (κατὰ τὰς θείας ὑποσχέσεις), that it extended to the boundaries of the universe (ἄχρι τῶν περάτων τοῦ παντός εὐρύνεται), and that those who possess this promise are inheritors of the four corners of the world (τῶν τοῦ κόσμου κληρονόμον μερῶν). Thus, according to Philo such a man is a benefit to all humanity because he diffuses good things over all people in a manner similar to the common good supplied by the sun (Som. I. 176). Philo supports these claims in this text by a citation of the promise of blessing (ἐνευλογηθήσονται γὰρ ἐν σοὶ) for all tribes (πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί). This promise to bless all tribes has application to the society in which the Jewish race lives in connection with the morality and improvement of character that are brought into the community (Som. I. 177b-178).⁷⁵ Philo, therefore, understood the promise to Abraham to bless all the nations in his seed to refer to the positive effect that the righteous had in the community in which he lived.

D. Summary

⁷⁵As in Migr. 119, Philo also interprets this statement with reference to the individual in relation to the proper ordering of mind and body (Som. I. 177a).

Philo of Alexandria explicitly refers to God's promise to bless the nations through Abraham's seed in four separate documents. For Philo this promise has two principal applications. First, in relation to the individual, he applies it to the well ordering of the mind and body. Second, in relation to the community and indeed to the whole world, he applies it to the beneficial impact that the presence of the righteous have in a community and the positive result for others of his understanding that wisdom's race would inherit the earth. Hence, for Philo the Jewish presence in the diaspora had a beneficial impact on others, and this was a fulfillment of the promise to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants.

VI. Josephus

Josephus, the Palestinian Jew who lived in the second half of the first century of the common era, wrote extensively on the history of the Jewish people.⁷⁶ In the course of his writing, he included the patriarchal narrative,⁷⁷ with material frequently both omitted and added.⁷⁸ We will examine Josephus' account of the patriarchal narrative⁷⁹ in order to determine how he understood the third strand of the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants.⁸⁰

⁷⁶On the life and literary works of Josephus, see Attridge 1984: 185-232; Feldman 1984: 763-862; Rajak; Cohen: 181-242; and Bohrmann: 119-281. For a discussion of the various attempts to link Josephus with one or more of the strands of sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple period, see Attridge 1976: 6-16.

⁷⁷On Josephus' treatment of the promise of land and descendants, see Halpern-Amaru: 95-115.

⁷⁸Cohen: 39: "In short, Josephus' paraphrase of the Bible, in spite of his protestations of unsurpassable fidelity, is freer than his version of *Aristeas*."

⁷⁹Twice Josephus omits any discussion of the promise to Abraham. Josephus omits any mention or discussion of the third strand of the promise in Gen 18.18. The same is true of Jubilees. Cf. Jub 18.16-19.20. Josephus condenses Gen 26.1-35 into the space of a few lines which focus on Isaac's relationship with Abimelech (Ant. 1.263-264). Thus the promises which are repeated to Isaac in this text are omitted, including the promise to bless the nations through his descendants.

⁸⁰On Josephus' use of written and oral sources for his history of the Jewish people, see Attridge 1976: 29-38. He concludes that "...Josephus apparently drew on a variety of

A. Ant. 1.154=Gen 12.1-3

In his account of the call of Abraham, Josephus notes that God commanded him to go to Canaan, but later he writes that although Abraham left his homeland "...at the will and with the aid of God" (Ant. 1.157: κατὰ βούλησιν καὶ βοήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ), he in fact decided to emigrate because of pressure exerted upon him by the Chaldeans who did not appreciate his monotheistic discoveries (Ant. 1.157).⁸¹ Josephus' account of the call of Abraham bears little resemblance to the text of the Jewish Scriptures: Abraham left his homeland at the age of seventy-five, he did this based on God's command to settle there, and he left the land to his descendants. Josephus thus omits any discussion of the promise to Abraham found in Gen 12.1-3, with the exception of the brief comment about the land and descendants. Josephus thus may have conflated the land and the seed elements of the promise found in Gen 12.7 and thereby combined this text with the narrative concerning Abraham's call, but he excluded the third element concerning blessing for the nations from the discussion.

B. Ant. 1.234-235=Gen 22.16-18

Josephus devotes an extended amount of space to the Aqedah.⁸² In this discussion he highlights both Abraham's piety⁸³ and his son's.⁸⁴ The divine

traditions and used them all with some flexibility" (37). Hence distinctive elements and elaborations in Josephus' history may be attributed to his own interpretive activity, and not merely to dependence upon literary sources. Cf. also Cohen: 35-42.

⁸¹Cf. also Ant. 1.281, which expresses a similar thought.

⁸²On the Aqedah, see p. 36, n. 54 above.

⁸³Josephus states that this was a test of Abraham's piety toward God (Ant. 1.223) and his obedience to the Lord's command (Ant. 1.233).

⁸⁴In Ant. 1.222 when Josephus sets the background for the offering of Isaac found in Gen 22, he remarks that Isaac endeared himself to his parents because he practised

promises⁸⁵ found in Gen 22.16-18 in the Jewish Scriptures are freely paraphrased and expanded by Josephus in Ant. 1.234-235: Abraham is promised that he would never fail to provide the most tender care both for himself and for his descendants (οὐχ ὑστερήσειν αὐτὸν αἰεὶ πάσης ἐπιμελείας καὶ τὸ γένος ἀξιούντα),⁸⁶ that his son should live a long and proper life (ἔσεσθαι τε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ πολυχρονιώτατον καὶ βιώσαντα εὐδαιμόνως), that he should leave a large dominion to his children (παισὶν ἀγαθοῖς καὶ γνησίοις⁸⁷ παραδώσειν μεγάλην ἡγεμονίαν),⁸⁸ that his descendants would become many nations (προεδήλου τε τὸ γένος τὸ αὐτῶν εἰς ἔθνη πολλὰ),⁸⁹ that he might have great wealth (καὶ πλοῦτον ἐπιδώσειν),⁹⁰ that he might be remembered forever (καὶ μνήμην αἰώνιον αὐτῶν ἔσεσθαι τοῖς γενάρχαις),⁹¹ that his descendants might possess the land (τὴν τε Χαναναίαν ὅπλοις κατακτησαμένους),⁹² and that he be envied by all men (ζηλωτοὺς ἔσεσθαι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις). Hence, Josephus appears to have drawn on a number of aspects of the promise, most of which do not appear in Gen 22.17-18, and to have supplemented this list with several interpretive additions. It is significant, however, that Josephus does not cite the third strand of the promise. On the other hand,

every virtue (ἐπιτηδεύων πᾶσαν ἀρετήν), he was faithful to the service of God (καὶ τῆς τε τῶν πατέρων θεραπείας ἐχόμενος), and he was indeed zealous for the worship of God (καὶ περὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ θρησκείαν ἐσπουδακώς). Hence, Isaac is presented to the reader as faithful to the Lord.

⁸⁵Josephus refers to these as τοιούτων ἀγαθῶν ἐπαγγελίας (Ant. 1.236)

⁸⁶This may refer to the promise that the Lord would bless Abraham (Gen 22.17 [LXX]: ἦ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε).

⁸⁷Josephus' use of this term apparently is intended to emphasize that the promise is to ethnic Israel.

⁸⁸This statement does not appear to correspond directly to any aspect of the promise to Abraham, but rather may be Josephus' interpretive summary of the significance of the promise for the descendants of Abraham.

⁸⁹This may be a reference to the LXX reading of Gen 28.3: καὶ ἔσῃ εἰς συναγωγὰς ἔθνων. Cf. also Ig. Neof..

⁹⁰Although Abraham acquires wealth in the Scriptural narrative (e.g. Gen 12.16), this is not an explicit part of the promise to him. On the other hand, it may refer to Gen 15.14.

⁹¹This statement probably refers to the promise that the Lord would make Abraham's name great (Cf. Gen 12.2)

⁹²Josephus may have Gen 15.18-21 in mind.

Josephus' last statement may be a reference to the third strand of the promise and, if this is the case, it has been interpreted in a significant manner. For if the clause ζηλωτὸς ἔσεσθαι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις is an oblique reference to the Lord's promise to Abraham to bless the nations, then Josephus understood it to mean that the Jewish nation would be the object of gentile envy.⁹³

C. Ant. 1.280-283=Gen 28.13-15

When Josephus narrates Jacob's dream of a stairway which reached heaven, he explicitly states, omits, and significantly modifies several aspects of the promise found in the Jewish scripture (Gen 28.13-15).⁹⁴ Josephus focuses on the promise of descendants and the land, but excludes the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants. In Ant. 1.282-283 we read that Jacob would marry, he would have good children (καὶ γενήσονται σοι παῖδες ἀγαθοί),⁹⁵ his descendants would be beyond number (τὸ δὲ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἀριθμοῦ κρείττον ἔσται)⁹⁶ and leave the land to an even greater number of sons (μειζοσιν υἱοῖς αὐτῶν καταλιμπάνοντες),⁹⁷ to whom the Lord would give dominion in the land (οἷς ἐγὼ τὸ ταύτης κράτος τῆς γῆς δίδωμι). These

⁹³Cf. Jub 20.10 and Ps. Philo 23.12. However, it is also possible to translate this clause "(they) will be zealous toward all people," thereby pointing toward the idea that the kingdom of Israel would extend (forcibly?) to the whole world.

⁹⁴Josephus' account includes two statements which are additions to the text. First, we read that Abraham will be greatly blessed by God (Ant. 1.281). The Lord's promise to bless Abraham and his descendants greatly is found in several texts in the Jewish Scriptures (e.g. Gen 12.2; 22.17; 26.3), but not in Gen 28.13-15. In Gen 28.3-4 Isaac blessed Jacob and twice requested blessing for his son (v.3: blessing; v.4: the blessing of Abraham). Perhaps Josephus has conflated the words of Isaac into the Lord's pronouncement to Jacob in Ant. 1.281. And second, we read that Jacob is ensured of the same proportion of inheritance as Isaac and Abraham (Ant. 1.281). In this text the Lord promised Jacob the same portion of prosperity that was promised to Abraham and Isaac.

⁹⁵This is Josephus' addition to the text.

⁹⁶This appears to allude to Gen 28.14a.

⁹⁷This also appears to be Josephus' addition, but its precise nature is uncertain due to a doubtful text.

descendants would fill the entire earth (καὶ παισὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν,⁹⁸ οἱ πληρώσουσιν ὅσπιν ἥλιος ὄρα καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν.⁹⁹) and be assured of God's presence to protect them forever. Josephus' account of this story, which mentions or alludes to every other aspect of the promise¹⁰⁰ and significantly expands the text in several places,¹⁰¹ is only concerned with the seed and land strands of the promise. Thus Josephus again ignores the promise to bless all the nations through Abraham's descendants.

D. Summary

Josephus wrote, in part, to detail the history of the Jewish people for a gentile audience. As a part of that history, he recounts the patriarchal narrative in the Jewish scripture. However, he never directly cites the promise to Abraham to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants. Once he may allude to this promise (Ant. 1.235). Even though Abraham himself is endowed with virtues which would be attractive to a hellenized audience,¹⁰² the promise to bless the nations is never explicitly cited. It seems odd indeed that Josephus, who was attempting to defend Judaism and was writing for a gentile audience in the wake of the Jewish war with Rome in 70 C. E.,¹⁰³ omitted any discussion of a part of Judaism which was vitally concerned with blessing for gentiles.¹⁰⁴ On the one hand, perhaps Josephus wanted to avoid any suggestion to his

⁹⁸This appears to correspond to Gen 28.13.b.

⁹⁹This is a reference to Gen 28.14b.

¹⁰⁰Moreover, Gen 28.13a may be reflected in Ant. 1.281.

¹⁰¹These additions highlight the promise to increase Jacob's offspring and their inheritance of the land.

¹⁰²Hansen 1989: 193-194.

¹⁰³Concerning Josephus' apologetic purposes, Cohen: 38 writes: "A frequent theme in AJ is the refutation of the charges of exclusiveness and hatred of foreigners, often made against the Jews..." Cf. also Attridge 1976: 17-26; and Schürer 1986: 545.

¹⁰⁴Cohen: 37 notes that Josephus "...omits whatever he does not need," including embarrassing and difficult incidents, extravagant miracles, technical material, and uninteresting details. Some material he appears to have simply forgotten. Thus any attempt to speculate concerning Josephus' motives for omitting the promise of blessing

Roman audience of Jewish superiority, which blessing mediated by Jews might imply, especially since Rome had recently put down the rebellion of the Jewish nation. On the other hand, it might be that Josephus did intend to highlight aspects of the promise that suggested Jewish superiority. He clearly stresses the importance of the promise to Abraham of descendants and the gift of the land to them. This stress on the importance of descendants and land, if intended to imply Jewish superiority, suggests that for Josephus the promise to Abraham of blessing for all nations might not have connoted any ethnic superiority, and thus this third strand of the promise might not have been of much interest to him in his narrative of Abraham.

VII. Conclusion

In the postbiblical literature the third strand of the promise is commonly cited in texts which attempted to interpret or rewrite the Genesis narrative, and it is interpreted in these texts as stressing the importance of Israel as the mediator of blessing through her occupation of the whole world and the positive influence obtained by gentile communities through the presence of the righteous in their midst. The third strand thus is understood as a blessing which the nations would share with Israel because the nations came into contact with and were influenced by the righteous behavior of Jews. This blessing would further be the result of the fact that Jews and gentiles lived in the same communities and that the nations would also benefit from the prosperity experienced by righteous Jews. The third strand of the promise is ignored in at least two major literary strands of the postbiblical period (Josephus and the Qumran literature).

for the nations must remain tentative, at best. It is curious, however, that an element which would appear to fit so nicely with his apologetic aim would be omitted. On the other hand, Kuschei: 45-46 notes that Josephus consistently "...eliminated exclusively Jewish features from his picture of Abraham."



Chapter Five

The Curse in the Literature of Postbiblical Judaism

I. Introduction

Thus far in our investigation we have argued in chapter three that failure to do all that the law requires designates a chief focus of Deuteronomy, which is concerned with covenant loyalty and its principal failure through the worship of other gods. We then examined several texts in the Deuteronomistic history and in the prophetic literature which also reflect this perspective. Our attention now turns to how this motif of failure to remain within all that is written in the book of the law through the worship of other gods was understood and employed in the various literature of the Second Temple period. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the function of curse in the postbiblical literature. Deuteronomy exerted a massive influence on a considerable number of Jewish documents in Second Temple Judaism, and the motif of curse continued to function in a way similar to its use in Deuteronomy: the curse came upon those who were disloyal to the covenant and thus were disloyal to the Lord.

II. The Apocrypha

A. The Wisdom of Solomon

The Wisdom of Solomon¹ is an exhortation written by an Alexandrian Jew who probably lived in the first half of the first century C.E.² A clear example of the curse on

¹According to Winston 1979: 4-9, this document is easily divided into three parts-Wisdom's gift of immortality (1-6.21); the nature and Power of Wisdom and Solomon's quest for her (6.22-10.21); and Divine Wisdom or Justice in the Exodus (11-19). Within these

those who worship other gods occurs in 14.8: τὸ χειροποίητον δὲ, ἐπικατάρατον αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὸ. Both the idol itself and the one who made it thus are cursed.³ The reference to an idol "made with hands" (14.10) is perhaps a reference to Deut 27.15,⁴ and if this is so, then the author intended to place the discussion within the context of the curses of Deuteronomy. Divine judgment (ἐν κτίσασατι θεοῦ) would fall upon the idols of the gentiles (ἐν εἰδώλοις ἐθνῶν) because they are a stumbling block and a snare (14.11).⁵ Hence, the focus of the passage is on the "idols of the nations," on whom a divine judgment would come. Israel, however, is protected from idolatry;⁶ and hence from the curse on idolatry pronounced in 14.8.

This polemic continues with the claim that idolatry leads to the sin of fornication (14.12: ἀρχὴ γὰρ πορνείας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων).⁷ Sexual sin thus has its roots in idolatry.⁸

three major sections there are two excursuses: one on divine mercy (11.15-12.22) and another on idolatry (13-15).

²The date of the *Wisd.Sol.* is very much debated and is not a settled issue. For surveys of the proposed date for *Wisd.Sol.*, see Reider: 12-14; and Winston: 20-22. The *terminus a quo* is commonly placed at 200 B.C.E. because of *Wisd.Sol.*'s use of some books in the LXX. Cf. Clarke: 1-2; Reider: 14; and Schürer 1986: 572. The *Terminus ad quem* is probably 50 C.E. because of probable allusions to the rule of Caligula. Cf. Winston: 20-24; Oesterley: 207-209; Nickelsburg 1981: 184. And these scholars argue that *Wisd.Sol.* was composed by the middle of the first century C.E. and most likely either during or shortly after Caligula's reign. Others reach the same *Terminus ad quem* on the basis of *Wisd.Sol.*'s lack of knowledge of Philo. Cf. Oesterley: 207; Reider: 14; and Clarke: 2. But these scholars tend to prefer a date more broadly within the Roman period. Schürer 1986: 572-573 also prefers a date within the Roman period. On the issue of authorship, see Winston: 1-2, 12-14, 20-25; Oesterley: 197-209; Nickelsburg 1981: 175-185; and Delcor: 478-486.

³Similarly, in 14.9-10 both the godless person (ὁ ἀσεβῶν) and his godlessness (ἡ ἀσέβεια αὐτοῦ) would be punished. The ungodly (3.10: οἱ ἀσεβεῖς) and those who have forsaken the Lord (3.10: [οἱ] τοῦ κυρίου ἀποστάντες) are cursed: ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν (3.12). According to the author, the inhabitants of the land of Canaan are cursed: σπέρμα γὰρ ἦν καταραμένον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (12.11).

⁴Winston: 267.

⁵Winston: 267 draws attention to Josh 23.13, in which the nations which dwelt in the land would be a stumbling block to Israel.

⁶*Wisd.Sol.* 15.1-6. See esp. v 4-5.

⁷The next clause asserts that the the discovery of idols resulted in the corruption of life (14.12: εὖρεσις δὲ αὐτῶν φθορὰ ζωῆς). The preservation of life and its prosperity are at the heart of the covenant blessing in Deuteronomy.

⁸For a concise discussion of this common link in Jewish literature see Winston: 271-272.

But the heart of the danger of idolatry⁹ is the association of the divine name with a wooden or stone object (14.21).¹⁰ This gross ignorance of God (τὸ πλανᾶσθαι περὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσιν) which is at the heart of all idol worship inevitably leads to moral corruption (14.22-26);¹¹ hence, every form of evil is linked to idolatry (14.27).¹² Those who are devoted to idols have placed their trust in them (14.29: πεποιθότες εἰδώλοις), and consequently are deceived (14.28-30). To devote oneself to idols thus is to think evil about God (14.30: κακῶς ἐφρόνησαν περὶ Θεοῦ προσέχοντες εἰδώλοις). Moreover, idolatry is the trespass of the unrighteous (14.31: τὴν τῶν ἀδίκων παράβασιν). Idolatry, therefore, is the sin of ungodly gentiles, and it is the source of fornication and every other form of evil in the world.

It is significant that this idol polemic does not mention failure to keep all the law. This is almost certainly due to the fact that Wisdom's polemic is directed at gentile idolatry, not the abandonment of the Lord by his covenant people to serve idols. The Wisdom of Solomon thus testifies to the close connection between the curse, idolatry, and sin, but not the failure of God's people to remain faithful to the covenant. There is no mention of failure to do the whole law because the objects of this polemic are gentiles who are not in covenant relationship with the Lord and thus are not under the law.¹³

⁹This danger is that people serve the idols that they worship (14.21: δουλεύσαντες ἄνθρωποι).

¹⁰Nickelsburg 1981: 182-183 argues that Wisd.Sol. 13-15 is structured in a chiasmic manner in which the focus is 14.21, which "... identifies the heart of the problem."

¹¹Compare the vice list of Wisd.Sol. 14.25-26 with Paul's in Gal 5.19-21. In Wisd. Sol., this vice list results from idolatry, while in Galatians the vice list is attributed to τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός. Cf. Winston: 280.

¹²It is especially striking that in this passage idolatry is the root of all evil (παντὸς κακοῦ). From the perspective of the Wisdom of Solomon, idolatry functions as the source (ἀρχή), the ground (αἰτία), and the purpose (πέρας) of all sin.

¹³However, Garlington 1991: 84 rightly argues that "the tirade against Egyptian idol-worship is intended to evoke as much disgust with the practice as possible and so put off any believers who might be tempted to succumb to it." Moreover, Nickelsburg 1981: 183 rightly notes that this section has many parallels with the polemic against idolatry both in the prophetic tradition in scripture and in other literature of the postbiblical

And even though the text states explicitly and repeatedly that all other sins stem from idolatry, the curse is mentioned only in connection with the one who makes idols and the idol itself. Thus the curse is on the idolater. This sin of idolatry is designated παράβασιν, however, which may carry covenant overtones.

B. I Esdras

I Esdras, which probably was written in the second century B.C.E.,¹⁴ is "...a divergent account of events which are related in several canonical books of the Old Testament."¹⁵ The Greek text of I Esdras is not based on the MT or LXX, but rather is evidently dependent on another source.¹⁶ I Esd 8.7 cites Ezra 7.10.¹⁷ I Esd 8.7b is an account similar to the LXX of Ezra 7.10b,¹⁸ but I Esd 8.7a reflects significant variation.¹⁹ For the present study, there are two significant variations. First, the clause εἰς τὸ μὴδὲν παραλιπεῖν τῶν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου κυρίου καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐντολῶν reflects the Deuteronomistic perspective outlined above. According to I Esdras, the result²⁰ of Ezra's vast knowledge (πολλὴν ἐπιστήμην) is that he did not neglect one thing from the law, which is most

period. For a summary of the terminology used in the biblical polemic against idolatry, see Weltman: 26-113.

¹⁴Metzger: 12; Oesterley: 141; Schürer 1987: 713; and Eissfeldt: 576. This date is not certain, but the *terminus ad quem* for composition is Josephus' use of I Esdras at the end of the first century C.E. For a more cautious approach to the date of I Esdras, cf. Myers: 8-15.

¹⁵Metzger: 11.

¹⁶idem: 11-12; and Oesterley: 138-10.

¹⁷As is commonly recognized, I Esd. 8.1-7 is based on Ezra 7.1-10. Cf. Myers: 81; Oesterley: 136; and Metzger: 17.

¹⁸I Esd 8.7b (διδάξαι τὸν πάντα Ἰσραὴλ πάντα τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τὰ κρίματα) = Ezra 7.10b (καὶ ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ προσταγmata καὶ κρίματα).

¹⁹I Esd 8.7a (ὁ γὰρ Ἐσδρας πολλὴν ἐπιστήμην περιείχεν εἰς τὸ μὴδὲν παραλιπεῖν τῶν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου κυρίου καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐντολῶν) = Ezra 7.10a (ὅτι Ἐσδρας ἔδωκεν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ζητῆσαι τὸν νόμον).

²⁰On the use of εἰς τὸ and the infinitive to express result, see Brooks: 135; Burton 1976: 161; and Dana: 286.

likely intended to be the positive counterpart to Israel's failure to do all the the law required. Second, the author twice inserts $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ into his narrative to state that Ezra taught all Israel all of the law. The narrative to which the author's comment refers centers on the rebuilt temple in Jerusalem and the proper worship of the Lord there (6.7-7.15).²¹ And although this text does not conjoin the curse with failure to do all the law, it may not be expected in such a positive statement and is certainly present in the broader context of I Esdras.²² The author of I Esdras, therefore, modified his citation of scripture to communicate clearly that Ezra was faithful to everything in the law and that this faithfulness was centered on covenant loyalty to the Lord, which was intended to distinguish Israel from other nations.

C. I Maccabees

The book of I Maccabees tells the story of the 2nd B.C.E.²³ conflict between

²¹On the significance of the temple for I Esdras, see Garlington 1991: 229-230. Garlington argues that in its final form I Esdras may have been intended "...to address a circumstance in which once again the temple was suffering at the hands of compromising Jews..." (idem: 230), in which Jews were in danger of repeating the sin of Zedekiah during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. In both instances the sin is idolatry.

²²Cf. I Esd 6.31 where anyone who transgresses the law ($\delta\sigma\sigma\iota \epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$) is to be hung upon a tree from his own house ($\lambda\eta\phi\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota \xi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa \tau\omega\nu \iota\delta\iota\omega\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$), perhaps reflecting influence from Deut 21.23. The repeated refrain of Μωυσεως Βιβλω (5.48; and 7.6, 9) clearly places these texts within the context of Deuteronomy. Compare also I Esd 8.21 where everything in the law is to be done diligently ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \tau\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu \epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\tau\omega \epsilon\pi\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma$) so that wrath ($\epsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\eta \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \omicron\rho\theta\eta\nu$) might not come to the king and his sons. According to 8.24, transgression meant punishment which may take several forms.

²³The text of I Maccabees probably reached its final form during the first half of the first century before the common era. This is indicated by the determination of its *terminus a quo*, which is due to the fact that the final form of the document narrates the death of John Hyrcanus (104/3 B.C.E.), and its *terminus ad quem*, which is due to the fact that there is no hint of the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey (63 B.C.E.). Cf. Goldstein 1976: 62-63; Schürer 1986: 181; and Oesterley: 301. However, Zeiltin: 27-33 argues that ch. 1-13 were written early in the reign of John Hyrcanus and re-edited after 70 C.E., to which ch. 14-16 were attached during the first decade after the destruction of the Second Temple.

Hellenism and Judaism,²⁴ and its chief purpose is to narrate and defend the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty.²⁵ The crisis narrated by I Maccabees describes, from a Deuteronomistic perspective, the events surrounding the desecration of the Jerusalem temple by Antiochus.²⁶ As D. Garlington has argued, this crisis for Israel's monotheistic faith and her covenant fidelity is the one to which much of the literature of this period responded and against which it must be read.²⁷ In I Maccabees, as in much of the literature of the Second Temple period, the danger of apostasy through idolatry is the primary background for Deuteronomistic language employed to warn of the consequences of disloyalty to the covenant.

I Maccabees begins with the crisis in which Antiochus defiled the temple and compelled Jews to worship other gods. Four strands of evidence suggest that Deuteronomy has informed this narrative. First, Antiochus' attempt to change the religion of the Jews included the destruction of the books of the law (1.56: τὰ βιβλία τοῦ νόμου) and the persecution of those caught in possession of the book of the covenant (1.57: βιβλίον διαθήκης). Second, Mattathias exhorted the Jews to walk in the covenant of their fathers (2.20: πορευσόμεθα ἐν διαθήκῃ πατέρων ἡμῶν) and not to forsake the law (2.21: καταλιπεῖν νόμον), to go either to the right or the left (2.22: δεξιὰν ἢ ἀριστεράν). These expressions recall Israel's covenant obligation before the Lord, and the last passage is an especially clear echo of Deuteronomy.²⁸ Third, Mattathias also exhorted the Jews who were zealous for the law (2.27: πᾶς ὁ ζηλῶν τῷ νόμῳ)²⁹ to maintain the covenant

²⁴Cf. Efron; and Bar-Kochva.

²⁵Cf. Goldstein 1976: 4-26; idem 1989: 292-351; Oesterley: 306-307; Nickelsburg 1981: 114; Delcor: 457-463; Bickerman: 17-21; Schürer 1986: 180-181; Zeitlin: 25; and Garlington 1991: 90-91.

²⁶Cf. Habicht: 341-350. He correctly notes that the events which led to the desecration of the temple were initiated in large part by certain Jews (e.g. Jason and Menelaus).

²⁷Garlington 1991: 90.

²⁸Cf. Deut 5.32; 17.11, 20; and 28.14.

²⁹Zeal for the law is a dominant motif in this narrative (cf. also 2.24: καὶ ἐζήλωσεν; and 2.26: καὶ ἐζήλωσεν τῷ νόμῳ). Phineas is the model to which the author

(2.27: ἰσθῶν διαθήκην), Israel's fundamental covenant obligation according to Deuteronomy.³⁰ And fourth, the narrative begins with an allusion to Deut 13,³¹ in which the danger posed by false prophets who attempt to draw Israel away from the Lord to other gods is stressed.³² Hence the danger posed to Judaism by Antiochus is cast within the Deuteronomistic tradition inherited from the Scriptures.³³

This danger is the apostasy of God's people (1.15: ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ διαθήκης ἁγίας;³⁴ 2.15: τὴν ἀποστασίαν), and the abandonment of the law (1.42: ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἕκαστον τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ; 1.52: πᾶς ὁ ἐγκαταλείπων τὸν νόμον³⁵). The focal point of this apostasy is sacrifice to idols³⁶ (1.43, 44-47, 54-55, 59; 2.15, 25),³⁷ even though the neglect of the Sabbath (1.43, 45), the consumption of unclean food (1.62-63), and the neglect of circumcision also are important aspects of it (1.48, 60-61). The purpose of this

compared Mattathias's actions. Goldstein 1976: 232 draws attention to the similarity of the language between I Macc 2.24 (καὶ εἶδεν Ματταθίας καὶ ἐζήλωσεν) and Deut 32.19 (καὶ εἶδεν κύριος καὶ ἐζήλωσεν). Cf. also Nickelsburg 1981: 115: "...the author implies that Mattathias' action has stayed God's wrath against Israel's apostasy...".

³⁰Cf. McCarthy 1983: 81.

³¹Cf. Garlington 1991: 92; and Goldstein 1976: 200. The allusion in 1.11 appears to be specifically to Deut 13.14, which described the danger of certain lawless men who seduced an entire town to apostasy. The use of the term παράνομοι points to the LXX of Deut 13.14, and the form λέγοντες occurs only in 13.14 (in 13.3 and 13.7 the form is λέγων). If the allusion is to Deut 13.14, then διαθώμεθα διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν κύκλω ἡμῶν has replaced λατρεύσωμεν θεοῖς ἑτέροις.

³²Bickerman: 84 remarks that the persecution in Jerusalem was aimed at abolishing particularism. He states further that "this still reflects the biblical concept of history, according to which every national disaster is the result of an act of apostasy." This apostasy was the removal of the boundary between Judaism and the nations and this drives to the heart of the matter because "to a Jew loyal to the law, his particularism appeared natural and necessary as a protective wall against the foolish vanity of idolatry." (idem: 85).

³³Cf. Goldstein 1976: 199.

³⁴This apostasy involved the removal of the mark of circumcision, so that assimilation might be accommodated. See Bickerman: 85.

³⁵The emphasis here is on the 'many' who joined in the sacrifices to idols. See Bickerman: 90.

³⁶Bickerman: 69-71, 78 rightly argues that the desecration involved sacrifice, not the placement of an image in the temple. However, with the significance of the renamed temple in view (see idem: 62-68), the sacrifices, from a Jewish perspective, would have been to a pagan God.

³⁷Cf. Garlington 1991: 105-108.

attempt to change Israel's religion is that they might forget the law and change all the ordinances (1.49: ὥστε ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ νόμου καὶ ἀλλάξαι πάντα τὰ δικαιώματα). Thus this attempt to cause God's people to apostatize,³⁸ which focused on the rejection of the Lord for other gods, had as its purpose the change of all the ordinances.³⁹ Moreover, it is likely, especially in view of the close proximity of this statement to the phrases τὰ βιβλία τοῦ νόμου and βιβλίον διαθήκης, that the author intended πάντα τὰ δικαιώματα to be the functional equivalent of the phrase πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου found in Deuteronomy. Hence, in I Maccabees ἀλλάξαι πάντα τὰ δικαιώματα meant to abandon the Lord, and this came into particular focus in the worship of other gods.

D. Baruch

The apocryphal work known as Baruch is a composite document⁴⁰ which probably reached its present form in the early part of the second century B.C.E.⁴¹ It is, however, a document which is bound together by the same historical background—the exile and return.⁴² One of the repeated themes of Baruch, especially in the prayer of confession, is the failure of Israel to do the commandments,⁴³ and it is this failure which

³⁸It is important to note that Jews were compelled (2.15: οἱ καταναγκάζοντες; and 2.25: τὸν ἀναγκάζοντα) to abandon Yahweh and serve other gods. Cf. Bickerman 1979: 77-78.

³⁹According to Bickerman: 56 the measures referred to in 1.49 involved "the degradation of Jerusalem and the idolatry on Mount Zion." Hence, this apostasy is closely linked to the Hellenistic movement under Antiochus. Cf. also Dommershausen: 20.

⁴⁰After a narrative introduction, this document divides into two major sections: a confessional prayer (1.15-3.8) and a poetic section which focuses on wisdom (Bar 3.9-5.9). Cf. Garlington 1991: 200-210; and Oesterley: 256.

⁴¹Although the time of composition for Baruch is difficult, Nickelsburg argues for a *terminus ad quem* of 116 B.C.E. For a discussion of the issues concerning the date and historical background of Baruch see Nickelsburg 1981: 109, 113-114; idem 1984: 140, 145-146; Schürer 1987: 733-738; Moore: 255-263; and Oesterley: 256-267.

⁴²Nickelsburg 1981: 109; and Moore: 259.

⁴³1.17-19; 2.5, 10, 12; and 3.4. Cf. Garlington 1991: 200.

is repeatedly stated as the cause of the exile, which was the time when Deuteronomy's curse and God's wrath were upon Israel.⁴⁴ This curse of the exile had come upon those who had departed from God.⁴⁵ This section of Baruch was originally written in Hebrew and depends heavily upon Jeremiah and Deuteronomy.⁴⁶ C. Moore suggests that this section was composed prior to the Hasmonean revolt⁴⁷ and that it functions as a didactic exhortation to the covenant people which vindicated God's punishment of them through the exile and placed the blame for it on the disobedience of the people to the law of God (1.15-18).⁴⁸

The curse (1.20: ἡ ἀρά) had come upon them because they had not obeyed the Lord's commandments (1.21: καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν), that is all of the words which had been communicated through the prophets (1.21: κατὰ πάντας τοὺς λόγους τῶν προφητῶν, ὧν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς). To be sure, this text does not state that Israel failed to do all the commandments, but rather she disobeyed the Lord's will as revealed through all the words of the prophets. However, it is probable that in this context κατὰ πάντας τοὺς λόγους τῶν προφητῶν is the semantic equivalent to πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου or πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου in Deuteronomy.⁴⁹

⁴⁴Cf. 1.20; 2.7; 3.4; 3.8; 4.6; 4.25; and 4.29. According to 2.2 the things which happened to Jerusalem came about κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσῆ.

⁴⁵3.8: οἱ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Cf. Nickelsburg 1981: 110.

⁴⁶Moore: 257; and Oesterley: 262.

⁴⁷Moore: 257. However, Garlington 1991: 200, citing others, suggests a Maccabean origin for Baruch.

⁴⁸Moore: 281-282.

⁴⁹This is especially the case in light of the fact that Bar 3.9 alludes to Deut 6.4: ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ ἐντολὰς ζωῆς. The text of Baruch, however, does not explicitly call Israel to acknowledge monotheism, but rather the commandments of life. On the phrase ἐντολὰς ζωῆς, see Moore: 297. Moreover, according to Bar 3.12 the exile of God's people occurred because they had forsaken the fountain of wisdom (ἐγκατέλιπες τὴν πηγὴν τῆς σοφίας). On the other hand, according to Bar 3.13 if Israel had walked in the way of God (τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰ ἐπορεύθη), they would have dwelt in peace forever (κατῴκεις ἂν ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὸν αἰῶνα). In the Hebrew Scriptures Israel was called to devotion to the Lord and failed in this covenant obligation when they had forsaken him for other gods. Thus in Baruch the

The specific way in which Israel had failed to obey the commandments was when she followed the evil inclination of her heart and served other gods (1.22: ἐργάζεσθαι⁵⁰ θεοῖς ἑτέροις). From the perspective of Baruch, Israel was cursed and sent into exile because she had failed to do all the words of the prophets when she had served other gods.⁵¹ This perspective is not a creation of the author or redactor of Baruch, but rather is a key part of the religious tradition inherited from Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.⁵² Baruch thus testifies to the continuation into the postbiblical period of the motif which we traced above; namely, that the curse of the covenant had fallen on those who had failed to do all that the Lord required through the worship and service of other gods.⁵³

E. The Prayer of Azariah

The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men is a composite document which consists of the confessional prayer of Azariah and the song of praise which was sung by the three young men in the midst of the furnace in the book of Daniel. The Prayer, with which we are primarily concerned, dates to the middle of the

position that the Lord had in Israel's covenant is occupied by the commandments and wisdom. Moore: 297-298 suggests that τὴν πηγὴν τῆς σοφίας refers to God himself. This argument is strengthened when the observation that in the LXX ἐγκαταλείπειν is one of the terms used in the Deuteronomistic history with reference to the apostasy of Israel.

⁵⁰Moore: 280 notes that only in Jeremiah and Baruch is the Hebrew ַלְּזָר rendered by ἐργάζεσθαι, rather than its usual Greek equivalent, δουλεύειν. See also Garlington 1991: 202-203.

⁵¹Cf. Garlington 1991: 206.

⁵²It is usually noted that I Baruch advanced no new ideas, but rather depended heavily upon older biblical traditions. See Moore: 259; and Nickelsburg 1981: 143-145.

⁵³It is important to note, however, that Baruch stresses the Lord's faithfulness to his covenant in which he would restore Israel from exile. Israel is blessed (4.4: μακάριοι ἔσμεν, Ἰσραηλ) and in spite of the fact that Israel was exiled for her sin, she would be delivered soon (4.21 ff.). Hence, although the pious Jew continued to look forward to the day when Israel would be fully restored to the land, the book of Baruch functions both to explain God's justice in punishing his people and also to affirm the promise, based on God's faithfulness to his repentant people, of restoration.

2nd century B.C.E.⁵⁴ and is concerned with God's justice in punishing his people when they abandoned him and with a penitent prayer for deliverance from the exile.⁵⁵ As such, it "...is essentially a confession based on traditional Israelite covenant theology."⁵⁶ The document⁵⁷ begins with Azariah's prayer to the Lord in which he praised him for his righteous judgment of his people (2-4). The reason this judgment is just is cited in 6-7: they sinned in all things (ἡμάρτομεν ἐν πᾶσι), were lawless (ἠνουήσαμεν), abandoned the Lord (ἀποστῆαι ἀπὸ σοῦ), and sinned in all things (ἐξημάρτομεν ἐν πᾶσι). They had not obeyed the commandments of his law (τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ νόμου σου οὐχ ὑπηκούσαμεν), kept them (συνετηρήσαμεν), or done as they were commanded (ἐποιήσαμεν καθὼς ἐνετείλω ἡμῖν).⁵⁸ If they had, they would have experienced blessing in the land (ἵνα εὖ ἡμῖν γένηται). Thus the sin of Israel which Azariah confessed resulted in the violation of the covenant through an act of apostasy:

*As is so common in this literature, Israel's sin is spoken of not so much in terms of the breaking of particular laws as of a falling away in principle from the true God and his covenant*⁵⁹

Hence Azariah could state that ἡμάρτομεν ἐν πᾶσι, ἠνουήσαμεν, and ἐξημάρτομεν ἐν πᾶσι in reference to Israel's sin, which was an act of apostasy from the Lord. In this text Israel's sin thus is the rejection of her covenant relationship with the Lord, and although it is not explicitly mentioned, idolatry "...could not have been far from view."⁶⁰

F. Summary

⁵⁴Oesterley: 276-277; Moore: 46; and Nickelsburg 1981: 28-29.

⁵⁵Oesterley: 273.

⁵⁶Garlington 1991: 192.

⁵⁷The text of this addition is from Dan 3.26-30 (LXX).

⁵⁸On the Deuteronomistic character of these three verbs, see Moore: 57.

⁵⁹Garlington 1991: 194. Emphasis is the author's.

⁶⁰idem: 195.

The pattern traced above in Deuteronomy is also evident in several books of the Apocrypha. And although the term 'curse' may not be used in every text cited (e.g. I Esd 8.7), language from Deuteronomy indicates that the motif of the curse is present in those texts. In the Wisdom of Solomon, an anti-idolatry polemic functions to link the curse with the worship of other gods, but it does so somewhat differently than in Deuteronomy because the gentiles who worshipped idols are not in covenant relationship with the Lord. In I Ezra, the citation of Ezra 7.10 inserts a reference to Ezra's faithfulness to the whole law. In I Maccabees, Baruch, and the prayer of Azariah, however, the covenant failure of God's people to remain faithful to him when they served other gods is described in Deuteronomistic terms, in which failure to do all that the law required and the worship of other gods are linked. It is this covenant failure upon which the curse of the covenant would fall.

III. Pseudepigrapha

A. Jubilees

Jubilees⁶¹ records several passages which provide evidence of the covenant structure within which the motifs of the curse of the covenant, the failure to do all the law, and idolatry are juxtaposed. As is commonly recognized, the author of Jubilees adapted the text of the Pentateuch and inserted new material into it⁶² in order to express his viewpoint, which included the idea that unfaithful Jews were under the curse, if they were disloyal to the covenant. We will examine three passages which indicate this.

⁶¹For bibliography on issues of date, authorship, and purpose, see p. 79 above.

⁶²Endres: 2-7, 15-17; and VanderKam 1985: 113.

First, in the first chapter of Jubilees, Israel's apostasy is described in terms of the service of other gods, which is designated as failure to keep all of the Lord's commandments.⁶³ After the Israelites entered the promised land, they would turn to "strange gods" (1.8). This "transgression of the covenant" (1.5), which was explicitly idolatry, was the failure to do all that the law required:

...for they will forget all of my commandments, everything which I shall command them, and they will walk after the gentiles and after their defilement and shame. And they will serve their gods. (1.9)

Israel would turn to strange gods, with the implication that they thereby turned from the Lord. In this way, God's people would forget, that is neglect, all of the commandments. Forgetfulness of all of the Lord's commandments is thus linked closely with the service of other gods in Jubilees. Since Israel had forsaken the ordinances and commandments of the Lord (1.10) and had neglected everything (1.12), they would be destroyed and taken captive (1.10, 13).⁶⁴ Although the term "curse" is not employed here with reference to Israel's failure to do the law,⁶⁵ the motif of destruction and removal from the land clearly alludes to the curse of the covenant in Israel's history. The result of this destruction is the loss of the land which the Lord promised to the fathers (1.8, 13) and to the loss of the presence of God in the land (1.10, 13). Thus, for Jubilees, the exile was due to the fact that

⁶³Although Jubilees 1.1-14 is cast as a revelation to Moses on Sinai and thus one would expect Exodus motifs there, it has also clearly been influenced by Deuteronomy. First, the reference to the law written by the Lord alludes to Deut 9.10. Second, the language of 1.6 is a citation of Deut 30.1. Third, the command to Moses to write all these words in 1.7 refers to Deut 31.24. And fourth, the reference in 1.7-8 to the entrance into the land flowing with milk and honey which was promised to the fathers and the subsequent turn to other gods alludes to Deut 31.20.

⁶⁴One of the purposes of Jubilees is to remind the people of God that although Israel had been unfaithful in that she had transgressed the covenant, the Lord was faithful and had not abandoned Israel (1.5-6). Compare this text with Deut 30.

⁶⁵The term "curse" is used in 1.16 in a positive context in which the author states that after her restoration from exile, Israel would be a blessing among the nations and not a curse, which is probably a reference to Zech 8.13.

...they will forget all my laws and all of my commandments and all of my judgments, and they will err concerning new moons, sabbaths, festivals, jubilees, and ordinances (1.14).

Israel was exiled because she had forgotten all of the laws both through the service of other gods and through the improper observance of religious festivals. This language, however, had more than an historical reference; it was intended by the author as a polemic against other Jews in the postbiblical period who were deemed to have violated the covenant through improper religious observance. Improper worship thus is at the heart of what it means to fail to do all that the law required. In this passage, therefore, the failure to keep all of the commandments and the worship of other gods are closely related.

Second, during Abraham's farewell address to his children in Jub 20,⁶⁶ he exhorted them that "...they should not cross over either to the right or left from all of the ways which the Lord commanded us..." (20.3). The echo of the language of Deuteronomy, in which devotion to the Lord is termed as not going to the right or to the left, is clear.⁶⁷ Moreover, Abraham's message for his children links together the Deuteronomistic motif of faithfulness to all the commandments and the avoidance of the service of other gods:

I exhort you, my sons, love the God of heaven, and be joined to all of his commands. And do not go after their idols and after their defilement. And do not make gods of molten or carved images for yourselves, because it is vain and they have no spirit. Because they are the work of hands, and all those who trust in them trust in nothing. Do not worship them and do not bow down to them. (20.7-8)

⁶⁶Since this narrative does not appear in the Biblical narrative, its inclusion here demonstrates many of the concerns of the author for his own generation. Cf. Endres: 28.

⁶⁷Cf. Deut 5.32; 17.11, 20; 28.14. Compare with I Macc. 2.22.

Abraham thus exhorts his children to keep all the Lord's commandments and avoid idolatry.⁶⁸ This exhortation follows the exhortation to guard against fornication and impurity so that the descendants of Abraham might not be cursed (20.6). Hence this narrative insertion by the author of Jubilees states Israel's fundamental covenant obligation according to Deuteronomy-to love the Lord God; and this obligation is juxtaposed with its principal failure-the worship of idols. If they fail to remain faithful to the Lord, they will be cursed like Sodom and Gomorrah; if they obey, they will be blessed (20.9-10).⁶⁹

Third, Abraham's last words to Isaac, which follow the typical form of a testament,⁷⁰ also emphasize this same point. Abraham declares that he always followed the Lord alone (21.2a) and that he "...sought with all my heart to do his will and walk uprightly in all his ways (21.2b). Abraham then describes how he walked with the Lord "in all his ways":

I hated idols, and those who serve them I have rejected. And I have offered my heart and spirit so that I might be careful to do the will of the one who created me because he is the living God. (Jub 21.3)

Abraham thus testifies to his own devotion to the Lord,⁷¹ and his rejection of idolatry and those who worship idols.⁷² This narrative is also influenced by Deuteronomy.⁷³ In 21.5, which functions as the "statement of substance",⁷⁴ the positive injunction to

⁶⁸Cf. Endres: 29, n.27.

⁶⁹This blessing is linked to the exclusive worship of God. Of special significance is the list of blessings, which correspond to those in Deuteronomy and to which is appended the promise of blessing for the nations in Gen 12.3. Jubilees thus links the blessing of Gen 12 with the covenant blessings of Deuteronomy for those who are loyal to the covenant. Cf. Morland: 78.

⁷⁰Baltzer: 135.

⁷¹Cf. idem: 138.

⁷²Nickelsburg 1981: 75.

⁷³Cf. Endres: 31. He points out the interpretive use of Deut 10.17 in Jub 21.4, in which divine impartiality is applied as a warning to those who transgress the commandments.

⁷⁴Baltzer: 12-13. The statement of substance of the covenant form summarizes the purpose of the stipulations. The basic requirement is loyalty.

observe the commandments is juxtaposed with the negative injunction which concerns idolatry. Thus the author of Jubilees follows the positive injunction to keep the commandments with its failure through the worship of idols.⁷⁵ This text does not use the term "curse", but it does refer to the Lord as "...one who executes judgment with all who transgress his commandments and despise his covenant" (21.4). Therefore, in Abraham's final words to his son, Isaac, he stresses the importance of faithfulness to the Lord in terms which are influenced by Deuteronomy's covenant structure.

B. The Testament of Moses

The Testament of Moses claims to be the farewell exhortation given by Moses to Joshua shortly before Moses' death. Although some scholars have attempted to date this document in the period of the Maccabean revolt, the most likely date for its composition is in the first century C.E. before the destruction of Jerusalem.⁷⁶ The Testament of Moses closely follows the outline of Deuteronomy 31-34, and as such it "...may be considered a virtual rewriting of them."⁷⁷ Thus the Testament of Moses is similar in function to the rewritten bible of Jubilees or Pseudo-Philo, even though it is distinct from them in form.

⁷⁵In addition to the prohibition of idolatry, the other stipulations that Abraham exhorts Isaac to keep focus on the proper worship of the Lord. Cf. Endres: 31.

⁷⁶Cf. Priest: 920-921. Priest argues that historical uncertainty makes any attempt to date the composition of the Testament of Moses earlier than this difficult, even though he recognizes that some of its materials may date to an earlier period in either oral or written form. See also Collins 1984: 347-348; idem 1973: 15-32; idem 1985: 148; and Tromp: 116-117. Nickelsburg 1973, however, argues for a date of composition in the Maccabean period with a final redaction in the 1st C. E. See also idem 1981: 80-83, 212-214.

⁷⁷Priest: 923. See also Harrington 1973: 59-66; Collins 1984: 345-347; idem 1985: 146; and Nickelsburg 1981: 80. Tromp: 121, however, asserts that T. Mos. is not a rewriting of Deut 31-34, but rather is a rewriting of Israel's history which adopts the general outline of Deut 31. This seems to miss the point that, first, Deut 31-34 is presented, in part at least, as Moses' prophetic vision of Israel's future apostasy and restoration and, second, the author or redactor of T. Mos. has in fact used these chapters of Deuteronomy to frame his adaptation of this tradition for his own generation.

After a brief chronological introduction, Moses informs Joshua that he would lead the people of Israel into the land promised to their fathers (1.6-9; 2.1-2), and he exhorts him to enter into the land "with all your strength" (1.10a). The purpose of this commission given to Joshua is "...that you may do everything which has been commanded in such a way as will cause you no blame in the sight of God" (1.10b).⁷⁸ Thus the author underscores the fundamental covenant obligation laid upon Israel according to Deuteronomy.⁷⁹ The day would come, however, when they would violate the covenant through the service of other gods (2.7-9). Thus Moses foresaw the day when Israel would violate the covenant through the worship of other gods,⁸⁰ and this violation is the failure to be faithful to the covenant obligation to do everything in the law. This violation of the covenant through the sin of idolatry would result in the destruction of the land through the hand of a foreign nation and exile for all the tribes of Israel (3.1-3).⁸¹

The Testament of Moses also records that the Lord restored Israel to the land.⁸² This return from exile⁸³ is followed, however, by a time of renewed

⁷⁸Tromp: 139 translates this passage: "...and promise to do impeccably everything that is commanded, according to your zeal." See his discussion (*idem*: 140 n.4) concerning the significance of the term "impeccably".

⁷⁹Tromp: 140 notes the link between this language and many passages in Deuteronomy and also in the first chapters of Joshua.

⁸⁰Tromp: 161 notes that this total apostasy which is the violation of the covenant is also described as the pollution of the *hies* which the Lord made with Israel. He argues that *hies* is a virtual equivalent of $\mu\omicron\tau\iota\varsigma$. The strength of this argument, however, is mitigated by the fact that it is based on Tromp's emendation of this text, in which he follows other scholars.

⁸¹The term "curse" is not used, but the theme of exile into a foreign land clearly points to the theme of the curse on covenant failure in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history. Cf. Harrington 1973: 64.

⁸²In the midst of the exile, all the tribes of Israel will cry out to heaven and will base their petition on the covenant with Abraham (3.9; 4.1-9). The Lord will then restore "some parts of the tribes" (4.7), but the ten tribes will remain among the nations where they will increase and spread out in the diaspora, which is referred to as "the time of their captivity." Thus although Jews living in the diaspora could be referred to as living in captivity, the two tribes returned to the land were not. Cf. Tromp: 183-184. However, Collins 1985: 152 points out that this translation is based on an obscure text which requires emendation.

apostasy⁸⁴ in which certain people, probably at the time of the Maccabean crisis,⁸⁵ did not follow the truth of God (5.2, 4) and worshipped other gods (5.3). After a passage which may be an interpolation in which events of the Herodian period are discussed (6.1-7.10), chapter eight clearly picks up the thread of the apostasy from the Lord, again probably in the Maccabean period.⁸⁶ The pressure to apostatize focuses on circumcision (8.1)⁸⁷ and forced idolatry (8.4).⁸⁸ In the midst of this apostasy, the Testament of Moses focuses upon a faithful man named Taxo.⁸⁹ He believed that the events of his day reflected a second time of punishment for the nation, which was distinct from the exile and in many ways exceeded it (9.2).⁹⁰ The curse of the covenant as it was manifested in Taxo's day thus is not understood to be a continuation of the curse of the exile, but rather is the effect of the idolatrous transgression of the commandments by the current generation.⁹¹ The Testament of Moses, therefore, provides evidence of the pattern of curse, the worship of other gods, and the failure to keep the commandments, both in its review of Israel's history and in its application of this pattern to the unfaithful generation, probably at the time of the Maccabean crisis.

⁸³It is evident that this restoration only partially fulfilled the hopes of those in exile (cf. 4.8). Cf. Nickelsburg 1981: 81.

⁸⁴Harrington 1973: 64

⁸⁵The people who led this apostasy are usually identified as the hellenizing priests of the Seleucid period or the priest-kings of the Hasmonean era. Cf. Priest: 919; and Harrington 1973: 64.

⁸⁶For the argument that this passage is an interpolation, see Nickelsburg 1973: 33-37. For the argument that T. Mos. comprises a literary unity, see Collins 1973: 17-30. Collins' argument centers on the author's use of elements of the Maccabean period in application to an ideal figure-Taxo.

⁸⁷The aim of this action was to get Jews to renounce Judaism. Cf. Tromp: 217.

⁸⁸The repetition of the verb "to compel" in 8.4-5 points to the social, political, and religious pressure placed upon Jews to abandon their ancestral faith. On the significance of the terms used here for the worship of other gods, see Tromp: 220-222

⁸⁹For a survey of the scholarly debate on the identity of Taxo, see *idem*: 124-128.

⁹⁰Cf. *idem*: 224-225.

⁹¹In order to avoid this divine punishment, Taxo exhorts his sons: "...let us die rather than transgress the commandments of the Lord of Lords, the God of our fathers" (9.6). Hence, the apostasy which focused on the abandonment of circumcision and the worship of other gods is the transgression of the commandments.

C. The Martyrdom of Isaiah

The pseudepigraphic work known as The Martyrdom of Isaiah is part of a larger work entitled The Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah. The former is "...a Jewish work which tells, in legendary form, of the martyr's death which Isaiah suffered at the hands of Manasseh."⁹² M. Knibb argues that the Martyrdom of Isaiah probably dates to the second century B.C.E., with the exception of 3.13-4.22, which he dates at the end of the first century of the common era.⁹³

In 5.1-7 Isaiah is put to death as a result of the accusations of false prophets. Belkira, one of the false prophets,⁹⁴ tells Isaiah that if he confesses that he lied and that Manasseh's ways are good and right, then he, Belkira, will make Isaiah the object of the worship of Manasseh and the people of Israel (5.8). He will be, in effect, another god to whom the people's heart will be turned. To this suggestion Isaiah responds faithfully within the context of Israel's covenant: "If it is within my power to say, 'Condemned and cursed be you, and all your hosts, and all your house!'" (5.9). Isaiah's response to this attempt to turn the heart of the people from the Lord to another and its consequent improper worship is to pronounce a curse. This text thus testifies to the curse which comes on those who turn the heart of the people of God away from him and to another god.

D. Pseudo-Philo

⁹²Knibb 1985a: 143.

⁹³idem: 149.

⁹⁴In this narrative, Belkira is presented as Beliar in human form. Cf. Knibb 1985a: 192.

Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities is a rewriting of the history of Israel from Adam to David which dates to the first half of the first century C.E.⁹⁵ It is clear that the fundamental reason for which a person or a group of people would come under the curse is idolatry.⁹⁶ This may be illustrated, first, through the author's use of traditions concerning Moses' final words to Israel as recorded in the latter part of Deuteronomy, and second, through an examination of an example from Pseudo-Philo's narrative of the time of the Judges, into which the author inserted the motif from Deuteronomy traced above.⁹⁷

First, before the report of Moses' death, Pseudo-Philo records⁹⁸ that he speaks "the words of the Law"⁹⁹ to Israel (19.1).¹⁰⁰ In response to these words of the law, the people vow to remain faithful to the covenant and to do all that God has commanded (19.4). Moses foresees, however, Israel's future apostasy (19.2). This abandonment of the Lord means that they will forget the law (19.6). The specific way in which Israel will be deceived and led off the path in which she should walk is through devotion to other gods (19.7).¹⁰¹ Hence Israel will be punished.¹⁰² Thus in spite of Israel's vow to do all

⁹⁵For bibliography and a discussion of issues of date, authorship, and purpose, see pp. 85-86 Above.

⁹⁶On the importance of the theme of idolatry in Pseudo-Philo, see Murphy: 252-254; and James: 59.

⁹⁷Although Pseudo-Philo deletes and compresses much of the Pentateuch, Judges is significantly expanded. Cf. Nickelsburg 1981: 266; and idem 1984: 107.

⁹⁸Cf. Murphy: 89: "Although it (ch. 19) uses biblical materials, it is mostly an original creation filled with elements characteristic of Pseudo-Philo."

⁹⁹On the importance in Ps.-Philo of faithfulness to the words of the covenant or the words of the Lord, see 21.7-10; 22.1ff; 23.1ff; and 24.3. This obligation is the central motif of the Deuteronomist. Cf. Murphy: 113. 22.1ff. is the narrative of the building of the altar beyond the Jordan (cf. Josh 22). This action disturbed the people greatly because they feared that these tribes had repeated the sin of the first generation at Sinai. Cf. idem: 104-106.

¹⁰⁰On this statement as a summary of Deuteronomy, see idem: 90.

¹⁰¹Moses is told here that he would not be permitted to enter into the land so that he might not see the graven images by which Israel would be deceived. Murphy: 91 notes that this unique feature of the narrative demonstrates that Pseudo-Philo is particularly interested in idolatry.

¹⁰²Significantly, in Pseudo-Philo God left the land, not Israel. See idem: 90.

that the Lord commanded, they will violate the covenant through the service of other gods.¹⁰³ The result of this violation of the covenant is that the Lord will "cut off" Israel (19.4), a probable allusion to the exile, even though the term "curse" is not used.

Second, the biblical narrative is expanded by the author in 25.1ff., an expansion in which the concern for covenant faithfulness as explicated in Deuteronomy¹⁰⁴ is evident. When Kenaz¹⁰⁵ addresses the Israelites, he reminds them of Moses' commandment "...not to transgress the Law to the right or to the left" (25.3). This language clearly echoes the injunction of Deuteronomy.¹⁰⁶ However, those whose hearts have been defiled and who have turned away from the Lord are under the fury of the wrath of God and must be removed from the community. Two texts are cited which link this expansion of Judges with Deuteronomy. First, Deut 28.14 is cited (25.3), in which Israel is warned: "and do not turn aside from any of the words which I command you today, to the right or to the left, to go after other gods to serve them." This text firmly links the failure to do the whole law with idolatry.¹⁰⁷ Second, Deut 29.18 is quoted in support of the removal of those whose hearts are defiled through the service of other gods (25.5). The narrator of Pseudo-Philo thus implies that the defilement of the hearts of some of the Israelites is due to their idolatry.

This implication becomes explicit later in the narrative.¹⁰⁸ Those who have turned to other gods are under the curse (26.1-2).¹⁰⁹ Those whose hearts have been so defiled are under the wrath of God (25.3) and must be removed from the community and

¹⁰³Cf. Harrington 1973: 62.

¹⁰⁴Murphy: 117.

¹⁰⁵Kenaz is only mentioned by name in Judges (3.9, 11). In Pseudo-Philo Kenaz takes his son's place as the first judge. Cf. Nickelsburg 1981: 266; and idem 1984: 107. He notes that Josephus also does this.

¹⁰⁶Cf. Deut 5.32; 17.11, 20; and 28.14. Compare also the narrative concerning Jair (Ps.-Philo 38.1-4) and Jephthah (Ps.-Philo 39.1-11). Cf. also I Macc 2.22; and Jub 20.3.

¹⁰⁷Cf. pp. 53-54 above.

¹⁰⁸Cf. 25.9-13; 26.4. The focus of this list of sins in 25.9-13 is idolatry, a point which is elaborated by Murphy: 119-121.

¹⁰⁹On the application of this text to anyone who committed apostasy, see idem: 122.

burned with fire (25.3, 6; 26.1, 5). Those who are involved in idol worship are under the curse of Deuteronomy.¹¹⁰

And now cursed be the man who would plot to do such things among you, brothers. And all the people answered, 'Amen, amen.' (25.5).

The juxtaposition of this imprecation and the twice repeated covenant response clearly indicates that Deuteronomy and its covenantal curses is the context of this episode. This narrative, therefore, which is an expansion of the biblical narrative,¹¹¹ focuses attention on those who have turned to other gods and who have thus violated the covenant through the failure to remain within the whole law, and it states explicitly that the curse is the the penalty prescribed for this disloyalty to the covenant.¹¹²

E. Summary

¹¹⁰It is imperative to note, however, that the curse of the covenant presented here is not intended to be understood as an eternal punishment. The Lord instructed Kenaz to provide an opportunity for confession by those who had violated the commandments of God (25.6), and Kenaz did this: "And now declare to us your wicked deeds and schemes. And who knows that if you tell the truth to us, even if you die now, nevertheless God will have mercy on you when he will resurrect the dead?" (25.7). Kenaz thus held out the hope to these sinners who were condemned under the curse of the covenant that they might participate in the life of the world to come through the mercy of God. For Pseudo-Philo, therefore, the curse of the covenant is linked with idolatry, yet it did not necessarily mean ultimate damnation for those who were punished by the curse. Compare this with Job 33.10-14.

¹¹¹For another example of the inclusion of this motif in an expansion of the biblical narrative, see the narrative of the story of the idolatry of Micah, in which each of the Ten Commandments is associated with idolatry (44.1ff.). The Ten Commandments themselves are slightly modified in this text: the first two commandments in Exodus and Deuteronomy are combined into one in Ps.-Philo and the eighth commandment is cited before the sixth. On this text, see Murphy: 173-175, 252. Thus it is evident that from the perspective of Pseudo-Philo, devotion to and the service of other gods effectively functions in such a way as to violate the entire law and thereby to come under the covenant curse.

¹¹²Cf. 28.2 where the author, in reference to this episode, states both that the establishment of the covenant was intended to keep the people from abandoning the Lord and that the Lord had in fact destroyed those who transgressed the covenant in the prior narrative.

Several of the documents within the pseudepigrapha also demonstrate the connection traced above in the Hebrew Scripture between the curse of the covenant and the failure to remain loyal to the covenant and its commandments through the worship of other gods. Although the term curse may not be used in every text cited (e.g. Jub 1.9ff.), language from Deuteronomy indicates that the motif of the curse is present in those texts. This perspective is retained both when a biblical text is clearly in view and when it is inserted into narratives about Abraham, Taxo, and Kenaz which are expansions of the Jewish scripture.

IV. The Qumran Literature

The covenant curse, which would fall upon transgressors of the law, is also found in the literature of the Qumran community.¹¹³ This polemical language is almost entirely directed at apostate Jews who, from the perspective of the Qumran community, have abandoned the covenant because they have failed to observe the law as rigorously as they themselves did.¹¹⁴

A. The Temple Scroll¹¹⁵

¹¹³This is not intended to imply that the Qumran community produced all of this literature, but rather that since they copied and preserved this literature, it functions as a means of determining the important issues for that community.

¹¹⁴The concern of the Qumran community with purity is well established. Cf. Schiffmann 1983: 215-216; idem 1990: 135-156; Dimant: 528; Milgrom: 83-99; and Kister: 571-573. This concern results in regulations which are aimed at keeping the members of the community from defilement when they came into contact with those from the outside world. We read in CD 12.6b-11, for example, of rules which pertain to gentiles and the restrictions on the way in which members of the community might conduct business with them. The motivation for this concern and the reward for obedience to these regulations is stated in CD 12.19-22. Although there might be a variety of ways in which a member of the community could be defiled, it must be noted that this text is especially concerned with the effect of contact with gentiles and that this concern is rooted in the desire to avoid idolatry so that the curse of the covenant might be avoided. See also 11QT 2.1-13; and 62.13-16.

¹¹⁵The text of the the Temple Scroll is taken from Yadin.

The Temple Scroll, which dates to the first or second century B.C.E.,¹¹⁶ contains a virtual citation of Deut 13, with slight modifications.¹¹⁷ First, 11QT 54.8-18 corresponds to Deut 13.2-6,¹¹⁸ and the Qumran text repeats the Scriptural injunction against a prophet¹¹⁹ (נביא) or dreamer of dreams (חולם חלום) who entices the people of God to abandon the Lord for other gods (ונלכה ונעבודה אלוהים אחרים). The penalty for the apostasy of that prophet or dreamer is death (יומת) because he has "proclaimed rebellion against YHWH, your God" (יב דבר סרה על יהוה אלוהיכה). Second, 11QT 54. 19-21 corresponds to Deut 13.7-12, but the column ends before the complete text from Deuteronomy is cited. The text refers to a relative or near neighbor who secretly entices to apostasy (ונלכה ונעבודה אלוהים אחרים). The scriptural penalty, which is not preserved in the Temple Scroll, is death.¹²⁰ And third, 11QT 55.2-14 corresponds to Deut 13.13-19,¹²¹ which addresses the issue of an entire town which is under the curse because of apostasy. The danger posed is from "men, sons of Belial" (אנשים [בגוי בליעל]) who have come "from your midst" (מקרבכה) to lead all¹²² the inhabitants to the worship of

¹¹⁶Yadin: 39; and Maier: 1-2 date the Temple Scroll to the Hasmonaean period, and Dimant: 527; and Schürer 1986: 415-417 concur with Yadin's dating of the Temple Scroll. Laperrousaz: 91-97; and Thiering: 99-120, however, argue that it dates to the first century B.C.E.

¹¹⁷The Temple Scroll appends a fourth example of the apostasy with which Deut 13 is concerned (11 QT 55.15-21=Deut 17.2-5).

¹¹⁸Several differences reflect orthographic changes (e.g. בקרבכה for בקרבך in 54.8). Some of these changes are motivated by the well known purpose of the Temple Scroll to cast itself as a direct address by the Lord, in contrast to much of Deuteronomy which refers to the Lord in the third person. Cf. VanderKam 1994: 59.

¹¹⁹See also 11QT 61.1-2, where the prophet who speaks in the name of another god is to be put to death.

¹²⁰On this penalty in Deuteronomy, see pp. 59-60 above.

¹²¹As was the case with 11QT 54.5-18 above, many of the changes are due to the first person direct address in the Temple Scroll in contrast to the third person of Deuteronomy.

¹²²Maier: 122 notes the insertion of כול in this text. The Temple Scroll thus makes explicit the attempt to deceive all the inhabitants of the city. Cf. also Schiffman 1994: 375-376, who argues that the most significant change occurs in the citation of Deut 13.13-19 in 11QT 55.2-14, a change which probably points to a polemical context with the Hasmoneans.

gods (נלכה ונעבודה אלוהים). If such accusations prove to be true, the whole city is under the curse (החרם in 55.7; and החרם in 55.11) and is to be destroyed (55.6-10). Such action functions redemptively, as the Lord turns from his anger and has mercy on the whole nation (55.11). This last point is especially clear in the change from בקרבך in the MT to בישראל.

It is significant that the Temple Scroll's citation of Deut 13 includes the text כול הדברים אשר אנוכי מצוה היום חשמור לעשות, which English versions designate Deut 12.32. Thus this text provides further evidence for inclusion of this statement within the pericope of Deut 13,¹²³ as well as further evidence that the three examples of apostasy are thought to be the violation of the positive injunction to do all the commandments. This is especially clear when we observe that the positive injunction to do all the commandments in 11QT 55.13 (אם השמע בקולי לשמור כול מצוותי) is a direct citation of Deut 13.19, except for the change from third person to first person in the Temple Scroll. The people of God thus reject the covenant of the Lord and fail to live within all its commandments when they turn to other gods. However, the Lord's promise is that that if his people are faithful and do not follow false prophets and others who attempt to lead God's people to worship other gods, then he will bless them as he promised the patriarchs.

B. The Community Rule

The curse of the covenant which falls upon those who are identified as idolators is explicitly cited in the Community Rule, a document whose composition dates to the

¹²³See pp. 59-61 above.

second half of the second century B.C.E.¹²⁴ In 1QS 1.13-17¹²⁵ we read that those who enter into this renewed covenant assume covenant obligations which are:

ולוא לצעוד בכּוּל אחד מכול דברי אל בקציהם

"They shall not stray¹²⁶ from any one of all God's orders concerning their appointed times"

ולוא לקדם עתיהם ולוא להחאחר מכול מועדיהם

"they shall not advance their appointed times nor shall they retard any one of their feasts"

ולוא לסור מחוקי אמתו ללכת ימין ושמאול

"They shall not veer from his reliable precepts in order to go either to the right or to the left."

וכול הבאים בסרך היחד יעבורו בברית לפני אל לעשות ככול אשר צוה

"all those who enter in the Rule of the community shall establish a covenant before God in order to carry out all that he commands "

These covenant obligations are concerned with the proper times for worship and feasts, a well known concern of the Qumran community. It is significant that these particular concerns are conjoined with strands from Deuteronomy which are focused on covenant loyalty, in particular the command not to turn to the right or left¹²⁷ and the command to do all that the Lord required. The purpose of these obligations, as is the case in

¹²⁴Dimant: 498. Wernberg-Møller: 1-21 places the date of composition in the first half of the second century B.C.E. Leaney: 113-116; and Schürer 1986: 383-384 place the date at about 100 B.C.E.

¹²⁵This is part of the record of a covenant ceremony for entrance into the community patterned after Deut 27-30. Cf. Dupont-Sommer: 75 n1.

¹²⁶Wernberg-Møller: 48 argues that לצל does not mean "transgression," and hence he translated "they must not walk away." Vermes 1987: 62, on the other hand, translates it with the term "depart" and accurately captures this meaning, while at the same time implying the transgression of the covenant which such behavior constitutes and which is clearly present in this context.

¹²⁷On the Deuteronomistic nature of this expression, see Wernberg-Møller: 49. Cf. Deut 5.32; 17.11, 20; 28.14; 1 Macc 2.22; Ps-Philo 25.3; 38.2; and Jub 20.3.

Deuteronomy, is that the members of the community might not "...stray from following him..." (1QS 1.17: ולוא לשוב מאחרו). Those who are admitted into the community must not depart from any of God's commandments (מכול דברי אל) and must obey all his commandments (ככול אשר צוה).¹²⁸

According to 1QS 2.11-18, those who thus rebel against the Lord and abandon him are cursed. This passage, which is based on Deut 29.18f.¹²⁹ and which also draws in elements of Deut 27¹³⁰ and Lev 19,¹³¹ functions as a warning against apostasy for those who have entered into the new covenant.¹³² 1QS 2.11-18 follows an extended section (1QS 2.1-10) in which the priests bless "all the men of God's lot who walk unblemished in all his paths" (כול אנשי גורל אל ההולכים חמים בכול דרכיו) and curse "all the men of the lot of Belial"¹³³ (אח כול אנשי גורל בליעל). According to 1QS 2.11, the person who worships idols is cursed (ארור בגולוי לבו לעבור). It is crucial to note that this curse is not viewed as a continuation of the curse on Israel for her idolatry in the past, but rather this curse is on "whoever enters this covenant" (הבא בברית הזוה), but who subsequently falls. The curse of the covenant, therefore, has a contemporary application

¹²⁸ *Face Leaney: 125*, who describes this language as the "element of 'perfectionism in this secretly revealed legalism of Qumran...". This renewed covenant into which the Qumran community has entered, however, is the result of God's gracious mercy in renewing the covenant with his people (1QS 1.16; 2.1), and it is necessary because Israel rebelled against the Lord and broke the former covenant (1QS 1.21-26). Thus the Qumran community is based on God's mercy and election, and obedience to all the commandments flows from this prior covenant relationship. On the pervasiveness of the language which refers to all the commandments, see Leaney: 125.

¹²⁹ This covenant records the revelation of all the words of this law which Israel was to observe (29.29), yet the focus of the entire chapter is on the commandment that Israel avoid idolatry and remain faithful to the Lord.

¹³⁰ Cf 1QS 2.18, which adapts to the Qumran community the repeated refrain of Deut 27.15-26.

¹³¹ Leaney: 134.

¹³² See Knibb 1987: 84, who writes that this section refers to a curse on "...those whose entry into the covenant is insincere." This curse thus is called upon Jews who enter the covenant community but demonstrate that they are unfaithful to it.

¹³³ The language of בני-בליעל draws on Deut 13.14 (אנשים בני-בליעל), which details the danger of certain men who enter a city to entice it away from the Lord to other gods. אנשי גורל בליעל thus are very likely those who entice God's people to idolatry.

among the Qumran community for those who have violated the precepts of the covenant. And in light of the concern in 1QS 1.13-17 for proper calendar observance, the way in which one who enters the community but who subsequently brings the curse on himself is through the violation of the precepts which distinguished the Qumran community from other Jewish groups of this period.

1QS 2.13-14a continues with a citation of Deut 29.18,¹³⁴ which in context refers to the person who is devoted to other gods, but who thinks that the covenant will nevertheless protect and bless him. The priests pronounce a fourfold curse on such a person (1QS 2.15-17), which includes כול אלות הברית הזוה and an eternal designation with the cursed ones (ארורי עולמים). The ground for these curses is idolatrous practice. Two observations are relevant to the present study. First, the statement of the curse in 1QS 2.15-17 brackets two statements which indicate that the curse means that the person who is viewed as an idolater is cut off from the covenant community.¹³⁵ Second, this person is under the curse forever. This is significant when we recognize that the penalty for many other violations of the Qumran halakah had a specific length of time attached to it before a person was admitted back into the community. Hence, if a person persists in rebellion against the Lord, a rebellion which is specifically designated as idolatry, then they would fall under the curses of the covenant.¹³⁶ This warning against idolatry in the

¹³⁴However, Deut 29.18 refers to האלה הזאת, while 1QS 2.13 refers to הברית הזוה. The covenant structure of the Qumran community thus is highlighted by this change, which is probably made under the influence of Deut 29.11.

¹³⁵The statements ויבדילהו אל לרעה and ונכרת מתוך כול בני אור both indicate that exclusion from the community is the issue.

¹³⁶On the connection between the curse and idolatry in this passage, see Leaney: 134. He notes that in Deuteronomy the concern is with actual idols, but in this Qumran text this passage is applied to those who abandoned the covenant with the Lord. Leaney also cites Habermann's interpretation in which "...that man is accursed who causes to err one who comes from the covenant of the sect and sets before him a stumbling-block...". If this is the case, then this passage functions similarly to 11QT 54.15bff. cited above, in which those who cause God's people to abandon him are under the curse. On the use of language in which the godless are cursed elsewhere in the literature of the Second Temple period, see Wernberg-Møller: 55.

Qumran community is based on the covenant Moses was commanded to make with Israel in Moab and which was recorded in Deut 29.14-21.¹³⁷ Those who enter into the new covenant and then abandon the Lord and his commandments, therefore, are under the curse of the covenant.

C. The Damascus Document

Although the Damascus Document was known before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, fragments of it discovered among the scrolls firmly link it with the Qumran community. Its date of composition is not later than 100 B.C.E.¹³⁸ In this document we once again find evidence to support the claim that the curses of the covenant fall on those associated with idolatry. This document begins with an explanation of the origin of the establishment of the Qumran community and the divine provision of the Teacher of Righteousness (CD 1.3-8). After Israel had been judged by the Lord in the destruction of Jerusalem and its sanctuary in 586 B.C.E. (CD 1.3, 5-6), the formation of the community resulted from God's faithfulness when he remembered his covenant with the patriarchs, visited his people, and preserved a remnant which he planted in the land (CD 1.4-8).¹³⁹ Thus the Qumran sect identifies itself as the recipients of the new covenant with the Lord, who remains faithful to his covenant with the fathers.

Within the context of the description of the origin of the community, we read in CD 1.12-17 of a "the congregation of traitors" (מִדְּבַר) who are "the ones who stray from

¹³⁷These lines are almost a direct quotation of Deut 29.18-20, to which elements of the language of Ez 14 have been joined. See Wernberg-Møller: 54; and Knibb 1987: 87.

¹³⁸Dimant: 490.

¹³⁹On the eschatological significance of the terms "visited" and "root," see Dimant: 491.

the path" (הם סרי דרד) and thus are outside of the new covenant community.¹⁴⁰ This apostate group is perhaps a reference to those Jews who have remained faithful to the Hasmonean High Priest, with whom the founders of the Qumran sect had violently disagreed.¹⁴¹ It is important to note that this event is viewed as a fulfillment of prophecy, specifically that found in Hos 4.16: "Like a stray heifer so has Israel strayed" (כפרה סורירה בן סרר ישראל). This statement is taken from a section of Hosea in which Israel is indicted for her idolatrous behavior.¹⁴² The author of the Damascus document thus indicates that the present apostate generation was predicted in Israel's scriptures. The result of this apostasy is that "the curses of the covenant would adhere to them" (הדבק בהם את אלות בריחו). Because of their persecution of the Qumran community, they transgressed the covenant and thereby came under its curses.¹⁴³ The faithful and righteous community thus could depend on the fact that God would judge those who despised him (CD 1.1-2). Therefore, those who are outside the community and have joined "the congregation of traitors" are designated idolators and thus are under the curse of the covenant.

D. Summary:

These documents from the Qumran community, which witness to the beliefs and practice of one strand of postbiblical Judaism, provide an insight into the categories in

¹⁴⁰Dimant: 493 stresses that the Qumran community perceived that the rest of Israel lay in sin and error, and hence it totally condemned non-sectarian Jews.

¹⁴¹Knibb 1987: 22-25 thinks that although this passage refers primarily to the past, it is also given a contemporary relevance by the Qumran community. He states that it is important to note that this passage thus "...is not concerned with the nation (i.e. Israel) as a whole, but with a specific group associated with 'the scoffer', which had apparently broken away from the movement."

¹⁴²Cf. Hos 4.1-19. Note especially that although the majority of the chapter is given to a denunciation of Israel's idolatry, a brief vice list is mentioned in verse two. Hosea thus places these sins within the context of Israel's idolatry.

¹⁴³Compare CD 1.20-2.1. According to this text, to oppose the community of God and to persecute it is to transgress the covenant and thus become liable to its sanctions.

which intra-Jewish polemic could be framed. One of the major categories is the curse which falls on those who are unfaithful to the covenant.¹⁴⁴ Those who fail to do all the commandments are often branded as idolators. We may, therefore, conclude that the connection between the curse of the covenant, failure to do all that the law required, and the worship of other gods is also evidenced in the various documents which are associated with the Qumran community.

V. Philo

Philo, the Alexandrian Jew who lived in the first century of the common era,¹⁴⁵ wrote extensively on the law of Moses.¹⁴⁶ Our examination of Philo's works will focus on his assertion that those who abandon the Lord and serve other gods are under the curse. First, we will examine Philo's assertion that loyalty to the Lord is the focus of Israel's religion. Second, Philo's description of Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord will be explored. And third, his account of the story of the episode with the Midianite women will be examined.

A. Loyalty to the Lord was the focus of Israel's religion

According to Philo the focus of Israel's religion is on the knowledge of and loyalty to the Lord. Indeed, according to Philo "the purpose of their laws was to honor the One

¹⁴⁴Compare 1Q22 1.3-2.11, where the link between all the commandments, devotion to other gods, and the curse is also evident.

¹⁴⁵On the life and literary works of Philo see p. 91 above.

¹⁴⁶The literary works of Philo which focus on an exposition of the Mosaic law include *De Decalogo*, *De Specialibus Legibus I-IV*, *De Virtutibus*, and *De Praemiis et Poenis*. Even though Philo was greatly influenced by Hellenism, Seland: 76 correctly argues that "Philo was Jew, and his close relation to Judaism is clearly set forth in his writings; all of them are in one way or other related to the Torah." For bibliography on Philo's exegetical method, see p. 91 above.

God."¹⁴⁷ The law of Moses was not a system of legalistic works under which humans toiled as sinners who could not keep it, but rather the goal of the Law was the knowledge of God. In *Vir* 177 Philo states that absolute sinlessness is a quality possessed by God (ἴδιον θεοῦ) or perhaps a divine man (θείου ἀνδρός). It is significant that the context of this statement provides no evidence that Philo thought that this lack of absolute sinlessness incurred the curse. In fact, this statement instead functions as the reason that all humans should exhibit the virtue of repentance. When he discusses the virtue of repentance with respect to those who have worshipped other gods, Philo describes this conversion from idolatry to the worship of God as "the first and most essential form of repentance" (*Vir*. 180: τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον καὶ ἀναγκαιότατον τῶν εἰς μετάνοιαν εἴρηται)¹⁴⁸, and those who respond to the general call to pursue piety and justice (*Vir*. 175: τοὺς πανταχοῦ πάντα εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης εἶναι ζηλωτάς) are rewarded with fellowship with the commonwealth of Israel (πολιτείας κοινωνίαν). Moses' exhortation to seek God and remain devoted to him is directed at those who formerly worshipped idols. Thus, for Philo repentance from sin is a virtue and leads to the knowledge of God and the rejection of idolatry.

Faithfulness to the God of Israel, moreover, is the focal point of the religion of Israel.¹⁴⁹ For example, in his discussion of the decalogue in *Dec.* 65, Philo exhorts his

¹⁴⁷Seland: 99.

¹⁴⁸That idolatry, and especially gentile idolatry, is in view is evident from the context of *Vir.* 178-179. First, the statement concerning the rejection of vanity (τυφὸν προβεβλήσθαι) points in this direction. Second, the exhortation "to rise in rebellion against mythical fables" (περιέχεσθαι μυθικῶν πλασμάτων) points even more clearly toward idolatry. Third, Philo wrote that those who are under the influence of these μυθικῶν have gone "...endlessly astray in their search for the knowledge of the best." (πλάνον ἀνήνυτον περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀρίστου γνώσεως ἀπεργασάμενοι). And fourth, the statement that some have assigned the honors due to God to gods that are no gods (τοῖς οὐ θεοῖς) is a clear allusion to a major strand of the Hebrew Bible's polemic against idolatry.

¹⁴⁹Philo points to Abraham (*Vir.* 212-219), Tamar (*Vir.* 221-225), and Phineas (*Spec.* 1.56-57) as examples from Israel's past of those who rejected idolatry. Philo also argues that the reason the law was given to Israel at Sinai was due to the idolatry which was rampant in the cities (*Dec.* 2-9). He also applies the prohibition against idolatry to the love of money (*Spec.* 1.25). Philo thus thought that material possessions could usurp the

readers to engrave the commandment to worship the Lord alone on their hearts (σθηλιτεύσωμεν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς)¹⁵⁰ because this is the first commandment (πρῶτον παράγγελμα) and the most sacred of commandments (παραγγεμάτων ἱερώτατον).¹⁵¹ The people of God must acknowledge and honor one God (ἓνα τὸν ἀνωτάτω νομίζειν τε καὶ τιμᾶν θεόν). According to Philo, the law of Moses unambiguously left no room for God's people to be devoted to anyone or anything other than the Lord, and indeed this is the best of goals to which they could aspire.¹⁵² Devotion to the Lord is the source of life for God's people.¹⁵³ Furthermore, in Vir. 35 Philo states that every other aspect of the law is founded on and flows from the knowledge of and devotion to the Lord. In this passage the bond of loyalty among Jews is based on their devotion to God. Thus the love for one's neighbor which the law commanded is the result of faithful devotion to God. Moreover, this ethical action which is based on and flows from devotion to the one God is true not only for the Jew by birth, but also for the proselyte (Vir. 181-182).¹⁵⁴ Philo thought, therefore, that as both the natural Israelite and the proselyte to the faith of Israel maintain faithful devotion of the Lord alone, the other aspects of the law which regulate daily life in the community of Israel and mandate love for one's neighbor would follow. Faithfulness to the Lord is the foundation upon which the faith and practice of Israel rest.

B. Philo on Deuteronomy

Lord's role in the lives of his people and that the prohibition against idolatry could be extended allegorically to this devotion to wealth.

¹⁵⁰This language recalls the Jewish scripture's call for a changed heart in the people of God and the law which would be written on their hearts.

¹⁵¹In Spec. I.20, after Philo introduced his discussion of the first commandment, he states that this commandment requires that honor be given to God because he alone is truly God. Philo thought that the violation of the first commandment meant that a person was guilty of the greatest impiety (ἀσεβεία τῇ μεγίστῃ).

¹⁵²Cf. esp. Seland: 95-99.

¹⁵³See also Dec. 81; and Spec. I.31, 345.

¹⁵⁴Stated negatively in Vir. 182, rebels from God's laws (τοὺς τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἀποστάντας) display many sinful traits.

Our attention now turns to Philo's treatment of several passages from Deuteronomy which point to the rejection of the fundamental aspect of Israel's covenant as the occasion and ground for the curse on God's people.¹⁵⁵ Philo makes this point very explicit in Praem. 162 when he concludes his discussion of all the curses (τὰς ἀράς) prescribed by the law. Those who would fall under the curse are those who disregard the holy laws of justice and piety, who have been seduced by polytheism, and have forgotten the teaching of their race and their fathers, in which they have been trained from their earliest years. For Philo, those who disregard the law of Moses and thus are under the curse¹⁵⁶ have been seduced by polytheism and thereby have left the worship of the one true God. However, Philo does not explicitly link this with the statement that this is failure to do all the law, even though the statement that they have forgotten the teaching of their race and their fathers may point in this direction.

Philo elsewhere discusses the rewards for obedience and the punishments for disobedience to the law of Moses (Praem. 3ff.). His treatment of the punishment or curse of the covenant is based on Leviticus and Deuteronomy, and Philo provides evidence in this work that he understood the curse that falls upon those who fail to remain within the covenant in terms of the worship of other gods. For example, in Praem. 142 when he cites the curses of Deut 28.16-20, he states that these curses fall on those who abandon the

¹⁵⁵In addition to the passages discussed below, Philo wrote that those who practised divination and other means of telling the future should be excluded from the community of Israel (Spec. 159-63). It is significant to note that Philo called for the exclusion of these people, but did not call for their death, as the Jewish scripture required.

¹⁵⁶In a passage which is greatly influenced by Deut 30, Philo indicates, however, that hope for restoration is held out for those who have experienced the curse (Praem. 163), if they accept this punishment as a warning, come to a whole-hearted conversion (ὅλη ψυχή μεταβάλωσι), acknowledge that they have gone astray, and fully confess their sin (ἐξαγορεύσαντες δὲ καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες ὅσα ἥμαρτον). Hence, it is significant that Philo states that the exile is not intended to destroy Israel, but rather to chastise her. When Israel has accepted this and returns to the Lord, she would find God's favor, would be restored from the ends of the earth (164-168), and her enemies would be cursed (169-171). Philo thought, therefore, that those under the curse could, and in fact would, be reconciled to the the Lord.

service of God (ἀπόλειψις θεραπείας θεοῦ).¹⁵⁷ In another passage in which Philo details the punishment for those who abandon the exclusive worship of the Lord for idolatry, he is explicit concerning the penalty prescribed by the law. Any (εἴ τις) who worship other gods betray God and his service (Spec.I.54). According to Philo, those who abandon the Lord must be punished and all who are zealous for virtue (Spec.I.55: καλὸν ἅπασιν τοῖς ζῆλον ἔχουσιν) should, motivated by love for God (φιλοθέω), exact the penalty immediately. This text is, in fact, Philo's paraphrase of Deut 13, which is influenced by Deut 17 and Num 25.¹⁵⁸

C. The story of Midianite Women

When Philo narrates the episode of the Midianites' attempt to defeat the Israelites, he notes that the Midianites made every attempt to turn the Israelites from the worship of God (Vir. 34: ἵνα ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ ὄντος ὄντος τιμῆς αὐτοῦ ἀποστήσωσι) to impiety (Vir. 34: μεθαρμύσσονται πρὸς ἀσέβειαν ἐξ ὁσιότητος). The plan that the Midianites devised called for the temptation of Israel's young men by the Midianite women. When this plan began to succeed, these women summoned them to join in their sacrifice, with the result that they separated them from the service of God (Vir. 40: ἀλλτριούσι τῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ ὄντος ὄντος θεραπείας θεοῦ). The goal of this plan was that they might destroy the whole nation through the sin of idolatry (Vir. 42). Philo thus ascribes to the Midianites the knowledge that if Israel abandons the exclusive worship of the Lord for other gods, they will be destroyed. Hence even though he does not use the terms usually translated "curse" in this passage, Philo clearly links the motif of the covenant curse, which he terms "casting down to destruction" (Vir. 42: καταβαλόντες διαφθεῖραι), with the cause for this curse which is the abandonment of

¹⁵⁷Philo used the term ἐπάρατος in this context.

¹⁵⁸Cf. Seland: 103-136. See also Spec. I.315-318; and idem: 136-160.

the worship of the Lord for devotion to the Midianite gods. Philo does not use the terminology of failure to do all the commandment in this passage, however.

D. Summary

Philo's extensive writings on the law of Moses and its interpretation provide us with an insight into the thought of at least one diaspora Jew on the significance and application of the Mosaic law within the first century period. Philo did not think that sinless perfection was required by the law; indeed, the truly wise person recognized that this quality was a divine attribute. Moreover, Philo provides us with an interpretation of the law which is consistent with the covenant pattern as outlined earlier in our examination of Deuteronomy. This can be most clearly seen in Philo's insistence that the religion of Israel is focused on loyalty to the Lord and that those who abandon this covenant loyalty to serve other gods are under the curse. Philo does not state that this is failure to do all the law, but he clearly thinks that those who serve other gods have violated and broken the covenant. Therefore, Philo's explication of the function and significance of the law is continuous with the dominant theme of Deuteronomy which was traced above; namely, that Israel was blessed when she remained faithful to the Lord and was cursed when she abandoned the Lord and served other gods.

VI. Josephus

Josephus, the Palestinian Jew who lived in the second half of the first century of the common era, wrote extensively on the history of the Jewish people,¹⁵⁹ and he often

¹⁵⁹On the textual history of Josephus' works, see Feldman 1984: 765-768, esp. 767: "...we may note that Schalit, the foremost Josephus scholar of the past generation, has remarked that the text of the 'Antiquities' is more corrupt than any other Greek text." On the life and literary works of Josephus see p. 96, n.76 above.

provides evidence that he was influenced by the Deuteronomistic perspective that we traced above.¹⁶⁰ First, we will examine Josephus' references to Deuteronomy in order to determine his understanding of the central focus of Israel's covenant. Second, we will consider how Josephus modified the narrative about the Midianite women in order to highlight the importance of exclusive devotion to the Lord. And third, we will turn to a brief survey of Josephus' record the history of Israel's monarchy and his understanding of the focal point of Israel's covenant failure, especially those places where Josephus modified the narrative in order to make this explicit as well as his evaluation of it.¹⁶¹

A. Josephus on the covenant in Deuteronomy

The motif, which we have traced above both in the Hebrew scriptures and in the various literary strata of the Second Temple period, that Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord is centered on faithfulness to the Lord, is also featured in Josephus' description of the central message of Deuteronomy. Josephus could refer to Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord as a "constitution" (πολιτεία),¹⁶² a term with political associations in the Greco-Roman world.¹⁶³ For example, this is indicated by

¹⁶⁰This is evidenced in spite of his claim to write an accurate record, "neither adding nor omitting anything" (This expression is taken from Deut 4.2; and 12.32). See Feldman 1984: 789. Josephus' translation is paraphrastic (on this point, see idem: 788-804). Attridge 1976: 41-42 argues that Josephus' preface to the Antiquities functions in a programmatic fashion in which Josephus states that law must be given in conformity with nature because nature mirrors the divine and the God who is lord of all rewards and judges all people on the basis of their deeds. Hence, "piety (εὐσέβεια) consists in recognizing this religious philosophy and once men are thus pious they will be ready to obey the laws." See also idem: 183, specifically the comment that εὐσέβεια is stressed in his theocentric history as the religious response to the facts of divine providence. Thus obedience to the law stems from the recognition in nature of the existence and nature of God, and those who reject this knowledge base their shameful behavior on devotion to other gods.

¹⁶¹On Josephus' use of written and oral sources for his history of the Jewish people see p. 96, n. 80 above.

¹⁶²Cf. also Ant. 4.191, 302, and 311.

¹⁶³Cf. Attridge 1976: 62-66.

Josephus' statement that the curse (Ant. 4.307: τὰς κατάρσας) fell upon those who intentionally violated the commandments upon which the nation was founded (Ant. 4.310). In this text, which is apparently based on Deut 13, Josephus wrote that Jews were called upon to uproot (ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνασπᾶν θεμελίων)¹⁶⁴ anyone from their race (ἄν τις τῶν ἐξ αἵματος) or any city (ἄν τε πόλις) that attempted to confound (συγχεῖν) or destroy (καταλύειν) the constitution based on the law (τὴν κατ' αὐτοὺς πολιτείαν). In this context the antecedent of αὐτοὺς is the laws which were discussed previously. Josephus' reference to the oath the people took (καὶ τὸ μὲν πλῆθος ὤμνηεν) clearly places it within the context of the covenant ceremony of Deut 27. Josephus thus links traditions from Deut 13 and 27 in order to warn of the danger of apostasy. Attridge argues that πολιτεία functions as an "interpretive apologetic" for Josephus' Greco-Roman readers.¹⁶⁵ Josephus' choice of the term the πολιτεία would focus his readers' attention on the proper relationship between Israel and the Lord, which is the constitution upon which Israel was founded.¹⁶⁶ Josephus asserts, therefore, that the curse of the covenant fell upon those who intentionally violated the commandments upon which the nation was founded, not upon those who violated one of the precepts of the law.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴His statement that if this were not possible, then Jews should at least indicate that this activity was contrary to their will (αὐτὸ τὸ μὴ κατὰ βούλησιν ἰδίαν ταῦτα γίνεσθαι δεικνύναι) suggests his application of Deut 13 in a time when Jews no longer had jurisdiction over their own country and its affairs.

¹⁶⁵idem: 65-66. Concerning Josephus' use of this term see also idem: 133, n.2.

¹⁶⁶Cf. Ant. 4.191-193. In this section, Josephus states that after the people living in the land were defeated, they and every aspect of their worship of other gods must be destroyed. This must be done if the Israelites wanted to remain within the law (εἰ βούλοισθε τούτους ἕμιν μένειν) so that they might not "...corrupt the constitution of your fathers" (διαφθεῖρητε τὴν πατριαν πολιτείαν).

¹⁶⁷When Josephus describes the covenant ceremony of Deuteronomy 27ff. in Ant. 4.306ff., it is clear that he understands failure to remain within the covenant to be due to the neglect of the proper worship of the Lord and to the wilful and intentional violation of the commandments. An Israelite does not come under the curse of the covenant because of the violation of a single commandment, but rather motives are of primary importance (Ant. 4.309). It is clear that Josephus does not think that Jews of the first century era live in fear of violating a single commandment and thereby incurring the curse of the covenant. Although the strict observance of the law is certainly important for Josephus, the intention of the first century Jew is an important criterion upon which

In Ant. 4.311-313 Josephus records Moses' instruction concerning the Levitical system through which Israel worshipped the Lord. Once again, Josephus refers to the fact that Moses left Israel laws (νόμους) and the order of a constitution (τὸν τῆς πολιτείας κόσμον), and he thereby points toward Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord and the law's function within that relationship.¹⁶⁸ Moreover, it is crucial to note that Josephus wrote that the curse¹⁶⁹ which would result in destruction for the land and exile for the people would come "...if they transgressed his rites..." (ὅτι παραβάντες τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν θρησκείαν).¹⁷⁰ This statement is significant for two reasons. First, in Josephus, as well as other Jewish literary works of the biblical and postbiblical periods, most often it is the law (νόμος) which is transgressed; hence, this variation is likely intentional. Second, Josephus wrote that it is the improper worship of the Lord which results in the curse, not the violation of one of the individual commandments in the law. Covenant unfaithfulness in terms of the worship of other gods is the cause of the curse and the exile in Israel's history.¹⁷¹

judgment is based. On the motif of curse within the context of covenant blessing for loyalty to the Lord and the curse for disloyalty, see Ant. 4.180-183. Although Josephus does not employ the term for curse here, he here clearly alludes to the juxtaposition of blessing and curse in Deuteronomy.

¹⁶⁸Josephus summarizes the significance of the law as a constitution in which Israel lived in covenant relationship with the Lord (Ant. 4.302). Thus the law functions as the foundation of the nation of Israel which provides for her blessing if she remains faithful to it and sanctions curses if she does not. The law, far from being a list of legalistic demands, is the very life blood of Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh and the foundation upon which her national existence rests.

¹⁶⁹Here κακῶν must be understood within the context of the blessings and the curses in Ant. 4.307. Cf. n.184 below

¹⁷⁰When he wrote that "Yet will they be lost not once, but often" (Ant. 4.314), Josephus suggests that this pattern would play itself out several times. Harrington 1973: 63 writes that "this apparent 'throw-away' line suggests that the pattern of history of Deut 32 is capable of even further expansion...Josephus indicates that the pattern is not a once-for-all series of events but has been and is now continuing on in Israel's history." Josephus' statement may be an allusion to the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E..

¹⁷¹When Josephus narrates Moses' final words of exhortation to the Israelites shortly before his death, he states that they should honor the Lord and his commandments (Ant. 4.318-319). The blessing and the curse are the consequence of covenant loyalty or disloyalty. It is striking that Josephus states that reverence and honor were due both the Lord and his laws (τὸ σεβειν τε καὶ τιμᾶν προσήκειν τοῦτον ὑμῖν καὶ τοὺς νόμους). This

B. The Story of Midianite Women

Josephus expands upon the story of Balaam as recorded in Num 22-24,¹⁷² and he places the following advice for Balak into the mouth of Balaam.¹⁷³ He said that although no one could successfully oppose the Israelites in battle because the Lord was on their side (Ant. 4.126-128), a more subtle strategy might prove successful. Balaam therefore advised¹⁷⁴ Balak to seduce the men of Israel with their most attractive daughters so that they might be able to induce them to renounce the laws of their fathers and hence the God who gave them (Ant. 4.130: ἀφέντας τοὺς πατριῶν νόμους καὶ τὸν τοῦτον αὐτοῖς θέμενον) in order that they might worship the gods of the Midianites and the Moabites (Ant. 4.130: τιμᾶν θεὸν τοῦ Μαδιανιτῶν καὶ Μωαβιτῶν σέβωσιν). The purpose of this plan was that the wrath of God might fall upon Israel (Ant. 4.130: οὕτως γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸν θεὸν ὀργισθήσεται). H. Attridge writes that "Capitulation to the demand involves the adoption of polytheism and a participation in the requisite worship."¹⁷⁵ The wrath of God would fall upon Israel when she renounced the law by worshipping the gods of the Midianites.

is due, almost certainly, to Josephus' understanding of Deuteronomy which links closely the obedience to the law and the proper worship of the Lord.

¹⁷²In general terms this tradition, especially Balaam's advice to Balak, was evidently wide-spread in the Second Temple period. Josephus, however, added his own interpretive touches. Cf. van Unnik: 242-245.

¹⁷³For a discussion of this pericope as an example of Josephus' tendency to add moralizing elements in his narrative, see Attridge 1976: 128-132. On Josephus' apologetic aims here, see Feldman 1984: 798.

¹⁷⁴On the importance of speeches in Josephus' narratives as indicative of his central concerns, see van Unnik: 244.

¹⁷⁵Attridge 1976: 131.

When these Midianite women had seduced the men of Israel in this manner (Ant. 4.137-138),¹⁷⁶ Josephus reports that these men were dominated by their love for these women and surrendered themselves to them so that they transgressed their traditions (Ant. 4.139: παρέβησαν τὰ πάτρια) and capitulated to the worship of other gods (Ant. 4.139-140). Hence these Israelites transgressed the law of God in that they acknowledged and served other gods (θεούς).¹⁷⁷ This behavior, which focuses on the worship of the Midianite gods, is described as a violation of everything that the law required (Ant. 4.139: καὶ πάντ' εἰς ἕβρονήν τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπὶ τούναντίον οἷς ὁ νόμος αὐτῶν ἐκέλευε ποιοῦντες διετελοῦν).¹⁷⁸ These young men violated the law not merely on the basis of a single transgression, but rather their transgression was a complete breach with their covenant relationship with the Lord. This lawlessness (Ant. 4.140: τὴν παρανομίαν) could have resulted in the complete destruction of their own national existence (Ant. 4.140: παντελοῦς τῶν ἰδίων ἐθισμῶν ἀπωλείας).¹⁷⁹

It is crucial to note that the emphasis in this narrative is on the story of the Midianite women and their seduction of the Israelite youths away from faithfulness to the law. This is demonstrated primarily by the editorial expansion given this part of the narrative,¹⁸⁰ which points towards its significance for him. Moreover, van Unnik has argued that the specific vocabulary which revolves around the motif of apostasy is central to Josephus' interest and functions didactically to warn his Jewish readers against the dangers of apostasy within the Greco-Roman world.

¹⁷⁶As van Unnik: 248-251 has correctly noted, according to Josephus the speech of the Midianite women focuses on the distinctive elements of Judaism and its exclusive monotheism as barriers to their marriage to the Israelite youths.

¹⁷⁷Cf. idem: 246-247. He writes that "unchastity leads to idolatry..."

¹⁷⁸Cf. idem: 251. van Unnik draws attention to parallels in Josephus' account of the fall of Solomon.

¹⁷⁹Josephus' use of ἀπόλεια with παρανομία in this context points to the complete violation of the covenant which culminated in idolatry. The term ἀπόλεια clearly points to the curse motif in Deuteronomy.

¹⁸⁰idem: 243. Cf. also Attridge 1976: 128-132; and Seland 1995: 60.

It is hardly conceivable that the words of this remarkable speech arose out of Josephus' own imagination. They are the expression of what was thought by his contemporaries who broke away from the ancestral religion and gave their reasons for doing so.¹⁸¹

Therefore, according to van Unnik, Josephus' elaboration of this episode places him within the broad stream of Second Temple Judaism in his understanding of the categories within which to understand apostasy from the Lord, and this apostasy, which Josephus terms καὶ πάντ' ...οἷς ὁ νόμος αὐτῶν ἐκέλευε ποιῶντες διετελοῦν, focuses on the rejection of an exclusive monotheism which is precipitated by the adoption of gentile customs.

C. Josephus' record of the Monarchy

In his record of the events during the reign of Israel's kings, Josephus is greatly influenced by Deuteronomistic tradition in his presentation of these events. This feature of Josephus' narrative of Israel's history has been highlighted by Attridge.¹⁸² It is our task to trace this influence in Josephus' narrative, and we will see that he framed Israel's covenant failure to remain faithful to the Lord within the Deuteronomistic connection between failure to do all that the law required and the service of other gods. It is this covenant failure which precipitated Jerusalem's destruction and Israel's exile.¹⁸³

¹⁸¹van Unnik: 259. Cf. also Attridge 1976: 168-169; and Feldman 1996: 68-69.

¹⁸²Attridge 1976: 86. He argues further that the three dominant influences on Josephus' historical method were the Deuteronomistic history, his own experience in the Jewish revolt, and his knowledge of the moralizing, rhetorical historiography in the Greco-Roman world. Cf. *idem*: 164

¹⁸³Josephus is not consistent with this language, however. For example, although Josephus' final evaluation of Solomon is a negative one (Ant. 8.190-192), he never employs the term πῶς in connection with Solomon's transgression of the law. In spite of his many great accomplishments, Josephus' final verdict on Solomon points to the fact that he did not remain in them to the end (οὐκ ἐπέμεινε τούτοις ἄχρι τελευτῆς), had abandoned the observance his fathers' customs (καταλιπὼν τὴν τῶν πατρίων ἐθισμῶν φυλακίην) and had transgressed the laws of Moses (παρέβη μὲν τοὺς Μωυσέος νόμους). The specific way in which he transgressed the laws of Moses was his love for and marriage to many foreign

On the one hand, the language of complete failure to do what the law required is employed negatively with respect to Israel's kings who turned from loyalty to the Lord to other gods. Jereboam failed to remain faithful to the Lord when he had two golden calves constructed (Ant. 8.226), which he then exhorted and encouraged the Israelites to worship (Ant. 8.227-228). In Ant. 8.229 Josephus comments that Jereboam thus misled the people (ἐξηπάτησε τὸν λαόν), caused them to abandon the worship of their fathers, which was the abandonment of God (τῆς πατρίου θρησκείας ἀποστάντας ἐποίησε), and caused them to transgress the laws (παραβῆναι τοὺς νόμους). This apostasy was the beginning of the covenant curse (κακῶν)¹⁸⁴ which resulted in military defeat and captivity.¹⁸⁵ Furthermore, Jereboam was led astray by false prophets (Ant. 8.245), who turned his mind completely from God (καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ τελῶς ἀποστρέψας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ). Although Josephus does not here use the term "all" here, the notion that only (μόνῳ) justice and piety would maintain the covenant and that Jereboam had completely

women, which in turn led to the worship of other gods (τοὺς δ' ἐκείνων ἤρξατο θρησκεύειν θεούς). This covenant failure meant that Israel had fallen away from the customs of their fathers (τῶν πατρίων ἀποστῶσι) and had neglected the honor of their own God (παρέντες τιμᾶν τὸν ἴδιον). This covenant failure in which Solomon worshipped other gods was the cause of the curse which eventually came upon the nation of Israel. Compare also Josephus' record of the covenant failure in Ant. 8.127-129 and the subsequent covenant curses in that text with the covenant curses in Deuteronomy. The language of failure to do all that the law required is also absent from the narrative of II Kgs 22 (Ant. 10.50ff.), even though it is explicit in the Jewish Scripture.

¹⁸⁴In Deut 31.17 and 32.23, κακά is part of the vocabulary used to describe the exile. In 31.29 it is part of Moses' prophecy about Israel in "the end of the days" (ἔσχατον τὴν ἡμερῶν). In 30.15 τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ κακόν is equated with τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον and this is in the context of 30.1 (ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ κατάρα). Cf. also 30.19, where τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον is equated with τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν. In 31.18, however, πάσας τὰς κακίας is a reference to Israel's idolatry, not the curse on that idolatry.

¹⁸⁵In the context of Jeroboam's reign (Ant. 8.280), Josephus wrote that only justice and piety toward God (ἐν γὰρ μόνῳ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβεῖ) would ensure the success of Israel's kings when they went into battle, a hope which only those who have from the beginning observed the laws and worshipped God (ἥτις ἐστὶ παρ' ἡμῖν τετηρηκόσιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὸν ἴδιον θεὸν σεβομένοις). Thus only faithfulness to the Lord could ensure that the king of Israel dwelt securely in his realm. This faithfulness is termed observing the laws and worshipping the God of Israel. If the king did otherwise and manufactured images and worshipped other gods, he deceived the people and brought ruin to the nation.

abandoned God through idolatry (τελέως ἀποστρέψας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) suggest that the Deuteronomistic perspective is present in this text.

In Ant. 9.27¹⁸⁶ Josephus reports that Jehoram followed Ahab's wicked behavior.¹⁸⁷ Jehoram showed every form of lawlessness (πάση παρανομία χρησάμενος) and impiety toward God (ἀσεβεία πρὸς τὸν θεόν). He thus was completely a transgressor of the law. This verdict is grounded in his idolatrous conduct because he neglected the service of God and worshipped strange gods (τοὺς ξενικούς ἐσέβeto). Jehoram thus failed to do all that the law required through his devotion to other gods.

On the other hand, this same language is employed positively of those who stemmed the tide of apostasy, if only temporarily. For example, Asa did what was right in the eyes of the Lord (Ant. 8.290) because he neither did nor thought anything (μηδὲν μήτε πράττων μήτ' ἐννοούμενος) which was contrary to observance of the laws (τὴν τῶν νομίμων φυλακὴν). This positive link between faithfulness to the Lord and the observance of the laws is reenforced in the narrative which follows Asa's victory over the Ethiopians (Ant. 8.294-297)). The prophet Azariah met the king on his return and said that this victory had been won because they had demonstrated that they were righteous and pure (δικαίους καὶ ὁσίους ἑαυτοὺς παρέσχον) and had always acted in

¹⁸⁶Cf. also Ant. 9.95-96, 98-99.

¹⁸⁷Josephus writes concerning Ahab that he followed in the evil footsteps of the kings before him and in those of Jeroboam; indeed, he exceeded them (Ant. 8.316). This king was noted for his idolatrous behavior, his marriage to a pagan wife, and the appointment of priests and prophets devoted to other gods (Ant. 8.317). In Ant. 8.318 Josephus states that Ahab's idolatrous and rebellious behavior earned him the title of the most foolish (ἄνοια) and wicked (πονηρία) king to date. Attridge 1976: 112-113 suggests that the term ἄνοια, among other terms denoting foolishness, is an editorial comment on Ahab's character. On the connection in Josephus between foolishness and the worship of other gods, see also Ant. 8.343 and 9.255. The worship of other gods not only is foolish, but also results in the corruption of the mind (διάνοια) of God's people (Ant. 9.261). Ahab's son, Ahaziah, is similarly compared (Ant. 9.18). He was wicked in every way (πονηρὸς ὧν καὶ πάντα) and is compared both to his parents and to Jeroboam, who was the first to transgress the laws (τῷ πρώτῳ παρανομήσαντι) and who thereby began to lead the people astray (τὸν λαὸν ἀπατᾶν ἀρξάμενον). Jeroboam's transgression, of course, centered on his idolatry.

conformity with the will of God (καὶ πάντα βούλησιν θεοῦ πεποιηκότας). This latter characteristic almost certainly refers to the covenant obligation as recorded in Deuteronomy to confirm the whole book of the law through the avoidance of the worship of other gods.¹⁸⁸ Thus Asa was blessed with this victory over his enemy because he did all that the law required by remaining faithful to the Lord and rejecting the worship of other gods.

According to Josephus, the pattern of covenant failure by the kings of Israel and Judah was interrupted by Jehu (Ant. 9. 132ff.), who was commended because he had done everything in accordance with God's will (τῷ πάντα πεποιηκέναι κατὰ βούλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ) by removing the idols established during the reign of Ahab. Moreover, in Ant. 9.132-133 Jehu's righteous and faithful conduct toward God and his desire to remain within the whole law is confirmed as he indicates his intention to punish the false prophets and false priest who had seduced Israel to abandon the worship of God and had led them to worship other gods. Jehu continued his faithfulness to all of God's will by punishing those responsible for seducing Israel to abandon the Lord for the service of other gods.

D. Summary

¹⁸⁸This conclusion is supported by two strands of evidence. First, the prophet's words that if they remained faithful (ἐπιμένουσι), the Lord would continue to give them victory; but if they abandoned him (ἀπολιποῦσι δὲ τὴν θρησκείαν), they would experience exile from the land clearly reflect the influence of Deuteronomy. Second, Asa's subsequent conduct, termed by Josephus as the enforcement of the laws throughout the country (ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν νομιμῶν ἐπιμελησομένους), most likely refers to the proper worship noted above. Josephus commended Jehoshaphat for similar conduct when he sent government officials and priests throughout the country to teach all the people to keep the laws of Moses and remain diligent in the worship of the Lord (Ant. 8.395: ...διδάξαι...τοὺς Μωυσέος νόμους καὶ φυλάσσειν τοὺς καὶ σπουδάζειν περὶ τὴν θρησκείαν τοῦ θεοῦ).

Josephus' voluminous writings on the history of the Jewish people include a significant section on Deuteronomy and the narrative to which modern scholars refer as the Deuteronomistic history. Within this vast literary body, Josephus refers to and rephrases the central covenant demand of Deuteronomy: Israel's covenant with the Lord demands that they remain faithful to him and all his commandments.¹⁸⁹ The judgment of God which sent Israel into exile came because Israel transgressed the law through the violation of its cultic elements centered on the proper and exclusive worship of the Lord.¹⁹⁰ Hence, according to Josephus Israel failed to remain faithful to all that the law required most often by turning from the Lord to serve and worship other gods.

Therefore, according to Josephus, Israel's primary covenant obligation was loyalty to the Lord which was often expressed in terms of the proper worship of the Lord and the keeping of his commandments. This covenant obligation is most often termed εὐσέβεια, by which Josephus "...seemed to imply that this virtue holds a particular place in the moral hierarchy."¹⁹¹ Josephus did not emphasize the term curse in every text surveyed, but he did point to the judgment on those who are disloyal to the covenant. This emphasis is especially clear in Ant. 4.310ff. which is based on Deut 13. In discussing the significance of this term in the writings of Josephus, Attridge notes that

...worship in the *Antiquities* is not simply an affair of cultic externals, but involves a complete devotion to God and a willingness to obey His law,

¹⁸⁹It is striking, however, that the language of 'covenant' is largely absent in the *Antiquities*, although the concept is clearly there and is derived from Deuteronomy. See Attridge 1976: 78-83, 149-151. He attempts to explain the relatively minor role that the concept of covenant played in the *Antiquities* by pointing to apologetic interests on the part of Josephus. He suggests that stressing Israel's unique relationship with the Lord might have offended a sophisticated audience and, perhaps more importantly, the central role that 'covenant' played in the Jewish revolt in which the zealots claimed that Israel's God, because of his covenant with Israel, would be the unconditional ally of the Jews.

¹⁹⁰idem: 5.

¹⁹¹idem: 116.

including His moral law. Ἐυσέβεια, then, in the *Antiquities* is the proper human response to the fact of God's providence.¹⁹²

Josephus, therefore, drew attention to Israel's fundamental covenant obligation which was to remain exclusively devoted to the Lord, and he narrated that Israel was judged when she violated this fundamental obligation.¹⁹³

VII. Conclusion

We have argued that the interpretation of Deuteronomy traced in chapter three is pervasive in the Jewish literature of the postbiblical period. The link between the curse, the service of other gods, and the failure to do all the law is a consistent feature of many strands of literature in this period. It is especially striking that such diverse literary sources as the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *I Esdras*, *I Maccabees*, *Baruch*, the *Prayer of Azariah*, *Jubilees*, the *Testament of Moses*, the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, *Pseudo-Philo*, the *Qumran literature*, *Philo*, and *Josephus* all testified to this motif of the covenant curse. Although the term curse is absent in some of the texts we have surveyed (e.g. *I Esd* 8.7), language from Deuteronomy indicates that the motif of curse is still present in those texts. Moreover, it is striking the number of times that the various strands of literature attribute the curse to be the result of a contemporary apostasy on the part of God's people.

¹⁹²ibid.

¹⁹³idem: 104-107 argues that one of the dominant, although at times implicit, motifs in the *Antiquities* is the eschatological restoration of the people of God, especially in light of the events leading up to and culminating in the crisis of 70 C.E. He suggests that one of the purposes of his narrative of Israel's history is to exhort his readers to trust in the providential care of God. On the didactic nature of Josephus' *Antiquities* in the context of the aims of historiography in the ancient world, see idem: 43-57.

Part Three

**Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law
in Paul's Letter to the Galatians**

Chapter Six

Blessing for the Nations and the Gospel of Jesus Christ: Paul's use of Genesis in Gal 3.8

I. Introduction

Our study in chapter two examined the promise in the Jewish scripture to Abraham to bless all nations through his descendants. We argued that this promise is a key feature of the Lord's covenant purpose with Abraham and his descendants from the very first formulation of the promise in Gen 12.1-3 to the repetition of the promise to Isaac and Jacob. And although the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is rare outside of the patriarchal narrative, it does occur in at least two texts in the Jewish scripture in connection with messianic and restoration motifs.¹ In chapter four we traced the various interpretive traditions concerning this promise in the literature of Second Temple Judaism. This study demonstrated that the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants is present in a number of the documents of postbiblical Judaism, and it pointed to the conclusion that it is interpreted in these texts to point to the importance of Israel as the mediator of blessing through her occupation of the whole world and the positive influence obtained by gentile communities through the presence of the righteous in their midst. In at least two significant strands of postbiblical Judaism, Josephus and the Qumran literature, it is not mentioned.²

It is the task of this chapter to place Paul's understanding of the significance of this promise to Abraham against and within these traditions.³ In order to accomplish this purpose, we must, first, examine Paul's account of his commission to preach the gospel to the gentiles and the implications of this call from God for our understanding of

¹ It is probably alluded to in several other texts. See pp. 42-48 above.

² On this omission, see pp. 90-91 and 96-101 above.

³ Hansen 1989: 175-199 has recently traced Abrahamic traditions in the postbiblical literature, but his work devotes little attention to the third strand of the promise.

Gal 3.8. Paul's explicit statement of the purpose of his call to be an apostle to the gentiles who was sent to preach the gospel to them informs our interpretation of Gal 3.8, especially in light of the link between the gospel and blessing for the nations in that text. Second, we will examine Paul's references to his defense of the truth of the gospel, which is an important aspect of the present study because it will bring into focus how the other gospel challenged the truth of Paul's gospel.⁴ In Gal 2 the issue which resulted in Paul's defense is the terms for the inclusion of gentiles into full fellowship in the covenant community. Once again the juxtaposition of the gospel and the gentiles may inform our interpretation of Gal 3.8. And third, we will argue that Paul's juxtaposition of the gospel and the promise to Abraham meant that the gospel was the fulfillment of the Lord's covenant purpose to bless the nations through Abraham's seed. In Gal 3.8 Paul argues that blessing for the nations (apart from works of the law) is a fundamental aspect of God's covenant purpose for his people as it was expressed from the establishment of his people when he called Abraham.

II. Paul's commission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles

⁴Our purpose will be to isolate the issues in Galatians around which Paul's defense of the truth of the gospel revolved: circumcision and purity laws. We will thus be able to trace more clearly, at least in terms which Paul uses in this letter, the contours of the other gospel which was preached by the troublemakers and to which the Galatians were attracted. We are well aware of the dangers of mirror reading an occasional letter (cf. Barclay 1987: 73-93), and thus our conclusions concerning the shape of this other gospel must remain tentative. However, two factors require such an attempt in the present study. First, this attempt is a necessary first step in a full understanding of Paul's statements concerning the consequences of preaching or accepting this other gospel. Second, scholars have long recognized that the argument in Galatians is sufficiently focused on a single issue, circumcision, and hence attempts to mirror read it for evidence concerning this other gospel may prove more successful than in other Pauline letters. On the unity of the argument in Galatians, see Barclay 1988: 45-60; Dunn 1993a: 9-11; idem 1993b: 7-12, 29-33; Hong 1993: 100-110; idem 1994: 168; Hansen 1989: 67-70; Gaventa: 153-156; and Brinsmead: 187-202. Nevertheless, the success or failure of this mirror reading does not affect the argument of this thesis concerning the results of preaching another gospel, but rather helps to clarify how the troublemakers were, in fact, doing so.

As is commonly observed by scholars, Paul presented his call⁵ in Gal. 1.15 in terms reminiscent of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. 1.5-6a)⁶ and/or the Servant of Yahweh (Isa. 49.1).⁷ Paul stated that he was set apart from his mother's womb (ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου) and that he was called through God's⁸ grace (καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ). Hence this text is part of a subordinate clause,⁹ which describes the God who had set Paul apart and had called him by grace. Scholars have typically argued that Paul was influenced by the LXX of Isa 49.1, from which he cited the phrase ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου.¹⁰ But Jeremiah's call, which took the form of two parallel lines, also states that the Lord knew him before Jeremiah was formed in the womb (πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ) and that the Lord sanctified him before he was born (πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐξελεῖν ἐκ

⁵The important debate about whether Paul here refers to his conversion or to his call is outside the parameters of this study. It is clear that Paul contrasts his former life with his life in Christ, but the significance of this contrast is debated. Cf. Segal. For a concise survey of the options, see now Dunn 1997b: 77-85. We agree with many recent scholars that Paul's conversion, in his own mind and self description, was to a Judaism centered on faith in the Messiah. On the other hand, the emphasis in this text is perhaps on the commission of Paul to be an apostle to the nations, especially with the important allusion to the calls of Jeremiah and the servant in Isaiah in view.

⁶Although scholars have long recognized that Paul presented his call to be an apostle of Jesus Christ in terms similar to the call of the prophet Jeremiah (Gal 1.15), few have taken this observation as a starting point for further investigation. Beker: 3, however, points to the importance of the influence of Jeremiah on Paul when he writes that Jeremiah was "...in many ways Paul's prophetic model." Cf. also Stuhlmacher: 152; and Bruce 1975: 24-25. A neglected avenue of research on Paul's letter to the Galatians, therefore, is the extent to which this letter was influenced by Israel's prophetic tradition, especially by Jeremiah.

⁷On Paul's call in connection with Israel's prophets, see Bruce 1982a: 92; idem 1975: 23-25; Betz: 69-70; Longenecker: 30; Segal: 13-14; Dunn 1993a: 63; Lührmann: 29; Munck: 25-35; Oepke: 60; Schlier: 53; Mussner: 81-82; Kim: 60; Baird: 656-657; Fung: 63-64; Sandnes: 48-70; Hansen 1994: 207-208; George: 117-118; Scott 1995: 124-125; and O'Brien: 5-6.

⁸The object of both adjectival participles is ὁ θεός, a reading which is probably not in the original text, but nevertheless is clearly implied.

⁹Sandnes: 58.

¹⁰Isa 49.5 also refers to the Lord, who formed the servant from the womb (κύριος ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας δούλου). The phrase ἐκ κοιλίας is used several times in Isaiah in connection with Israel's role as servant. This phrase modifies πλάσσειν (44.2, 24); and αἶρειν (46.3). In Isa 48.8, however, the text states that the Lord knew that Israel would be called 'lawless' even from the womb (καὶ ἄνομος ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας κληθήσῃ).

μήτρας). Thus Paul's key phrase (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου) finds its equivalent both in Isa 49.1 and Jer 1.5, but the language is not a precise match with the context of Isaiah¹¹ or the exact wording of Jeremiah.

The infinitive ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ completes the temporal clause ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν, and this revelation of God's son to Paul refers to the Christophany on the Damascus road.¹² The purpose of the revelation of God's son to Paul was that he might preach the gospel¹³ among the gentiles (1.16a: ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν).¹⁴ O'Brien has concluded that "...the main lines of Paul's preaching Christ to the Gentiles were already set at the time of the Damascus road revelation."¹⁵ For Paul, therefore, the immediate significance of his call on the

¹¹In the LXX ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου modified ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομά μου, but in Gal 1.15 the phrase modified ὁ ἀφορισάς με. Moreover, in Gal 1.15 God called Paul by his grace (καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ) and in Isa 49.1 the expression was that the Lord "had called my name" (ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομά μου).

¹²Cf. e.g. Kim: 56-66; and Dunn 1997b: 90.

¹³For a comprehensive study of the rhetorical function of gospel in Galatians, see Hughes 1994: 210-221. On the background for the term gospel in the Jewish scripture, see Stuhlmacher: 149-172. For a discussion of the history of the debate on a Jewish or Greco-Roman background for the term gospel, see Wright 1994: 223-229. At least in Galatians, Paul is almost certainly influenced by a Jewish background. This is indicated by his link between the gospel he was commissioned to preach and the call of the servant/Jeremiah and by his connection of the gospel with the promise in the Jewish scripture.

¹⁴Hughes: 218; and Matera: 60.

¹⁵O'Brien: 10; Räisänen 1992: 22-25; and Dunn 1993b: 68-69. *Face* Taylor: 62-74, who argues that Paul's perception of his call to a mission to the gentiles is the result of later reflection which is read back on this experience when he wrote Galatians. This is not to say, however, that all of the implications of Paul's call to the gentiles were in place at this time. It is likely that the implications for the law's role in relationship to the gospel to the gentiles became clear for Paul over a period of time, and Galatians probably represents Paul's first attempt to explicate this relationship. See Donaldson 1994: 179-193 who argues that the gentile mission set within a Jewish conceptual framework was present at least as early as the initial proclamation of the gospel to the Galatians, but that the "...vagueness or lack of resolution between Paul's universal message and its Jewish framework may suggest that he did not have the concomitant issues fully worked out from the beginning." (p.193). Segal: 6-8, 13 also thinks that there is a delay between Paul's conversion and his realization of a commission to the gentile mission. The text Segal cites (II Cor 11.24-26) is hardly a clear support for this thesis, however. Watson: 28-36 argues that Paul's gentile mission came only after a mission to Jews failed.

Damascus road was that he would preach the gospel among the gentiles,¹⁶ and this corresponds to elements in Isa 49 and Jer 1.¹⁷ The significance of the call of the servant in Isaiah is that the servant would be the means of the restoration of Israel (49.5-6a) and that he would be a light to the gentiles (49.6b: εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν) and would bring salvation to the end of the earth (49.6b: τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς). This light for the gentiles and salvation for the world is explicitly within the context of the covenant (49.6b: ἰδοὺ δέδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους). The significance of Jeremiah's call is that he was appointed a prophet to the nations (προφήτην εἰς ἔθνη τέθεικά σε). Both call narratives, therefore, might have been read by Paul to support his own conception of his call to be an apostle to the gentiles.¹⁸

K. Sandnes has recently argued that Paul conceived of his apostolic call and his commission to preach the gospel to the gentiles in prophetic terms.¹⁹ His work is important and helpful because it stresses the prophetic nature of Paul's call and ministry as an apostle of Jesus Christ. With respect to Gal 1.15, the link between the prophetic call and 'light to the nations' motif from Isa 49.1ff. has been clearly highlighted.²⁰ But equally clear in the prophetic tradition is the role of the prophet as a messenger who critiqued the people of God, both in relation to the prophet's role as the one who pointed to the sin of the people and who called for them to return to covenant loyalty. This is

¹⁶Cf. Dunn 1990: 89-107; Bonneau: 64; and O'Brien: 10, 22-25. Although most scholars mention this as the result of Paul's commission, few have developed this important point either in connection with Paul's apostolic ministry or his argument in Galatians. Kim: 57-66, for example, acknowledges this important result of the Damascus road Christophany, but devotes the main thrust of his study to the argument that Paul's fully developed Christology and his theology of the law both are implicitly present in this call experience. Hong 1993: 92-95 argues similarly, but he also recognizes the importance of the commission to preach the gospel to the gentiles. Stuhlmacher: 149-172 also does not adequately focus on the commission to the gentile mission.

¹⁷Dunn 1997b: 91; and Sandnes: 65-69.

¹⁸Cf. O'Brien: 6-7, 20, 46; Bruce 1975: 23-24; Matera: 63; Hong 1993: 95; Williams 1997: 46; and Dunn 1997b: 91.

¹⁹Sandnes: 58-70.

²⁰Cf. e.g. O'Brien: 20.

especially clear in Jeremiah, but it is also clear in Isaiah. If Paul thought of his call in continuity with Israel's prophets, then this important feature of that prophetic tradition has not been adequately explored with respect to Paul's polemic in Galatians.²¹

Paul stressed that his commission to preach the gospel among the gentiles was from God, not from men (Gal 1.1, 11, 16b). This emphasis has led many to conclude that Paul was primarily concerned with a personal defense in Gal 1-2 because those who had troubled the Galatians had attacked Paul when they had come into the Galatian churches. However, it may be more natural in light of the evidence to conclude that Paul thought that the gospel itself was under attack and that his statements are best understood as a defense of the message he had proclaimed to the Galatians.²² To be sure, Paul's statement in Gal 1.1 may be construed as a personal defense, but in 1.11 he makes it clear that it is the gospel itself that is not of human origin (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον), and likewise his statement in Gal 1.16b refers back to the call to be an apostle whose purpose is the proclamation of the gospel among the gentiles. In Galatians, therefore, Paul is not merely defending himself, but rather is defending the gospel he has proclaimed to the Galatians.²³ This conclusion best accounts for Paul's striking statement that he himself would be under a curse if he preached another gospel and for the whole train of thought in Gal 2, where Paul twice explicitly defends the truth of the gospel.²⁴

²¹We must remember, however, that Paul never referred to himself as a prophet, but rather his primary self designation is as an apostle. Cf. Segal: 14. He did refer to himself as a δούλος in Gal 1.10.

²²Cosgrove: 25; Dunn 1993b: 25-28; and Hong 1993: 89-90.

²³Hansen 1994: 205-206. The importance of Paul's defense of his apostleship is evident elsewhere in his letters. The point here is that the emphasis is on Paul's defense of the gospel he preached.

²⁴God had called and sent Paul to the gentiles with the gospel, and therefore anyone who opposed or hindered that gospel was in opposition to God himself and hindered his purpose. This is clear from the double anathema in 1.8-9, where Paul placed himself or even an angel from heaven under the curse, if another gospel were preached to the Galatians. Wright 1994: 228-239 has argued that as the Jewish character of Paul's

For Paul, his proclamation of the gospel to the gentiles was a mission with divine authority, and he probably viewed this mission as a fulfillment of Israel's mission to be a light to the nations.²⁵ Paul's ministry to preach the gospel to the gentiles was a ministry which was in continuity with Israel's prophets, especially Jeremiah and the servant of Isaiah. The significance of this call can only be fully appreciated when we remember that for Paul the content of that gospel was the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants (Gal 3.8).²⁶ This significance is alluded to in Gal 1.16 (ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν).²⁷ It is thus likely that Paul's reference to the gospel preached to Abraham is best understood within the context of Paul's ministry to preach the gospel among the gentiles and that Paul's intention was to indicate that this gospel carries with it divine authority.

III. Paul's Defense of the Truth of the Gospel (Gal 2.1-14)

Paul twice stated that his actions before other Jewish believers in Christ were motivated by a concern for the truth of the gospel. The central importance in Galatians of Paul's defense of the truth of the gospel has long been noted by scholars.²⁸ However, it is crucial for the present investigation to identify and clarify the issues for which Paul was compelled to defend the truth of the gospel. Given the narrow focus of this study on Paul's use of Genesis and Deuteronomy in his letter to the Galatians, this task will necessarily be restricted to the letter to the Galatians. This does not, however, prove to be

gospel is understood, the categories of Jewish monotheism and polemic increase in importance for the interpretation of Galatians.

²⁵So Dunn 1997b: 91; Bruce 1975: 24; and Hong 1993: 95.

²⁶O'Brien: 10-12.

²⁷Lührmann: 60.

²⁸Cf. e.g. Bruce 1975: 22.

a liability because the only two occurrences of this exact phrase are in Galatians.²⁹ Indeed they are separated by only nine verses.

A. Gal 2.1-10

The first occurrence of the phrase ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is in Paul's narrative of a meeting in Jerusalem³⁰ with οἱ δοκῶντες στυλοὶ, during which Paul submitted to them (2.2: ἀνεθεῖπν ἀντοῖς³¹) the gospel he preached to the gentiles.³² Paul had gone on the basis of a revelation (2.2: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν³³). Paul went with divine authority, and the specific issue with which Paul's visit was concerned was the gospel he preached among the gentiles³⁴ (2.2: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν).

²⁹A similar phrase occurs in Eph 1.13: ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν; and in Col 1.5: ἦν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. In the former passage, however, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is in apposition to τὸν λόγον, and thus is not linked directly to τῆς ἀληθείας. Moreover, its indirect link with τῆς ἀληθείας produces "the gospel of truth," which is the inverse wording of Gal 2.5, 14. The passage in Colossians provides a closer parallel because the genitive string τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου modifies τῷ λόγῳ. Hence, although it is used to modify another noun, the Pauline phrase from Galatians is present in this text. Furthermore, it is important to note that in both of these passages the phrase modifies the term λόγος which is the object of ἀκούειν or προακούειν.

³⁰For a recent study of the issues pertaining to Paul's relationship with the Jerusalem church and the aftermath of the incident at Antioch, see Taylor.

³¹It is possible that Paul first presented his gospel to a larger group and then discussed it privately with τοῖς δοκῶσιν, almost certainly a reference to Peter, James, and John (cf. 2.9). See Longenecker: 47-48; and Dunn 1993a: 93.

³²On the significance of ἀνατίθημι in this context, see Dunn 1990: 113-116; and idem 1993a: 91-92.

³³Paul's use of this term here in light of 1.11ff. functions to highlight the divine motivation for this visit; it was not motivated by Paul nor was he summoned to Jerusalem by the Apostles. Cf. Longenecker: 47; and Dunn 1993a: 91. And apparently Paul went with a degree of uncertainty and apprehension. It is likely that Paul's uncertainty and apprehension was focused on his fear for the unity of the church and the effectiveness of his gospel among the gentiles, or the lack thereof if a serious breach opened between Paul and Jerusalem. See Longenecker: 49; and Dunn 1993a: 93-94.

³⁴Paul's gospel was a universal message expressed within a Jewish framework. On the tension between these, see Donaldson 1994: 166-193; and Boyarin: 112-114. Boyarin's thesis, however, that Paul's gospel was centered on a universalistic hermeneutic, which subordinated all cultural differences under the importance of the new spiritual Israel,

This concern correlates well with the connection between Paul's commission to be an apostle and his mission to preach the gospel among the gentiles.³⁵ Significantly, both Paul's call to preach the gospel among the gentiles and his visit to Jerusalem to defend that gospel are said to be due to a revelation (1.16: ἀποκαλύψαι; and 2.2: ἀποκάλυψιν).³⁶ The result of this meeting confirmed Paul's gospel to the gentiles because Titus, who was a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised (2.3: ἤναγκάσθη περιτεμεῖσθαι³⁷). The issue at this meeting, therefore, is Paul's gospel to the gentiles, and more specifically whether or not the gentiles converted by Paul's gospel must be circumcised. It is this gospel which provoked ψευδαδελφοί to infiltrate the meeting.

A conflict arose when, according to Paul, these false brothers infiltrated the meeting (2.4a: τοὺς³⁸ παρεισάκτους ψευδαδελφούς)³⁹ with the intention "to enslave us" (2.4b: ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν). These Jewish Christians were false brothers because "...they could not accept Gentile Christians as true brothers apart from circumcision and so denied the universality of the gospel."⁴⁰ Paul asserted that he did not yield (2.5: εἴξαμεν) to their demand, evidently that Titus be circumcised, in order that the truth of the gospel might remain for the Galatians (2.5: ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνη πρὸς ὑμᾶς). This purpose clause made clear the significance of Paul's defense of the truth of the gospel for the Galatians themselves. Just as Paul's defense in Jerusalem meant that Titus need not be circumcised, so also Paul's exhortation to the Galatians in his letter to them was that their own participation in the gospel meant that they did not need to be

misses the full significance of the promise of blessing for the nations in Paul's argument. For a summary of Jewish views on gentiles, see Fredriksen: 533-543.

³⁵See pp. 152-156 above.

³⁶Hansen 1994: 199.

³⁷Some scholars have argued that Titus was circumcised, but was not compelled to accept this Jewish rite. However, see Longenecker: 50; Matera: 74; and Dunn 1993a: 96.

³⁸Longenecker: 51 suggests that Paul's use of the definite article here provides a rhetorical link with the troublemakers in Galatia.

³⁹Watson: 50-53 argues that these false brothers infiltrated the church in Antioch, not the meeting in Jerusalem.

⁴⁰Longenecker: 51.

circumcised (cf. 3.1ff). And the specific occasion which necessitated Paul's defense of the truth of the gospel was the demand that the uncircumcised, believing Greek, Titus, be circumcised.⁴¹ Therefore, those who compel gentile believers to be circumcised threaten the truth of the gospel, whether at the meeting in Jerusalem or among the Galatian churches.

B. Gal 2.11-14

After Paul's account of the meeting in Jerusalem with the 'pillar' apostles, he narrates the so-called 'incident at Antioch.' Even before he described the events which led to his actions, Paul states that he confronted Peter (2.11b: κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην) because he stood condemned (2.11c: ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν). It is likely in view of the double ἀνάθεμα in 1.8-9 that κατεγνωσμένος ἦν indicates either the current presence or the imminent threat of that ἀνάθεμα, especially since Paul explicitly states that Peter and the others who followed him were not walking in line with the truth of the gospel. The events which led to this verdict focus on Peter's withdrawal from table fellowship with believing gentiles⁴² when certain ones from James (τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου) appeared (2.12),⁴³ Peter's refusal to continue to eat with believing gentiles and the social pressure his action put on those gentiles to Judaize was an act of hypocrisy (2.13b: συναπήχθη αὐτῶν ὑποκρίσει) which meant that Peter was not walking correctly in relation to the truth of the gospel (2.14a: οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ

⁴¹idem: 49; and Dunn 1993a: 95-96, 98-102.

⁴²μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν. The imperfect tense of the verb indicates that this was Peter's customary behavior prior to the visit by "certain ones from James" (τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου). This conclusion is strengthened by the verb structure of the subordinate, temporal clauses in verse twelve: πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν... ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον. Cf. Jewett: 248.

⁴³On the significance of τοὺς ἐκ περιουτῆς, cf. Dunn 1991a: 295-312.

εὐαγγελίου).⁴⁴ Paul's choice of verb may be an allusion to an important strand from Deuteronomy which commanded Israel to walk faithfully with the Lord and not to go either to the right or the left after other gods.⁴⁵ This possibility is made more likely in light of the dominant influence of Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic tradition both in Galatians and elsewhere in his letters. Hence, the truth of the gospel here is closely connected with the inclusion of believing gentiles in table fellowship without any need for them to Judaize.⁴⁶ Paul's argument in Galatians is grounded on the conviction that in Christ the descendants of Abraham are inclusive of gentiles.⁴⁷

However, Paul's gospel had at its heart the promise to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants and thus the function of the law to separate Jew and gentile must be temporary and no longer relevant for those in Christ (Gal 3.23-25). The two instances in Galatians in which Paul defends the truth of the gospel both focus explicitly on the issues of the requirement of circumcision and the requirement for table fellowship between Jews and gentiles. Paul narrates these events because he believes that the issues which led to the events in Jerusalem and in Antioch are being played out

⁴⁴Jewett: 240 states that this conduct is "a violation of the gospel." See also *idem*: 250-252; Gordon 1987: 36; McKnight 1995: 100-101; Stuhlmacher: 153; and Hansen 1989: 100, who uses the term "violation" and the expression "guilty of transgressing" in connection with the truth of the gospel.

⁴⁵Cf. Deut 5.32; 17.20; and 28.14.

⁴⁶This verb means to live like a Jew. Cf. Barclay 1988: 36, 77; Dunn 1990: 149-150; and *idem* 1993a: 129-130. McKnight 1995: 106-107 argues that it means to convert fully to Judaism.

⁴⁷The importance of social factors, especially with respect to the grounds on which gentiles might be included in the people of God, has been increasingly recognized by recent scholars. Cf. Segal: 193; Dunn 1993a; Howard; Watson; Donaldson 1986; Jewett; McKnight 1995: 106; Boyarin: 107; and Barclay 1988: 56-60. It is also the conviction of the present study that the social definition of the people of God is at the center of thought in Paul's letter to the Galatians. For the importance of social factors within postbiblical Judaism, see Neusner 1990: 32-36; and Ackroyd: 235-237. Hong 1993: 145-148 attempts to hold together the traditional interpretation of Gal 3.10 with the insights from those who argue for the importance of the social function of the law. However, he convincingly argues for the importance of the latter and thereby undermines his own ability to maintain the former.

again among the Galatian churches.⁴⁸ The issues Paul faced when he wrote this letter center on the issue of the inclusion of the gentiles: must gentiles be circumcised to belong to the people of God and must faithful Jews who believe in Christ separate from gentiles at table fellowship? According to the gospel that Paul was commissioned to preach among the gentiles, the answer to both must unequivocally be no!⁴⁹ Any other answer results in enslavement (2.4), condemnation (2.11), and failure to walk correctly in line with the truth of the gospel (2.14).⁵⁰

IV. The Gospel Paul preached and the Promise to Abraham to Bless all the nations through his seed.

With both the significance of Paul's call to be an apostle and his firm defense of the truth of the gospel in view, we will examine Paul's citation of Genesis in Gal 3.8 within the context of Gal 3 and the letter as a whole.⁵¹ The extent to which the gospel and the promise to Abraham⁵² are tightly bound together in Paul's argument has thus far not been fully appreciated.⁵³ First, we will consider the important link in Gal 3.8 between the gospel and the promise to Abraham to bless all nations in his seed. Our

⁴⁸Cf. Tomson: 226; Dunn 1993b: 72-73; and Hong 1993: 105. Most scholars think that Paul lost the argument in Antioch and that this loss best explains his independent mission. See the list of scholars in Jewett: 249.

⁴⁹On the significance of the gospel in these two contexts, see Hughes: 217-219; and Hansen 1989: 100.

⁵⁰Hansen 1994: 206 concludes that "whoever perverts the gospel by word or action is under a curse (1.8-9), must be resisted (2.5) and rebuked (2.11-14)." Cf. also idem 1989: 97.

⁵¹On the thematic connections between the Abraham story in Gal 3 and both Paul's statement of rebuke in 1.6ff. and his autobiography in Gal 1-2, see Hansen 1989: 97-99. Fowl: 77-95 argues that Paul's argument in Gal 3-4 is allegorical throughout, not just in 4.21-31.

⁵²This study will not focus on promise in the abstract, but rather on the observation that Paul highlighted and stressed that blessing for the nations was a central feature of the promise to Abraham and the covenant made with him.

⁵³The interface in Gal 3.8 and 3.10 between blessing for the nations and the curse on ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου has also not been satisfactorily investigated. This will be explored in Chapter Seven.

study will indicate that a major strand of the promise to Abraham is an important part of Paul's argument in Galatians, a letter in which he is defending the truth of the gospel which he was commissioned to take to the gentiles.⁵⁴ Second, we will examine Paul's understanding of the link between promise and covenant in Gal 3.15-29. In Paul's argument, the Law functioned temporarily to restrict Israel until the promise was fulfilled, but was not intended to supersede that promise. Thus it is important for the present study to stress that Paul thought that the Law in its role as a παιδαγωγός had a temporary purpose in redemptive history, and that this temporary role was even a positive one.

A. The Gospel Paul Preached and Its Connection to the Promise to Abraham (Gal 3.8)

Scholars widely acknowledge that in Gal 3.6 Paul began his argument from scripture, and some argue that many of the passages Paul cited, together with the issues he raised, had been used by the troublemakers⁵⁵ in presenting the other gospel to the Galatians.⁵⁶ This may especially be the case with respect to Paul's citation of Gen 15.6; Deut 27.26; and Lev 18.5.⁵⁷ A citation from scripture which has thus far not been fully

⁵⁴For a summary of Jewish views on the eschatological redemption of gentiles, see Fredriksen: 544-548.

⁵⁵The present study will refer to the person or, more likely, the group of people who had come into the Galatian churches and who were compelling the Galatians to accept circumcision as the troublemakers, which reflects Paul's language in 1.7 (οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς) and 5.10 (ὁ ταρασσών ὑμᾶς). To be sure, any negative inference from this term is due to Paul's bias with respect to (from his perspective) the Galatian crisis, and it is most unlikely that the group in question would have understood themselves as troublemakers. We agree with the commonly held view that they were Jewish Christians. Cf. e.g. Longenecker: lxxviii-xcviii; and Dunn 1993a: 9-11.

⁵⁶E.g. Watson: 69-72; Burton 1920: 153, 160-162; Martyn: 301-302, 309; and Lührmann: 56.

⁵⁷Cf. Barrett: 6-7; Longenecker: 109-110; Hansen 1989: 113; Stanton: 106-107; and Smiles: 241-242. Hence, according to this view, Paul was compelled to interpret these texts in order to defend adequately the gospel, even though some of these texts may have better supported the arguments of the troublemakers. Some commentators have leveled the charge that Paul's handling of these texts illustrates the extent to which he would ignore

appreciated in Paul's argument is his use of Gen 12.3/18.18⁵⁸ in Gal 3.8, in which the connection between the gospel and the promise to Abraham is clear:

προϊδούσα δὲ ἡ γραφή ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη⁵⁹ ὁ θεός
προευηγγελίσσατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ
πάντα τὰ ἔθνη⁶⁰

the natural reading of the Jewish scriptures in order to build and support his own argument. With respect to Deut 27.26, Longenecker: 117 writes: "Undoubtedly the Judaizers had quoted this passage as being decisive." Cf. also Barclay 1988: 66-67. The implication is that Paul was forced to take up a scripture citation that was used against his gospel and was ill suited for the defense of his gospel. The present study will argue that a question mark must be placed after the latter statement.

⁵⁸For recent examinations of the exact citation from Genesis see Koch: 162-163; and Stanley 1992: 236-238. Martyn 1997: 301-302; idem 1985: 318-320; and idem 1991: 166-167 has most actively advocated the view that those whom he calls the "Teachers" first presented the Genesis text to the Galatians. This view is possible for two reasons. First, there is no suggestion in the text in relation to the use of Genesis in 3.8 that Paul is reminding the Galatians of previous teaching, unless the reference in 3.1 to Paul's initial proclamation of the gospel to the Galatians includes the promise in 3.8. Second, our study has demonstrated that the third strand of the promise to Abraham is commonly cited in the postbiblical literature, and this frequency of reference suggests that the troublemakers may have been the ones to introduce the motif of Abraham's blessing to the Galatians. Although Paul's use of Genesis in 3.8 thus may be reactive, Paul clearly thinks that the troublemakers have misunderstood the significance of this promise for gentiles because the Galatians' own experience as a response to the proclamation of Paul's gospel indicates that they shared Abraham's blessing apart from works of the law and that this misunderstanding is a very serious matter because it results in apostasy from God (1.6, 4.8-9). Paul refers to a promise *to Abraham*, which likely refers to Gen 12.3/18.18. The troublemakers may have referred to the statement of the promise in 26.4-5, with its conjoining the promise with obedience to the commandments. Thus the different forms of the promise in Genesis provide the occasion for a range of debate on the matter of blessing for gentiles. On this point, cf. Dunn 1993a: 164-165. And we should not underestimate the importance of Paul's commission to preach the gospel to gentiles for his interpretation of Genesis in 3.8. Moreover, Donaldson 1994: 166-193 argues that Paul was the one to introduce the motif of membership in Abraham's family to the Galatians. If this is so, then it becomes more likely that Paul first introduced Gen 12.3/18.18 to the Galatians as part of his proclamation of the Gospel to them.

⁵⁹For a helpful study of Paul's use of τὰ ἔθνη against the backdrop of the LXX and other Jewish writings of this period, see Scott 1995: 57-134. His argument based on a protracted exile (idem: 130-133) must be questioned, however. See the discussion in Chapter One.

⁶⁰Paul's citation is clearly from Gen 12.3, in spite of the fact that Paul has replaced πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς with πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Cf. Stanley 1992: 236-237. Paul asserts that the text he cites was spoken τῷ Ἀβραάμ, but Gen 26.4 and 28.14 are statements of the repetition of the promise to Isaac and Jacob, respectively. On the other hand, one ancient version also reads "all nations" in its own citation of Gen 12.3 (Jub 12.23).

The main verb of the sentence is προενηγγελίσαστο,⁶¹ and everything else in this sentence in some way elaborates its significance. It is modified by the adverbial participle προἰδούσα, which explains that Scripture, here personified, foresaw the day when God would justify gentiles by faith (ἐκ πίστεως⁶²) in Christ.⁶³ The prophetic role given to

⁶¹Although Hughes: 215ff. is correct that εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελίζειν are not found in 3.1-4.11, the use of προενηγγελίσεσθαι in 3.8 provides a firm connection with the preceding context where these terms are more common.

⁶²Paul thereby linked the promise of blessing for the nations with Abraham's faith in 3.6. Cf. Hansen 1989: 115. Hays 1989: 106f. argues that Paul here is arguing in ecclesial, rather than christological terms. The point is well taken in light of Paul's reference to Abraham's faith, which was in God's promise of numerous descendants. But in Galatians Paul has already defined faith as faith in Christ (2.16). Cf. also Scott 1995: 130.

⁶³In this thesis we understand the phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ to mean "faith in Christ", rather than "the faithfulness of Christ". Those scholars who take this phrase to mean "the faithfulness of Christ" (e.g. Hays 1983; Hooker; Longenecker: 87-88; Martyn 1991: 168-169; and idem 1997: 251, 270-277) argue that πίστις Χριστοῦ refers to Christ's response of obedience to God, especially as demonstrated in the cross. This is fundamentally a divine action, in contrast to ἔργα νόμου which is a human response to God. Moreover, this view argues that this translation accounts for the redundancies of 2.16 and 3.22 and for the statement in 3.23 that there was a time when "faith came" (πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἔλθειν τὴν πίστιν) and when "faith appeared" (...εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι). However, other scholars understand πίστις Χριστοῦ to mean faith in Christ (e.g. Betz: 117; Bruce 1982a: 138-139; Dunn 1991c: 730-744; and idem 1993a: 138-140). Several considerations indicate that this interpretation of πίστις Χριστοῦ as an objective genitive is to be preferred. First, although the term πίστις may refer to either "faith in" or "faithfulness", the former is the most natural way to take this term when the context does not provide a clear elaboration which indicates that the latter is intended (so Dunn 1993a: 138-139). Second, the issue in 2.15ff. is how one is justified before God. The alternatives posed by Paul are works of the law and faith (in Christ). That faith is a human response to God in Paul's argument beginning in 2.15 is clear in 3.6, where Paul clearly understands that Abraham is justified by his faith (Hooker argues that Christ is the one true seed of Abraham and that he shares Abraham's faith. However, although Paul states that Abraham believed [3.6] he nowhere states unambiguously that Christ believed. Cf. Dunn 1991c: 737-738). Third, in verbal constructions we have no evidence in Paul's writings that Christ is ever the subject of the verb πιστεύειν. And fourth Paul does clearly use Christ as the object of this verb in 2.16 (cf. also 3.6 where Abraham's faith is in God). This use of Christ as the object of the verb πιστεύειν indicates that subsequent similar phrases are intended to have a similar meaning. Given the crucial nature of the contrast between works of the law and faith in Galatians, the repetition in 2.16 and 3.22 is better understood as intending emphasis, not redundancy. Paul in these places stresses the importance of faith in Christ. And the reference to a faith which came and appeared in 3.23 is best understood as a reference to Christ (the object of faith) who came and appeared (so e.g. Gordon 1987: 37).

Scripture here is clearly implied by the use of προῖδειν.⁶⁴ Hence Paul's statement that God intended to justify gentiles by faith is vested with prophetic authority.

Implicit in this clause, based on the previous argument (2.15ff.), is the statement that the justification of gentiles would not be ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. God's intention was to justify all people, including gentiles, ἐκ πίστεως, not ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.⁶⁵ This point follows from 3.7, the point of which 3.8 is a further elaboration. In 3.7 Paul writes that the Galatians should know (γινώσκετε), based on the combination of their own experience (3.2-5) and scripture (3.6=Gen 15.6), that οἱ ἐκ πίστεως are sons of Abraham.⁶⁶ Even for Jewish believers, to be ἐξ ἔργων νόμου does not matter (Gal 5.6; 6.15) and does not justify (2.15-16). And gentiles who are οἱ ἐκ πίστεως have received the blessing of Abraham (3.14: εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) and are heirs according to the promise (3.29: εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι). Hence, full inclusion into the people of God for Paul is based on faith in Christ, not works of the law.⁶⁷

The verb προενηγγελίσαστο is a *hapax legomena*, and thus in order to understand its significance in this context we must pay careful attention to its function in this verse. It is striking that Paul asserts that the gospel was preached to Abraham. He does not say that the gospel was predicted in Scripture, but rather that the gospel itself was proclaimed

⁶⁴Hays 1989: 105, 108; Hansen 1989: 115; Barclay 1988: 88; and Amadi-Azuogu: 120.

⁶⁵Cf. Barclay 1988: 88; Matera: 123; and Cousar: 73-74. More broadly stated, Paul argued that Jews also were justified ἐκ πίστεως (2.16). The focus in 3.8, however, is on gentiles, and we retain this focus in order to follow the argument as carefully as possible.

⁶⁶Hong 1993: 131-132 argues that for Paul the promise of blessing for the nations is the means of fulfilling the promise, in the context of Gen 15.6, of numerous descendants in that many gentiles are included in the family of Abraham. Hong thereby subordinates the promise of blessing for the nations under the promise of many descendants.

⁶⁷Cf. Williams 1997: 87. Cf. also Stanton: 104, who rightly argues that the distinction between "getting in" and "staying in" proposed by Sanders may be misleading in the interpretation of Galatians because "'faith' is not to be confined to 'getting in': it is a continuous process—it is as necessary for 'staying in' as it is for 'getting in'."

to Abraham.⁶⁸ And the specific content of the gospel to which Paul points is the promise to bless all nations in his offspring.⁶⁹ Thus in Gal 3.8 Paul integrally and fundamentally links the gospel with this promise to Abraham⁷⁰ because this promise functions as the content of the gospel message preached to Abraham.⁷¹ And according to Paul this promise pointed to the day when God would justify gentiles based on faith. Hence the gospel that Paul had preached among them was foreseen in the scripture and was the fulfillment of God's intention from the start.⁷² Paul's gospel was not his invention, but had been prophetically foreshadowed in scripture.⁷³

Paul does not use the term ἐπαγγελία in Gal 3.8, but the citation of Gen 12.3/18.8 and its subsequent development in 3.14ff indicates that Paul thought of blessing for gentiles in terms of ἐπαγγελία.⁷⁴ And the parallelism in 3.14 between εὐλογία and ἐπαγγελία indicates that Paul thought that blessing and promise were closely related. An

⁶⁸ *Pace* Longenecker: 115. His statement here ("...the gospel as proclaimed apart from law.") may go too far in its implication that a wedge be driven between gospel and law in this text. Paul's point is not so much gospel in contrast to the law, but rather gospel preceding and thus subsuming the law. In Paul's argument in Gal 3, the gospel and the law both played complementary roles in redemptive history, with the promise to Abraham, which Paul identified as the gospel, playing the foundational role to which the law was related.

⁶⁹ Scott 1995: 129-130 argues that Paul has refracted Gen 12.3/18.18 through the lens of Ps 71.17 (LXX) in which the Abrahamic promise is linked with a messianic motif through which the nations are blessed. Cf. also Pyne: 211-222. Scott argues further that Paul has modified Gen 12.3 with the inclusion of τὰ ἔθνη from 18.18 in order to provide the link in the original context to the table of nations tradition, which forms the principal backdrop for Paul's use of τὰ ἔθνη in general. Stanley 1992: 237 thinks that because the language of Gen 12.3 and 18.18 is so close, an accidental conflation is a possibility.

⁷⁰ *Pace* Amadi-Azuogu: 122. Amadi-Azuogu has helpfully drawn attention to the divine authority upon which Paul's apostolic ministry of the gospel is based (see also note 74 below), but he fails to drive home the important point that Paul's gospel itself was preached beforehand to Abraham. Paul's gospel is not merely based on or consistent with Gen 12.3/18.18.

⁷¹ The ὅτι clause, which consists of the citation of Gen 12.3/18.18, functions to explicate the specific content of προεσηγγελίσατο. See further Dunn 1993a: 165-166.

⁷² Dunn 1994: 371-372; and *idem* 1993b: 82-83.

⁷³ Amadi-Azuogu: 121; Hansen 1989: 116; and Barclay 1988: 88.

⁷⁴ It is clear that Paul thought that the statement of blessing for the nations meant that gentiles would become descendants of Abraham and would be fully heirs of the promise to him. Cf. O'Brien: 11. Williams 1988: 709-720 argues that Paul's refers to the promise of the spirit in Gal 3.

important observation which is frequently overlooked, however, is the fact that the terms ἐπαγγελία and ἐπαγγέλλειν are relatively rare with reference to the promise to Abraham. Neither ἐπαγγελία nor ἐπαγγέλλειν occur in the LXX of the Genesis narrative.⁷⁵ Philo used ἐπαγγελία only once.⁷⁶ Josephus used the term once in connection with a list of various promises as recorded in Gen 22.⁷⁷ God's promise to Abraham is mentioned occasionally in the Pseudepigrapha for which we have manuscript witness in Greek.⁷⁸ Hence Paul has employed this word group which does not occur in connection with any statement of promise to Abraham in the LXX and is relatively rare elsewhere in conjunction with the Patriarchal promise in order to indicate the significance for his readers of the statement to Abraham that all nations would be blessed through his descendants. Thus it is likely that ἐπαγγελία is Paul's interpretive term in his letter to the Galatians. Whether or not the application of this term to the promise to Abraham was original with Paul may be impossible to determine. But we may conclude that if Paul is dependent on someone else for the use of this term, it is not the LXX. Furthermore, there is no evidence elsewhere in the NT to suggest that a pre-Pauline tradition existed which linked the gospel with the promise to Abraham.⁷⁹ And

⁷⁵In fact, these terms are very rare in the LXX. ἐπαγγελία occurs only in Ps 55 (56):8; Am 9.6; and Esth 4.7. ἐπαγγέλλειν occurs in Pr 13.12; and Esth 4.7. Cf. Cosgrove: 94-96.

⁷⁶Cf. Nomin. 201, with reference to the promise to Abraham of the birth of Isaac. Philo preferred the term ἐπάγγελμα, which together with ἐπαγγέλλειν, he used primarily of a human promise. Cf. Post. 139; Agri. 17, 64; Apol. viii, 7, 17; Spec. II, 99; Immut. 146; Plant. 81; Cong. 138, 148; and Vir. 54, 64.

⁷⁷Cf. Ant. I.236: καὶ τοιούτων ἀγαθῶν ἐπαγγελίας ἀκηκοότες. The verb form is used twice of human promises in Ant. I.208, and I.321 (2x).

⁷⁸Cf. T. Abr 3.6; 6.5; 8.5; and 20.11; T. Jos 20.1. Only the last reference may be confidently dated to the first century. ἐπαγγελία is also used of a human promise (Aris. 51, 124, and 322).

⁷⁹Since Galatians is one of the earliest documents in the NT, it is difficult to postulate Pauline dependence upon tradition at this point. Even if we allow for the possibility of pre-Pauline strands of oral tradition which were included in the gospels, on the one hand it would be difficult to prove that Paul knew a given tradition and on the other hand ἐπαγγελία and ἐπαγγέλλειν are rare in the gospels (only in Mk 14.11 and Lk 24.29). In Acts ἐπαγγελία and ἐπαγγέλλειν are used of God's promise to Abraham of the

in view of the important role that 'promise' (ἐπαγγελία) plays in the argument of 3.15-4.31,⁸⁰ it is likely that this text (i.e. 3.8) forms a significant part of the foundation upon which the whole argument rests.⁸¹ For Paul, in contrast with the broad stream of his Jewish contemporaries who thought of land and seed in connection with the promise to Abraham,⁸² this promise of God to Abraham focused on his seed and, especially, blessing for the nations through his seed.

Therefore, to require works of the law for gentile participation in the blessing of Abraham would result in a violation of the terms of the promise because "Paul takes 'all the nations' seriously - Gentiles as well as Jews, not Gentiles distinct from Jews."⁸³ In

land (7.5, 17), of the promised Spirit (1.4; 2.33, 39;), the promise of salvation through Jesus (13.23, 32), and of a human promise (23.21). Hebrews uses these terms with reference to God's promise to Abraham to bless him and increase his descendants (6.12-17; 11.9, 11, 13, 17), the promise to Abraham in general (7.6), in connection with the term covenant (8.6; 9.15), in connection with the promise of God in general (10.23, 36; 11.33; 12.26). It is at least a possibility that the author of Hebrews is dependant on Galatians at this point. On the influence of Galatians on Hebrews, cf. Witherington 1991: 146-152. II Peter uses them both with reference to God's promise (3.4) and a human promise (2.19). James uses them of the promise of the crown of life (1.12) and the promise of God's kingdom (2.5). I John refers to the promise of eternal life (2.25).

⁸⁰The term ἐπαγγελία is used in 3.14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 29; 4.23, 28. The verb form (ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι) is used in 3.19. The significance of the repetition of this term in Paul's argument is brought into focus when we recognize that the term does not appear in Paul's sources in Genesis.

⁸¹Cf. Dunn 1993: 163-164. He correctly notes that the conjunctive δὲ in 3.8 points to the conclusion that the two scripture citations (Gen 15.6 in 3.6 and Gen 12.3/18.18 in 3.8) function in a correlative manner, and it is the latter which is explicated in the following verses. So also Cousar: 73-74; and Howard: 55: "...the chapter as a whole is an elaboration on the implications of the promise in 3.8." Many have failed to note the significance of the close connection between the gospel and the promise, and their elaboration in the subsequent context. See, for example, Hong 1993: 75, who thinks that 3.15-22 is "a transitional excursus" and 4.21-31 is "a supplementary argument." These two sections contain most of Paul's references to promise in this letter, but Hong's argument consigns them to a transitional and supplementary role in Paul's argument.

⁸²Cf. Halpern-Amaru. She argues that although the promise of the land to the Jewish people is interpreted differently in the various strands of this literature, this promise remained a key feature of Jewish thought in this period. But in the four literary witnesses that she investigates, Halpern-Amaru concludes that the land recedes in importance and the promise of protection and prosperity for the descendants of Abraham becomes the most important aspect of the promise for these authors. The land remains important only as a means of promoting the protection and prosperity for the descendants of Abraham.

⁸³Dunn 1993a: 165.

fact, in light of the close connection between the gospel and the promise in this text to bless the nations ἐκ πίστεως, for anyone to attempt to require ἔργα νόμου of gentiles is to change God's promise to Abraham and thus to oppose his purpose in fulfilling his promise to Abraham. For from the start the promise to Abraham and the gospel upon which it is based had the blessing of the gentiles through Abraham's descendants in view:

The promise to Abraham's seed was incomplete without the Gentiles' sharing in the *same* blessing. Consequently, Paul did not see himself as doing anything which was contrary to the spirit and character of his ancestral faith. On the contrary, *his mission to the Gentiles was nothing other than the fulfillment of Israel's mission.*⁸⁴

Paul thus thought that his mission to the gentiles was faithful obedience to Israel's mission to extend the blessing of Abraham to all nations, as this had been promised to the patriarch himself. However, those who required ἔργα νόμου for complete membership in the people of God were, in effect, disloyal to this covenant and thus came under the curse of the covenant.

The significance of the juxtaposition of blessing in 3.8 and the curse in 3.10 cannot be overemphasized.⁸⁵ This same juxtaposition occurs in the promise itself (Gen 12.1-3).⁸⁶ For the promise to Abraham held out blessing for all who blessed Abraham and sanctioned a curse on those who cursed him. Thus Abraham himself was the means of blessing for all who blessed him and, consequently, he was the means of a mediated blessing for all nations. But also within the entire covenant structure of Israel's relationship with Yahweh in Deuteronomy these themes are constantly juxtaposed:

⁸⁴ibid. Emphasis is the author's. So also O'Brien: 11-12, 20; Hansen 1989: 104; and Hays 1989: 105.

⁸⁵The implications of the significance of the curse in 3.10 will be explored in Chapter Seven.

⁸⁶Cf. Hays 1989: 109-110; and Lührmann: 60.

Israel would be blessed for obedience⁸⁷ and cursed for disobedience. In Deuteronomy blessing and curse are closely related in the sense that blessing comes to those who are faithful to the Lord and the curse comes on those who have been unfaithful to him.⁸⁸

Furthermore, in Deuteronomy the promise to Abraham is frequently cited.⁸⁹ This promise is always the promise of land to Abraham's descendants, not blessing for the nations, however. Especially significant for the present study are Deut 27.3 and 30.20. In the former text entrance into the land promised to the fathers is conditioned on obedience to all the commandments.⁹⁰ And in the latter text life in the land promised to Abraham and his sons is the result of loyalty to the Lord and covenant faithfulness.⁹¹ Thus the link between the promise to Abraham and faithfulness to the covenant in Deuteronomy is firm both in Deut 27 and Deut 30, and Paul was clearly influenced by both texts. But if he linked the promise to Abraham to bless the nations with the curse of Deuteronomy based on the mention of one strand of the promise to Abraham, then we may conclude that according to Paul the mention of one strand implied the inclusion of the whole promise to Abraham. Such an interpretive move would almost certainly have been viewed by other Jews as speculative at best, but to Paul, who was convinced

⁸⁷In Genesis and Deuteronomy the motif of blessing occupies a central position. Cf. Westermann 1978: 29.

⁸⁸As we argued above in Chapter Three, the core of Israel's covenant relationship is faithfulness to Yahweh and exclusive devotion to him. Blessing and curse are both fundamentally and inextricably bound to this central demand of the covenant. We will argue in Chapter Seven that in Galatians, Paul argues that everyone in Christ demonstrates loyalty to the Lord through loyalty to the gospel of Jesus Christ, which Paul preached to the Galatians. The gospel has brought blessing to the nations through faith in Jesus Christ, not works of the law, and any deviation from the gospel results in the curse.

⁸⁹Deut 1.8, 11, 21, 35; 6.10, 18, 7-8, 12-13; 8.1; 9.5-6; 10.11; 11.9, 21; 19.8; 26.3, 15; 27.3; and 30.20. On the frequent reference to the promises in Deuteronomy, see Westermann 1980: 119-120.

⁹⁰The promise in 27.3 is prefaced with the statement of the requirement of obedience to all the commandments (cf. 27.1).

⁹¹For the theme of covenant loyalty and obedience to all the commandments, see pp. 50-61 above. On the significance of blessing as life in the land, see Westermann 1978: 45-49.

that he had been commissioned to preach the gospel to the gentiles and that this commission was intended to fulfill the promise which had been made to Abraham, this connection may have been obvious.

B. The Role of a Prior Covenant in God's Plan (Gal 3.15-29)

Paul's argument in Gal 3.15-29 picks up the key term ἐπαγγελία, which is implicit in the citation of the statement of blessing for gentiles in 3.8 and which plays a central role in the conclusion Paul draws in 3.14. He explicates its significance for the people of God in general, but also for the Galatian communities in particular. In Gal 3.15-18 Paul links closely the terms ἐπαγγελία and διαθήκη.⁹² The promise to Abraham that all nations would be blessed through his descendants functions as a covenant purpose of his people.⁹³ In this text τῷ δὲ Ἀβρααμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι⁹⁴ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι⁹⁵ σου (3.16) is understood within the framework of ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται (3.15). Thus the promises to Abraham function for Paul as a previously ratified covenant (3.17: διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) which after it has been ratified cannot be set aside or amended (3.15: ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται).

This covenant, which was previously ratified and cannot be set aside or amended, is the promise to Abraham and his seed. Paul, of course, interprets the collective τῷ

⁹²So Hansen 1989: 128.

⁹³ibid; and McKnight 1995: 166.

⁹⁴Paul's use of the plural here is unusual; he usually preferred the singular in Galatians. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that Paul is here developing the significance of the promise to bless the nations with respect to the Law's role in redemptive history. Paul may have used the plural here in anticipation of the introduction of a second element of the promise to Abraham (καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου). Cf. Dunn 1993a: 183.

⁹⁵The language Paul employs here is most often used in connection with the promise of land in Genesis.

σπέρματι as a singular,⁹⁶ which refers to Christ (3.16). The phrase καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου occurs eight times in Genesis⁹⁷ and is almost always in connection with the promise of the land.⁹⁸ However, in 28.4 the reference is to the blessing of Abraham (LXX: τὴν εὐλογίαν Ἀβραάμ),⁹⁹ and given the use of this phrase in Gal 3.14 (ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ), perhaps Gen 28.4 is the text from which Paul cites this phrase.¹⁰⁰ This possibility is made more likely when we read in 28.3 (LXX) that part of Isaac's blessing of Jacob include the clause καὶ ἔσῃ εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν, which would obviously have been attractive for Paul in light of his argument for the inclusion of the gentiles in the people of God. What is certain is that Paul has linked the promise to Abraham and his seed with the term διαθήκη, which for any Jewish reader would invoke the whole of Israel's covenant relationship with the Lord, especially as it is recorded in Deuteronomy. At the same time, however, the Law,¹⁰¹ which for Second Temple Judaism defined the essence of covenant faithfulness,¹⁰² was introduced 430 years later and did not invalidate

⁹⁶Alexander: 20-21 has argued that in Gen 22.18 it is a possibility that the reference to seed through whom all nations would be blessed is to a single person, Isaac.

⁹⁷The only other occurrence of this phrase is in Num 18.19, which refers to the portion allotted to the priest and his sons and daughters.

⁹⁸Cf. Gen 13.15; 17.8; 24.7; 26.3; 28.13; 35.12; and 48.4. Cf. Hong 1994: 172-173; and Williams 1988: 716-717.

⁹⁹The reference may still be to the land, however, since this phrase is followed by κληρονομήσαι τὴν γῆν τῆς παροικησεώς σου, ἣν ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ.

¹⁰⁰However, see Witherington 1994: 46: "...in Gal. 3:15-16 it appears certain that Gen. 17:6-7 lies in the background." But in Gen 17.7 the genitive form appears two times, (τοῦ σπέρματος σου...καὶ τοῦ σπέρματος σου), and only in 17.8 is the dative form (καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου) is used in connection with the promise of land. Thus the form Paul cited is paralleled in 17.8 with reference to the promised land. It may be argued that the threefold repetition of the phrase has drawn Paul's attention, but this does not appear to be Witherington's argument.

¹⁰¹When Paul uses νόμος in Galatians, he refers to the covenant obligation of God's people which was laid down for them at Sinai. Hence νόμος refers to the obligation to walk within the terms of the covenant. So e.g. Hong 1993: 125-148; and Westerholm 1986: 327-336. *Face* McLean: 113-119.

¹⁰²It is important to remember, however, that Paul does not explicitly refer to the Law as a covenant here, even though he may be working with the idea of two covenants on an implicit level. In another text Paul makes the idea of two covenants explicit (Gal 4.24). However, Paul's key term in Gal 3 is clearly ἐπαγγελία, not διαθήκη.

the terms of the covenant, namely that the nations would be blessed through Abraham's descendants.¹⁰³ Paul's argument here is based on the priority of the promise over against the law in God's covenant purpose for Abraham's descendants,¹⁰⁴ and based on Paul's citation of the promise to Abraham to bless the gentiles, this promise has significance for all people.

Paul's argument in Gal 3.19-29 is motivated by the concern to address the question: τί οὖν ὁ νόμος;. Paul gives two principal answers to this question. First, the law was given to confine all people under sin in order that the promise might be given to those who believe in Christ (3.22). According to Paul, everything (τὰ πάντα) is confined under sin. The clause ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν suggests that Paul's point here is that all people, including Israel under the law, are under sin and that the law is powerless to release one from this confinement. This point follows from the statement in 3.21 that the law is powerless to give life (εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι). Paul's argument here which relates to the universal sinfulness of humanity has, of course, parallels in Romans.¹⁰⁵ However, συγκλείειν here ultimately functions toward a positive goal in redemptive history (ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν).¹⁰⁶ Scripture does confine all under sin in order that the promise may be given. This positive purpose suggests that Paul does not have confinement under an evil cosmic power in mind.¹⁰⁷ And Paul's strong

¹⁰³von der Osten-Sacken: 9.

¹⁰⁴Cf. Hays 1989: 109; and Dunn 1993b: 87-88.

¹⁰⁵Cf. Dunn 1993a: 194-195. In contrast to Romans, however, Paul's argument in Galatians is focused more on the temporary role of the Law in redemptive history, and thus it would be a mistake to overemphasize what is clearly not the central thrust of the argument in Galatians. *Face* Longenecker: 144.

¹⁰⁶And also in Rom 11.32 (ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ)

¹⁰⁷The law, in spite of its restrictive nature both in 3.22 and in 3.23ff., is not an evil power in Paul's argument. Cf. esp. Belleville. Paul states clearly in 3.21 that the law is not opposed to the promises of God (ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν [τοῦ θεοῦ]; μὴ γένοιτο). On this point and the connection of this statement with the question of 3.19, cf. Dunn 1993a: 192; and Longenecker: 143. Paul may also call into question Israel's view of

denial in 3.21 (μὴ γένοιτο) of the possibility that the law is against the promises of God suggests that Paul does not view the law as a power opposed to God.¹⁰⁸

Second, Paul's answer to the question of 3.19 is that the law was given in order to provide protective custody for Israel until the promised seed came (3.23-25).¹⁰⁹ This answer to the above question has special significance for the present study because it highlights the temporary nature of the Law's purpose in redemptive history.¹¹⁰ Paul's use of temporal language dominates his argument in 3.23-25. In 3.23 πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν and εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι both point to the importance of the coming of Christ for Paul's argument concerning the role of the law in redemptive history. This important aspect of Paul's argument is evident in 3.24 (εἰς Χριστόν¹¹¹) and in 3.25 (ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως¹¹²). The importance of the coming of Christ is indicated in the context as early as 3.19 (ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπὶγγελται). Hence the temporary role that the law played in God's plan is stressed in 3.23-25, and it forms an important part of Paul's answer to his question in 3.19.

Paul's use of the image of a παιδαγωγός in 3.24-25 connotes this temporary role for the law. In the ancient world, the social function of the παιδαγωγός was as the guardian of the minor child until he reached maturity.¹¹³ This social function meant

herself as privileged above all other nations. This privileged position may be questioned because the scripture confines all under sin. So Dunn 1993a: 194-195.

¹⁰⁸As is argued by Martyn 1997: 370-373. However, see Belleville: 56: "It might be tempting to see in Paul's use of ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν the concept of sin as a power that needs defeating. Ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, however, need not denote a negative state...and it is Scripture that is the prevailing power in this passage, not sin."

¹⁰⁹Dunn 1993b: 88-92.

¹¹⁰Braswell: 80-86.

¹¹¹This phrase is best taken in a temporal sense, given the use of a similar phrase in 3.23. The faith about to be revealed in 3.23 refers to the revelation of Christ, either as the object of faith or as the one who was faithful. Cf. e.g. Longenecker: 145-146; Dunn 1993a: 197-198; and Martyn 1997: 362.

¹¹²This clause is almost certainly best taken in a temporal sense, as the parallel clause in 3.23 indicates.

¹¹³On this role for a παιδαγωγός, see Young 1987; Belleville: 59-63; Gordon 1989; Lull; Boyarin: 149; Hansen 1988: 71-76; McKnight 1995: 183; Longenecker 1990: 146-148;

that the παιδαγωγός would guard and protect the child under his care, which would also include instruction and discipline when necessary. The primary role for the παιδαγωγός was supervisory, a role which was well known to end once the child reached maturity.¹¹⁴ This supervision of the child until maturity most often meant that the παιδαγωγός "...restricted a child's freedom, limited his activities, controlled his life, kept his from free association."¹¹⁵ This temporary role as that which rightly restricted the freedom of a minor child for a period of time is the point of contact between Paul's understanding of the role of the law in redemptive history and his analogy of a παιδαγωγός. It is in this sense, therefore, that Paul's statement that ὑπὸ νόμου ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι is probably best understood.¹¹⁶ For the Law, in Paul's argument in Gal 3.23-25, held those minor children under its authority in a restricted custody for a temporary period, but now this role for the law is not longer necessary for those in Christ.

Furthermore, Paul's continued argument in 4.1-7 indicates that the temporary role of the supervisory function of the law of the law is still in view. First, those ὑπὸ νόμον and ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are clearly the children (4.1: νήπιός; and 4.3: νήπιοι). The fact that the explicit subject of this section is νήπιός suggests that Paul does not have enslavement to cosmic powers in mind here. Second, this suggestion is strengthened when we recognize that these children are explicitly the children of the father (τοῦ πατρός). Third, Paul does compare the state of the child to a slave. But he does so to highlight that although the child is the heir (4.1: ὁ κληρονόμος) and is master

and Dunn 1993a: 198-200. *Face* Hong 1993: 156-158; and Martyn 1997: 362-363, who argue for a negative reference for ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν.

¹¹⁴Cf. esp. Young 1987: 168-169.

¹¹⁵idem: 170-171.

¹¹⁶Belleville: 60: "The Law holds us in an authorized custody. It hems in our freedom and supervises every aspect of our lives." Belleville concludes that Paul's concern is on the necessity of the law for the minor child, not on the positive or negative nature of the law's function. One may conclude, however, that if Paul indeed has used this analogy for the law in this manner, a negative function for the law here is probably very unlikely. Cf. also Lull: 486-489; Belleville: 56-60; and Gordon 1989: 153-154.

of the entire estate (4.1: κύριος πάντων ὧν), he is for a time in no better position than a slave (4.1: οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου).¹¹⁷ This is not to say, however, that the child who will inherit the entire estate is a slave. Fourth, it for this reason that the child is placed under the authority of guardians (4.2: ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶν οἰκόνουσας). It is most likely in Paul's analogy that the father in 4.2 has placed the child under the care of the guardians. And fifth, this position of the child under guardians is temporary (4.1: ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον; and 4.2: ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς). And it is this temporary status for the child which forms the point of contact for Paul in 4.3-5 between his analogy and its application in his argument. For there was a time when the children (4.3: ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι) were ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.¹¹⁸ At this time the children were enslaved (ἦμεθα δεδουλωμένοι)¹¹⁹, but almost certainly in the sense already established in 4.1-2 of the child who was under the control of others, and hence like a slave, until the time set by the father. And when the fulness of time came (4.4: ὅτεν δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου), those under the law (4.5: ὑπὸ νόμον) were redeemed and made sons (4.6: οἰοί; and 4.7[2x]: υἱός) and inheritors (4.7: κληρονόμος). The pattern of thought in 4.1-7, therefore, is similar to that in 3.23-25 where the temporary role of the law as a παιδαγωγός is stressed in Paul's argument.

Therefore, Paul's use of the image of a παιδαγωγός connotes the temporary, and even perhaps the positive, role the law played in Israel's history. It is temporary, according to Paul, because a παιδαγωγός is needed only for the time that a master's son is

¹¹⁷Cf. Belleville: 60-63.

¹¹⁸The meaning of the phrase is debated. Belleville: 64-69 surveys the options and concludes that this phrase refers to the basic rules that closely regulated the pre-Christian life of the Jewish people. This interpretation probably is best in this context. Longenecker: 166 is correct to note that the use of this phrase in 4.3 is to be distinguished from its use in 4.9.

¹¹⁹When Paul draws the point of his analogy in 4.3, we must be careful not to understand ἦμεθα δεδουλωμένοι as enslavement to cosmic powers. Paul's choice of term here is almost certainly due to his analogy in 4.1 where the child of the father is in no better position than a slave until he reaches the age of maturity. This is not to say that the child is a slave, however.

a child. Once the son reaches maturity, the services of a παιδαγωγός are no longer needed (Gal 4.1-2). Moreover, the παιδαγωγός provides protective custody for the son, he guards the son from dangerous people and influences.¹²⁰ Thus a παιδαγωγός is essentially an image for the temporary role of the law in redemptive history, which, in Paul's argument, restricted and guarded Israel until Christ came (3.23-24). But the important point to be made is that this role for the law has come to an end in Christ (3.25: οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἔσμεν), and to attempt to place adult heirs in Christ under its protective custody is to treat them as though they are children, and no better than slaves (4.1-7). In Christ both Jews and gentiles are sons of God, are one in Christ, and are heirs according to the promise (3.26-29).

V. Conclusion

In his letter to the Galatians Paul argues vigorously that the gospel he is commissioned to preach means that those who believe in Jesus Christ are sons of Abraham and thus are heirs of the promise to him. Paul argues that the promise of God to bless the nations through Abraham's σπέρμα is important for both Paul's gospel and the Lord's covenant purpose for Abraham's descendants. Paul's gospel states that both Jews and gentiles are Abraham's descendants based on faith, not works of the law. Specifically, this means that believing gentiles need not be circumcised. Paul's defense of the truth of the Gospel indicates that the other gospel preached to the Galatians is centered on circumcision and issues related to table fellowship between Jews and gentiles.¹²¹ Those who introduced this other gospel to the Galatians thus focus on the

¹²⁰Cf. e.g. Williams 1997: 102-103. See the often cited reference to this function of the law in Aris. 142.

¹²¹This separation, as was the case in Antioch, meant the separation of Jew from gentile. For a similar use of separation prior to Galatians, see 4QMMT 92-93, which is the community's self-designation as those who have "segregated ourselves from the rest of

central identifying marks of the nation of Israel as the means to participate in Abraham's blessing. For Paul, the gospel of Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of the promise to bless the nations through Abraham's seed and is now the focal point for covenant loyalty in the people of God.

Paul's gospel has resulted in the Galatians' participation in the blessing of Abraham apart from works of the law. For Paul this is God's covenant purpose in fulfillment of his promise to Abraham. Faithfulness to the covenant, according to Paul, demands loyalty to this strand of the promise to Abraham.¹²² Paul's citation of Gen 12.3/18.18 functions to highlight the whole of the patriarchal narrative and the prominence of the third strand within it. And this third strand is crucially important for a proper understanding of God's covenant purpose for Abraham's descendants. The promise of God to Abraham functions as the foundation of God's covenant relationship with Abraham's descendants to which the law is related in a subsidiary manner. According to Paul, then, for anyone to require that gentiles, who have come to know God through faith in Jesus Christ, observe works of the law is to be disloyal to the Lord's covenant intention,¹²³ to attempt to frustrate his plan to redeem all of humanity, and we will argue below, to fall short of doing all that the law requires and thereby to come under the covenant curse.

the peop[le and (that) we avoid] mingling in these affairs and associating with them in these things." Cf. Dunn 1997a: 147-148; and Abegg: 54.

¹²²On the importance in Galatians of loyalty to the gospel, see Hansen 1994: 206-207. Wright 1994: 229-236 also recognizes the importance of the category of loyalty to the gospel, but his argument focuses more on the confrontation between the gospel and pagan deities in the Greco-Roman world and the continued exile of Israel from which Christians have been redeemed.

¹²³See Dunn 1991a: 311, who writes with respect to Paul's point of difference with οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς: "...his indictment rather indicates that Jewish restriction of the covenant in narrowly national and ethnic terms is to be designated *un*faithfulness (rather than as covenant loyalty)." Cf. also Garlington 1997: 90.

Chapter Seven

The Curse of the Law and the Deuteronomistic Framework of Paul's Polemic: Paul's Use of Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10

A. Introduction

Our examination of Deuteronomy in Chapter Three has argued that the various terms for curse in Deuteronomy were often used in the context of failure to do all that the law required and that this failure very often meant to abandon the Lord and to turn to other gods. Loyalty to the Lord was the central obligation of the covenant, and those who were disloyal to it were therefore under its curse.¹ This covenant perspective is present in the Deuteronomistic history and in Israel's writing prophets. Moreover, in Chapter Five we have pointed to the significance of this covenant perspective in the various literary strands of Second Temple Judaism. Our conclusion was that the connection between failing to keep the whole law, disloyalty to the Lord through devotion to other gods, and the covenant curse is a persistent theme both in the Jewish scripture and in the extant literature of Second Temple Judaism.

The task at hand is to examine Paul's letter to the Galatians in order to determine how his understanding of the significance of Deut 27.26, especially as it was refracted through the lens of Gen 12.3/18.18, is compared and contrasted with this common theme in the scripture that he read and elsewhere in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period.² This task will involve a careful reading of this letter which, we hope to demonstrate, will cast new light on a significant number of texts in Paul's letter to the Galatians which indicate that Paul also operated within this covenant perspective and

¹Noth 1966: 128 has noted the importance of covenant loyalty in Deuteronomy, but he appears to understand this within the context of the traditional interpretation.

²Thielman 1994: 49 states that this "theme functions as a leitmotif of the entire Bible." His application of this leitmotif to the argument of Galatians is significantly different from that of this thesis.

that his use of Gen 12.3; 18.18/Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.8/3.10 must be viewed from a vantage point not yet reached by scholars attempting to trace Paul's argument in Gal 3.6-14.³ This examination will argue that those under the curse of the law according to Paul in his letter to the Galatians are both Jewish Christians who compelled gentile believers to accept circumcision and other elements of the law which defined Israel's national existence and also gentile believers who accepted circumcision and these other elements of the law. The ground for Paul's assertion that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under a curse is not that they have failed to keep the law perfectly,⁴ or that they have attempted to do so in a legalistic manner,⁵ but rather that they have been disloyal to God's covenant purpose to bless the nations through Abraham's seed,⁶ which is an important aspect and obligation of the covenant for those who are "in Christ."

³The importance of a fresh effort to understand Gal 3.10 within the context of the letter as a whole has been stressed recently. Cf. e.g. Eckstein: 1: "...die Quellen selbst immer wieder neu in den Blick genommen und in ihrem Kontext interpretiert werden." The latter point is especially important for our study of Galatians, and its importance has been increasingly recognized by scholars. Cf. also Donaldson 1986: 94; Stanley 1990: 486-492; Thielman 1994: 121-123; and Bonneau: 60-62.

⁴One of the central aims of the present study is to challenge the prevalent interpretation of Gal 3.10 which is based on the premise that Paul implied both the Law's demand of perfect obedience and human's inability to keep the law perfectly as the implied context for the curse of the law in Gal 3.10. Cf. Longenecker: 118; Burton 1920: 164-165; Bruce 1982a: 159; Hübner: 36-42; George: 230-231; Schreiner 1984: 151-160; Mussner: 223-224; Thielman 1994: 124-125; Matera: 123; Fung: 141-143; Hong 1993: 81-82, 135; Hansen 1989: 119-120; and Dahl: 170. For a very helpful survey and critique of this position see Cranford: 242-258. Cf. also Howard: 53, who highlights the importance of the motif of the inclusion of the gentiles. On this important motif in Galatians, see Donaldson 1986:94. However, Donaldson (*idem*: 104-105) still advocates the traditional view that the law cannot be fulfilled and all Jews therefore are under the curse. In Donaldson's view, Israel's plight is representative of the universal human plight. Several scholars argue that Paul thought that the troublemakers taught a selective observance of the law and that this inevitably led to disobedience. Cf. e.g. McLean: 121-122. Unless one holds to the traditional view, this position logically should lead to the exhortation to keep the whole law, not to abandon the law.

⁵Cf. e.g. Burton 1920: 163-164; and Schlier: 131-133.

⁶In reference to the apparent conflict between Paul's statement in 3.10a and the scripture he cited in 3.10b to support his assertion, see Segal: 119: "The lack of exegesis of the full and plain meaning to the passage sounds like a non sequitur. We are likely missing something that Paul took for granted." Cf. also Dunn 1990: 215: "Such respect (for the integrity of the text and Paul's intellectual calibre and theological competence) includes a constant bearing in mind of the possibility or indeed likelihood that the situations confronting Paul were more complex than we can now be aware of, or include

B. Gal 3.10: Those who are under the curse because they are disloyal to God's covenant purpose for his people.

It is our task now to indicate how Paul's letter to the Galatians may have been influenced by the Deuteronomistic pattern traced in Part One and Part Two. We will attempt to demonstrate that Paul was largely in agreement with the Jewish scripture and many strands of postbiblical Judaism in his assertion that those who are disloyal to the covenant, and thus are apostates, are under the curse;⁷ however, the manner in which one is disloyal to the covenant is significantly different for Paul. For in Paul's letter to the Galatians, a important aspect and obligation of the covenant with Abraham is blessing for the nations, rather than works of the law⁸ which, according to Paul, were the

important aspects which are now invisible to us." The present study argues that this missing element is the Deuteronomistic framework common to Second Temple Judaism within which Paul's argument and citation of scripture functioned. Moreover, Paul brought together this common framework with his contention that the promise to Abraham to bless the nations through his seed was a key aspect of the covenant made with Abraham which then determined covenant loyalty for those who have received this blessing in Christ. This thesis differs from the traditional interpretation which supplies an unexpressed middle statement in that it merely provides the context within which to understand Paul's explicit statements. Once the phrase οοοι εξ εργων νομου is understood as designating those who fail to do God's covenant purpose and thus are apostates from the covenant, the scripture Paul cited clearly supports such an assertion.

⁷On the importance of faithfulness to God as demonstrated through loyalty to the covenant in the postbiblical period see Garlington 1991; and now Freed. Although Freed does helpfully stress the importance of faithfulness toward God for understanding Paul within the context of the various strands of Judaism, he overemphasizes the significance of the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for understanding Paul's thought concerning justification by faith in Galatians. In this Freed follows in the wake of Hays 1983. Against this interpretation, see Hong 1993: 128-129.

⁸Although it is still a matter of debate within New Testament scholarship, within the context of Galatians, 'works of the law' almost certainly refer particularly to circumcision and other aspects of the law which distinguished Jew from gentile. Cf. Tyson: 423-431; Gordon 1987: 36-39; Dunn 1990: 183-214, 215-241; idem 1992: 99-117; idem 1993a: 135-137; Wright 1992a: 139, 240, and 242; idem 1992b: 238; Bonneau: 65-69; Segal: 123-125; and Cranford: 252. *Face* Schreiner 1991: 217-244, who argues for the traditional view. The interpretation of 'works of the law' as a subjective genitive, argued by Gaston: 100-106, has won little support. Most commentators agree that the troublemakers focused on circumcision as a central issue in Galatia and that they probably pointed to the example of Abraham and the commandment in Gen 17 that his descendants be circumcised. Cf. Barclay 1988: 53-56.

focal point of covenant loyalty for Second Temple Judaism. More importantly within the context of this letter, works of the law were the focal point of covenant loyalty for the troublemakers who had come into the Galatian churches and had preached another gospel to them.

1. Paul's assertion that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν.

Paul's argument in Gal 3.10a turns from a discussion of Abraham and the blessing of gentiles through Abraham's descendants to a statement that certain people are under a curse:

ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν

The connection between 3.10 and the preceding context is of considerable importance. Paul linked this section to the former by means of γάρ, which often functions to indicate that the following statement is the ground of a prior statement.⁹ It is difficult to sustain this typical function here, however. This connective particle may also function to indicate that what follows explains or carries forward the preceding argument.¹⁰ Given the close connection between blessing and curse both in Genesis and Deuteronomy, Paul's assertion in Gal 3.10a is probably best understood within the context of the close relationship between blessing and curse both in the promise to Abraham (Gen 12.1-3) and in Deuteronomy. Paul's juxtaposition of these two terms here then probably is due to the symbiotic relationship between blessing and curse, and the foundational role that covenant loyalty played in Judaism in the determination of whether or not one was blessed or cursed. For Paul the gospel which had been proclaimed to Abraham that all

⁹In 3.10b γάρ functions in this manner.

¹⁰So Longenecker: 116; Scott 1993a: 187; Dunn 1993a: 170; and idem 1993b: 84.

nations would be blessed in his descendants functions in such a way as to be the primary indicator which determined covenant loyalty (cf. Gal 1.6-9).

The recent attempt to place Paul within the Deuteronomistic tradition has sought to soften the polemical edge here, with its stress on the universal recognition among first century Jews that Israel as a whole continued in a state of exile.¹¹ This thesis is doubtful for several reasons. First, there is evidence from this period which points to the conclusion that apostates were under the curse because they had abandoned the covenant, not because of a continuation of the curse of the exile.¹² Second, several strands of evidence from this period indicate that various authors thought that the Jewish nation was blessed, not cursed. Ben Sira describes the restored temple worship in glowing terms¹³ and describes the blessing from the Lord pronounced on those who worshipped at the restored temple¹⁴ and also pronounces a blessing on those who

¹¹Wright 1992a; idem 1994; Scott 1993a; idem 1993b; Thielman 1989; and idem 1994.

¹²Several texts of the postbiblical period suggest that the curse of the covenant might have a contemporary application in the midst of the 'in-house' disputes which marked this turbulent period of Jewish history. A text such as T.Mos 9.2, for example, indicates that subsequent manifestations of the curse of the covenant could be compared to, but not directly linked with, the exile of Judah, as the expression "a second punishment" indicates. In the Qumran literature, texts such as 1QS 2.4-18 and CD 1.5-8, 13-2.1 apply the covenant curse to Jews of that day who were viewed as unfaithful to the covenant. See Knibb 1987: 25: "Thus it is likely that the present passage, which refers primarily to the past, was also given a contemporary reference." In polemical texts whose focus is on the definition who a faithful Jew was, therefore, the curse of the law could be pronounced on other Jews who were not viewed as living faithfully within the confines of the Law, and this curse could be considered as a replication of the curse of the exile. These 'accursed Jews' were not in this state due to a continuation of the exile, but rather due to their own covenant unfaithfulness. This is the thesis of Chapter Five.

¹³49.12-50.24: In 49.12 the restored temple (*ναὸν ἁγίον*) is described as possessing eternal glory (*δόξαν αἰῶνος*), and in 50.13 the restored worship is compared positively with the glorious worship of the sons of Aaron! In connection with this, see Skehan: 540-555. See also Nickelsburg 1983: 58: "Noteworthy throughout the passage are Ben Sira's awe of and deep emotional attachment to the person and office of this high priest (i.e. Simon II) and the service of worship over which he presides." This text hardly testifies to a widespread idea that the nation and its institutions were still under the curse of the exile.

¹⁴50. 21: ἐπιδέξασθαι τὴν εὐλογίαν παρὰ ὑψίστου.

followed the instruction which he himself had written (50. 28);¹⁵ Third, in reference to the people of Israel when they were delivered from Egypt, the Wisdom of Solomon refers to them as αὕτη λαὸν ὄσιον καὶ σπέρμα ἄμειπτον (10.15).¹⁶ And fourth, it is significant that two of the most important and prolific witnesses in the first century (i.e. Philo and Josephus¹⁷) provide no evidence of this perspective. The significance of this observation is strengthened when we recognize that Philo devotes extensive attention to the interpretation of Deuteronomy and that Josephus also provides a lengthy treatment of Deuteronomy and continues with an extended commentary on Israel's history.

In spite of several recent efforts to interpret this verse in a non-polemical way,¹⁸ the polemical nature of Paul's argument, both in Gal 3.10 and elsewhere in the letter, must be stressed, not eliminated.¹⁹ The polemical nature of Paul's argument, both in the letter as a whole and in Gal 3.10 in particular, has been a typical feature of most attempts to understand Paul's argument.²⁰ Moreover, Paul's opponents (as they are variously identified), it is argued, would have rejected this statement and would have

¹⁵50.28: μακάριος ὃς ἐν τούτοις ἀναστραφήσεται. The author of Pseudo-Philo expands the original promise to Abraham to include the promise that "(I) will bless his seed" (7.4), which is probably an expansion intended for the author's own generation; and Josephus at least once refers to the Israelites as "the blessed army" (Ant. 4.115).

¹⁶Cf. also P.Man 1, where Israel is referred to as "righteous offspring" (τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν τοῦ δικαίου) of the patriarchs. This is especially significant in the context of a prayer of confession for the sin of idolatry. Jubilees consistently refers to Israel as a "holy seed." Cf. Jub. 2.19-20; 16.25.b-26; 22.9-10, 23-24; 25.3. Thus it is clear that more research into the perspectives of the various authors from this period which may indicate that they thought of Israel and by extension their Jewish audience as a people who are blessed, not cursed, is necessary before such sweeping claims are made.

¹⁷Thielman 1994: 51-64 argues that this theme is common in Josephus, but his examples do not demonstrate a continuation of the curse of the exile. Instead, they point to the application of this theme to covenant violators.

¹⁸Cf. Thielman 1989; idem 1994; Wright 1992a; Scott 1993a; and idem 1993b. Although they approach Gal 3.10 from a different perspective than these scholars Stanley 1990, and Braswell also argue for a non-polemical interpretation.

¹⁹This contrasts sharply with the recent suggestions outlined above which have attempted to soften the polemical edge of Paul's assertion in Gal 3.10 with the claim that Paul was drawing on common ground in first century Judaism at this point in his argument.

²⁰Cf. e.g. Dunn 1993b: 1; Hughes: 219-220; and Patte: 31.

good Biblical grounds to respond to Paul's assertion. The entire letter to the Galatians is sharply polemical, both with respect to the possible acceptance of the works of the law by the Galatians and especially with respect to the troublemakers who have come into the Galatian churches. The present study will approach Gal 3.10 as a polemical statement and will indeed attempt to demonstrate its sharpness and clarify its function within the letter.²¹

The present study thus also argues for a Deuteronomistic background for this difficult text,²² but it takes a significantly different line of interpretation from the view that Paul based his argument on a widespread understanding in first century Judaism that Israel as a whole continued in the curse of the exile. For in spite of its bold claims, the evidence for such a view in first century Judaism is both sparse and unclear. The evidence instead points more in the direction of the renewed application of the covenant curse within the sectarian controversies which marked this period of Jewish history and within which Paul's apostolic ministry to the gentiles must be understood.²³

²¹In the context of Gal 3, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is not a neutral term which simply designates Judaism as a whole with no polemic intended. The parallelism in 3.2-3 between ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε, which is commonly recognized by scholars, does not point to a non-polemical reference, but rather it points to the intrusive message of the troublemakers and consequently to the danger of apostasy from the gospel which faced the Galatians. Thus the thesis of Wright, Scott, et. al. begins to run onto rocky ground at precisely this point.

²²That Deuteronomy forms a significant part of the background for the interpretation of Gal 3.10 is indicated not only by the fact that Paul cited Deuteronomy to support his assertion here, but also by the observation that the whole letter is framed by the covenant curse (1.8-9) and covenant blessing (6.16). Both the curse and blessing are to be understood within the context of Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh: the former draws to a significant degree on Deut 13 (see pp. 217-219 below) and the latter is pronounced as blessing on τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. Ebeling: 56.

²³Neusner 1990 has argued that Israel's experience of exile was paradigmatic for future Judaisms, but this experience of exile was not in direct continuity with future generations. The exile then functions as a pattern to which future generations refer without implying a direct link to the Babylonian exile. If Neusner is correct, then those scholars who point to the pattern of sin, exile and return and suggest that Paul and most other Jews in the Second Temple period thought that Israel continued under the curse have misunderstood Paul's use of this well established, highly significant, and extensively influential motif in Second Temple Judaism.

The main verb in this clause is εἶσιν, and the simple observation that this is a present tense verb is often overlooked. This is an especially important observation in light of the recently advanced thesis that Paul has here assumed the commonly held opinion in Second Temple Judaism that Jews as a whole continued under the curse of the exile. But Paul does not here state that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου were under a curse, from which they have been redeemed by Christ's death, but rather that they are now under the curse. Whoever this group is, the curse has been activated and they are now under its power.²⁴

The indefinite pronoun ὅσοι functions as an oblique reference to the troublemakers.²⁵ Judaism as a whole is not within Paul's view here, but rather the individual or individuals who are promoting circumcision in the Galatian churches and who are compelling them to accept it as a sign of the covenant.²⁶ A number of scholars have recently underscored the importance of understanding the occasional nature of Paul's letters in general and Galatians in particular.²⁷ This has been a helpful and fruitful advance in Pauline studies. However, this insight has not often been carried

²⁴On the curse as realized in this context, see Morland: 201-203.

²⁵Paul's use of the indefinite pronoun may indicate a measure of conditionality. So Stanley 1990: 498. Although it is likely that Paul, in fact, did not know the identity of the troublemakers, the rhetorical force of the indefinite pronoun may be directed more toward the conditional nature of Paul's assertion. Paul's use of the indefinite pronoun here would also have left the door open for the Galatians themselves to understand their own fate, if they were to accept circumcision and his language here may also function as a warning to them.

²⁶Bonneau: 73. On the connection between works of the law and circumcision as a (or the) sign of the covenant which distinguished Jew and gentile, see n. 8 above.

²⁷Donaldson 1986: 94; Howard: 49-54; Morris: 13; Bonneau: 62; and Stanley 1990: 486-488. Cf. esp. Stanton 1996: 99: "Galatians 3 to 6 are related even more intimately than Paul's other discussions concerning the law to a quite specific historical, social, and theological context." Stanley also has recently pointed to the importance of the occasional nature of this letter for the interpretation of Gal 3.10. However, he has missed the polemical force of this verse within the context of the letter when he argues 3.10a functions merely as the threat of a curse for the Galatians. The statement does indeed function as a curse-threat for the Galatians if they accept circumcision, but it also functions as a statement of fact for those who oppose God's covenant purpose to bless the nations through Abraham's seed, specifically the troublemakers in Galatia. On Stanley's restriction of the curse to the Galatians, see Dunn 1993a: 172; and Scott 1993: 193.

through to the attempt to identify ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, which is, of course, of considerable importance for the interpretation of Gal 3.10. Most interpreters apparently assume that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου may only be understood as a reference to all Jews living in the first century, or more specifically all unbelieving Jews.²⁸ Paul's statement that this group is under a curse then would be directed against Judaism as a whole.²⁹ However, nowhere in Galatians does Paul negatively indict Judaism;³⁰ his focus in this letter is always on the troublemakers, the other gospel preached in Galatia, and the danger faced by the Galatians. For Paul circumcision itself is a matter of indifference (5.6; 6.15). It is only those who compel circumcision (2.3, 14; 6.12)³¹ and other Jewish distinctive elements who draw criticism in this letter. Thus the literary force of the phrase ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is perhaps that if one compels gentiles to accept circumcision in order to belong to the people of God, then that person is under a curse.³² It may be better

²⁸Cf. e.g. Cosgrove: 55; Hong 1994: 177; Wright 1992a: 146; Scott 1993b: 657; and Watson: 72. With respect to this, commentators apparently assume that Gal 3.10 contains a pattern of thought that is more fully unpacked in Rom 9-11. Although there are unquestionably many points of contact between Galatians and Romans, we submit that this is not one of them. Cf. Segal: 276: "In Galatians, Paul had been concerned with clarifying that new converts did not have to observe Torah. In Romans, by contrast, Paul turns to the issues of the election of Israel and the ultimate fate of the Jews." Amadi-Azuogu: 127-129 is a recent example of the interpretation that Paul's intention is to demonstrate that both Jew and gentile are under the curse because of universal sinfulness. Although Paul certainly describes universal sinfulness elsewhere, especially in Romans, this should not be read into the argument in Gal 3.10.

²⁹Schoeps: 170 wisely cautions against the assumption that Paul's statements about the law were directed against Judaism.

³⁰The one exception to this statement might be Gal 4.21-31, in which Paul contrasts two covenants. However, even here the emphasis in the argument is on the present Jerusalem (4.25: τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ), not Israel's whole history, and on the expulsion of the troublemakers from the Galatian churches (4.30: ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς). Watson: 61 argues that Paul's polemic "is directed primarily against the Judaizers, and not the Jewish community as a whole. However, the Judaizers are seen as the representatives of the Jewish community (cf. 4.25), so the distinction is not significant." Watson does not explain why Paul would make an insignificant distinction, however.

³¹Although the verb ἀναγκάζειν is fairly rare in the LXX, it is used in several strands of the historical literature of the postbiblical period in connection with Jews being compelled to acts which resulted in the violation of the covenant in general or apostasy in particular. Cf. I Macc 2.25; II Macc 6.1, 6, 18; 7.1; IV Macc 4.26; 5.2, 27; and 18.5.

contextually, therefore, to restrict the identity of ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου to the troublemakers, and perhaps also the Galatians, if they accept circumcision.³³

Moreover, Paul's consistent habit in Galatians is to refer to those with whom he disagrees with respect to the truth of the gospel in an oblique fashion, and thus it is likely that this is his intention in Gal 3.10 with reference to the phrase ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.³⁴ When he refers to the group that infiltrated the meeting at Jerusalem, he called them οἵτινες παρεισήλθον κατασκοπήσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν (2.4). Those whose presence caused Peter and others to withdraw from table fellowship with gentiles were τινες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου (2.12). When he mentioned those who had come in to the Galatian churches, he designated them εἰ μὴ τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταρασσοντες ὑμᾶς (1.7), εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται (1.9), τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι (5.7), ὁ δὲ ταρασσῶν ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα, ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ (5.10), and ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐποσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί, οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι (6.12).³⁵ Paul's consistent habit in this letter is to refer to the troublemakers in an oblique manner. The focus of the polemic in this letter thus is on the troublemakers who have come into the Galatian churches and on the impending Galatian apostasy.³⁶ Hence the occasional nature of Paul's letter to the

³²In this respect, a close connection can be seen between Gal 3.10 and 1.8-9, where Paul twice pronounced a curse on anyone who preached another gospel. See Betz: 144.

³³Cf. Cranford: 258: "...it is Paul's disobedient opponents who are cursed, together with all who are 'of works of the law.' That the Galatians should not undertake to be identified by works of the law is clearly entailed." Cf. also Hansen 1989: 119: "In the context of the Galatian dispute, the appellation ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου refers primarily to those who were persuading the Galatian believers to enter their circle by keeping the law" and idem: 120 "The reality of this curse is intended to dissuade Galatian believers from seeking to belong to 'those of the works of the law' and so placing themselves under the curse."

³⁴So Morland: 202.

³⁵Cf. also Sandnes: 50. He does not stress the oblique nature of Paul's reference to the troublemakers, however. The last reference, with its use of ὅσοι, provides an especially close parallel with Gal 3.10. It is indeed surprising given the controversy which has surrounded the interpretation of this verse that the identity of ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου has been taken for granted, and few have noticed this important tendency in Galatians.

³⁶Compare Betz: 144. Betz thinks that the reference is also to all Jews, however. Eckstein: 123 argues that Paul refers to both "die Juden, die nicht an Christus glauben"

Galatians is of prime importance for our understanding his intention in Gal 3.10.³⁷ The motif of the inclusion of the gentiles is vital for our understanding Paul's argument and must always be kept clearly in view.³⁸

The indefinite relative pronoun ὅσοι is modified by ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, which functions to limit further its application. The identification of this group has often been assumed by scholars to be a reference to Judaism as a whole.³⁹ However, this phrase within the context of this letter has special reference to those who advocate circumcision and other aspects of the law which divide Jew from gentile and who compel gentiles to accept the distinctive features of the Jewish law in order to obtain or maintain full membership in the people of God.⁴⁰ In his letter to the Galatians, Paul used this phrase only in 2.16 (3x) and 3.2. In the former reference, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου most naturally refers back to the two issues on which Paul focused in 2.1-14: circumcision and table fellowship between Jews and gentiles.⁴¹ In the latter reference, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου refers to the central

and "diejenigen *Judenchristen*, die...die Toraobservanz abermals als verbindlich >aufrichten< wollen". He is correct with respect to the latter (although we would argue that his statement "wie die galatischen Gegner" is Paul's primary referent), but the former finds no basis in this text.

³⁷Recently several scholars have noted the importance of the occasion of this letter for its interpretation. Cf. e.g. Thielman 1994: 119-120. However, most fail to carry this general insight for our understanding Galatians as a whole through to the interpretation of Gal 3.10 in particular. Cf. also Hansen 1989: 119, who argues that the phrase is limited to the troublemakers, but then reverts to the traditional interpretation when he states that they are under the curse because they have failed to keep the whole law.

³⁸Cf. Howard: 49. He correctly notes the importance of the gentile issue for our understanding Gal 3-4.

³⁹See recently Braswell: 74-75.

⁴⁰Hansen 1989: 161-162; and Dunn 1993b: 75-79.

⁴¹Hansen 1989: 102. However, He thinks (*idem*: 103-104) that in 3.10 the phrase refers to "all the works commanded by Mosaic law." On the importance of 2.16, within the context of 2.15-21, for the interpretation of Gal 3, see Garlington 1997: 87-92; Gaston: 65; and esp. Stanton: 101: "...2:16 functions as a 'text' which is then expounded at length from many angles throughout the rest of the letter. The strong antithesis between those who are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and those who are ἐκ πίστεως is sustained right through chapters 3 and 4, with later echoes." See also *idem*: 110. However, he (*idem*: 103-104) thinks that only 2.16a is connected to the issues of circumcision and food laws, while the remaining references point toward "...the agitator's claim that one's standing before God (past, present, and future) is determined by carrying out the requirements of the law." But this

issue which confronted the Galatians, which is the demand of the troublemakers that the Galatians accept circumcision in order to attain full membership in the people of God. The identification of ἐξ ἔργων νόμου as the troublemakers among the Galatian churches, which is perhaps only implicit in 2.16, is made explicit in 3.1-2 where Paul linked the rhetorical questions τίς ὑμῶς ἐβάσκανεν and ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε.⁴² For the force of Paul's argument in 3.1-2 is that the demand of the troublemakers, which Paul terms a bewitching power, is the demand for circumcision, which Paul refers to as ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.⁴³ Circumcision is a matter of indifference for Paul (Gal 5.4; and 6.15), and in itself it would not have led to the announcement that those who are circumcised (i.e. Jews) are under the curse. When Paul's uses ἐξ ἔργων νόμου in Gal 3.10a, therefore, it is as a reference to the troublemakers and their demand for circumcision as a means of demarcation for the people of God.⁴⁴ This phrase is not intended as a indictment of Judaism as a whole, but rather functions on a much more limited scale within the argument of Galatians.⁴⁵

An important issue to be addressed is the source and significance of the phrase ὑπὸ κατάραν in Gal 3.10a. It is indeed surprising given the intensity of attention devoted

is to miss the significance of the troublemakers' demand that the Galatians accept circumcision, which is the consistently explicit occasion for this letter.

⁴²Cosgrove argues that these questions must be the starting point for our reading of Galatians. On the importance of the fact that the Galatians' past and present experience of the Spirit is not based on works of the law, see Barclay 1988: 85; and Dunn 1993a: 152-154.

⁴³Cf. Hansen 1989: 110: "...'works of the law' refers principally, though not exclusively, to circumcision and other marks of Jewish identity."

⁴⁴Perhaps the recently published Qumran text 4QMMT and the attention devoted to it is relevant here because this precise phrase "works of the law" is used. For the phrase מִקְצֵה מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה, which has a positive connotation in 4QMMT, refers to those aspects of Qumran Halakah which distinguish the community from others. Compare also 4QFlor 1.7 where the phrase מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה occurs. Cf. Dunn 1997a; and Abegg.

⁴⁵The question of whether or not Paul would have applied the application of the curse on a wider scale is probably to be answered positively, especially when we remember that he had already pronounced ἀνάθεμα on anyone who preached another gospel. But the important point made here is that within the flow of thought in Gal 3.1ff., οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου almost certainly is limited to the troublemakers.

to this text that no one has noticed that this phrase appears to be unique to Paul. For the phrase ὑπὸ κατάραν does not occur in the LXX; instead, the preposition usually associated with κατάρα is ἐπὶ.⁴⁶ Hence Paul's phrase in Gal 3.10a that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are ὑπὸ κατάραν may be uniquely his in the sense that there is no direct influence from the LXX on his argument here, at least with respect to the use of ὑπὸ with κατάραν. This observation makes it likely that his use of ὑπὸ κατάραν here reflects his own interpretive application of the Deuteronomistic tradition as it pertains to the situation among the Galatian churches.⁴⁷

When someone is placed under a curse in the Biblical tradition, the explicit purpose is the purity of the people of God and their protection from harmful influence,⁴⁸ not punishment of sin. This is especially the case with reference to the terms ⲠⲚⲓ/ἀνάθεμά in Deuteronomy.⁴⁹ The person under the curse was certainly

⁴⁶Cf. Gen 27.12-13; Deut 28. 15, 45; 29.27; 30.1; Judg 9.57; Mal 2.2; and Dan 9.11. κατάρα is part of a phrase using ἐπὶ in Deut 27.13 (καὶ οὗτοι στήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς κατάρας). κατάρα is part of a phrase using εἰς in IV Kgs 22.19; Isa 64.10; 65.23; Jer 24.9; 29.13; 33.6; 36.22; and 51.8, 12. In Ben Sira 41.9 the curse comes to (εἰς κατάραν) the covenant breaker (41.8: οἵτινες ἐγκατέλιπετε νόμον θεοῦ ὑψίστου). In Ben Sira 41.10 everyone who is "from the earth" will return to the earth (πάντα ὅσα ἐκ γῆς εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσεται), the result of which means that the ungodly (ἀσεβεῖς=πάντα ὅσα ἐκ γῆς?) will move from a curse to destruction (οὕτως ἀσεβεῖς ἀπὸ κατάρας εἰς ἀπώλειαν), implying a distinction between the two. Once κατάρα is used with ἐν (Zech 8.13).

⁴⁷Several scholars have recently drawn attention to the fact that certain strands of the LXX refer to the curse which has come upon Israel as a result of her violation of the terms of the covenant. Cf. e.g. Scott 1993a: 198-201, 213-217 who argues, based on a similar prepositional phrase (ἐπήλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἡ κατάρα in Dan 9.11 and ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσιν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσιν in Gal 3.10), is that Paul's use of Deut. 27.26 in Gal 3.10 has been refracted through Dan 9.11. However, there is no evidence that in his letter to the Galatians Paul was influenced by Daniel. Hence Scott's thesis at this point is merely speculation. Paul has more clearly refracted Deut 27.26 through several strands of Deuteronomy (9.10; 28. 58, 61; 29.19, 20, 26; 30.10; and 31. 26) and Genesis (12.3/18.18). And it is significant that the exact phrase Paul used never occurs in the LXX.

⁴⁸The harmful influence is usually devotion to other gods or things that are devoted to other gods. Thus idolatry is a strong thread woven into the theme of being under a curse.

⁴⁹The connection between idolatry, the curse, and the protection of the community from the harmful influence is consistent in Deuteronomy (Cf. Deut 7.25-26; 13.12-18, 17; 20.17-18). This connection that is implicit in Josh 6-7 in the sin of Achan is made explicit in Josh 22.20.

punished for his own sin, but ultimately the curse functioned to protect the whole community from the insidious nature of the sin of idolatry. But even in connection with the exile, the ultimate intention was the purification and restoration of the people of God. Punishment for the sin of the nation was, to be sure, a significant part of the exile, but it was penultimate to the goal of purification and restoration. This observation is often lost sight of in the interpretation of Gal 3.10, where the theme of punishment is often brought to the forefront of the discussion so that the ultimate purpose of the curse is obscured. Paul's purpose in placing the troublemakers under the curse, however, may have been instead to protect the Galatians from their harmful influence.⁵⁰ It is therefore likely that ὑπὸ κατάραν in 3.10 is the functional equivalent of ἀνάθεμα ἔστω in 1.8-9.⁵¹

Therefore, the function of Paul's assertion that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under a curse is to protect the Galatians from the harmful influence of the troublemakers.⁵² But

⁵⁰Cf. Morland: 158-160. The infectious nature of the curse and the need to protect the community from those infected by it is a feature of Gal 3.10 that has not been stressed enough. Paul clearly viewed those who had come into the Galatian churches in this way. First, they were those who had bewitched the Galatians (3.1: *τις ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκαθεν*). Second, they had troubled the Galatians (1.7: *οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς*, Cf. also 5.10). Third, their zeal for the Galatians was not for their good (4.17: *ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς*). Fourth, they are agitators (5.12: *οἱ ἀναστατούντες ὑμᾶς*). The common thread is the negative affect on the Galatians so that Paul commands that they be cast out of the community (4.30).

⁵¹To be ὑπὸ κατάραν then would be equivalent to $\square\Gamma\Gamma$ or ἀνάθεμα. On this ground the suggestion of Burton 1920: 164-165 that the curse is not God's curse is unlikely. It is especially idolators who were under the curse. Cf. Goldstein 1976: 233. Martyn 1997: 370-373 argues that the phrase "to be under (something)" in Galatians refers to enslavement to cosmic powers opposed to God. However, see pp. 174-178 above where we argue that the phrase ὑπὸ in 3.23, 25; and 4.2-3 refers in Paul's argument to the law's role in restricting Israel during the period when she is viewed as a minor child, a role which is now no longer relevant for those in Christ. Moreover, if ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου refers to the troublemakers, as we have argued above, then there is a significant dissimilarity between the context of 3.10 and the context of 3.22-23, 25; and 4.2-3, in which all people, or at least all Israel, is in view. Cf. also Belleville: 54: "It is important to notice that while these five phrases are syntactically parallel they are not logically parallel."

⁵²Face Gaston: 74-75, who argues that 3.10a refers to the gentiles who are under the curse. And also Braswell: 75-77; and Stanley 1990: 500, who argue that this clause functions as a warning to the Galatians that if they accept the law, then a single violation of one of the commandments would bring the curse. In this respect, Stanley's thesis appears to be a modification of the traditional view. Moreover, our argument has been that the phrase indicates that the troublemakers are under the curse.

what is this harmful influence? The answer to this question lies in the connection of 3.10a with 1.8-9 and 3.8. On the one hand, Paul has already stated that anyone who preaches another gospel is ἀνάθεμα. The charge leveled against the troublemakers in Gal 1.6-9 is that they have perverted the gospel of Christ so that the Galatians are in danger of turning from the true God to another gospel.⁵³ On the other hand, this same danger is present in the context of Gal 3.10. For Paul has cited Gen 12.3/18.18 in 3.8 as God's covenant purpose for Abraham and his descendants, and he has placed the Galatians' faith in the gospel in opposition to works of the law (3.2-5). Within the context of Gal 3.1-14, works of the law are in opposition to the gospel and are even a danger to those who are enticed by them (3.1, 3). In Paul's argument, ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου find themselves in opposition to the gospel in a way similar to 1.6-9. According to Morland the pattern in the blessing and curse motif in Deuteronomy is that the "...the cursed deeds are the opposite of the blessed deeds."⁵⁴ In other words, the action which leads to the curse (i.e. disobedience to the law) is the opposite of the action which leads to blessing (i.e. obedience to the law).

We would clarify this even farther. Based on our study of the curse motif in Deuteronomy, elsewhere in the Jewish Scripture, and in the literature of postbiblical Judaism,⁵⁵ the action which leads to the curse is covenant unfaithfulness as it is manifested in devotion to other gods, and the action which leads to blessing is covenant faithfulness which is manifested in exclusive devotion to the Lord. Hence when Morland argues that "...since the blessed are those who have faith like Abraham, the cursed should be those who disobey this claim to faith,"⁵⁶ he has correctly drawn out the

⁵³For a more complete discussion of the importance of 1.6-9 for the interpretation of Gal 3.8-10, see pp. 214-220 below.

⁵⁴Morland: 206.

⁵⁵See Chapter Three and Chapter Five.

⁵⁶Morland: 206. His statement that "the question is therefore whether Deut 27.26 also can be taken as requiring faith" is misguided on two fronts. On the one hand, the issue in Deuteronomy is not explicitly faith so much as obedience. In Paul's argument faith in Jesus Christ has in one sense replaced the law as the means of definition for the

implications of Paul's use of Deuteronomy. But he has failed to notice the important correlation between the occasion for the curse both in Deuteronomy and in Galatians. For Paul, the citation of the promise in Gal 3.8 functions to highlight that "all things written in the book of the law" includes the promise to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants.⁵⁷ Thus Paul can state that those who are of works of the law are under a curse because they have preached another gospel among the Galatian churches.⁵⁸

Paul's assertion in 3.10a that ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσιν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν, therefore, is best understood to refer to the troublemakers who preach another gospel. And since Paul has already pronounced a curse on anyone who preaches another gospel,⁵⁹ it should not be terribly surprising that he asserts in 3.10a that those who have come into the Galatian churches to preach another gospel are under a curse.⁶⁰ The

covenant people, so much so that Paul can refer elsewhere to the obedience of faith (Cf. Rom 1.5). On the other hand, Deuteronomy and the Jewish traditions which stem from it understood obedience to the law in terms of faith and faithfulness so that faith is not a foreign concept in Deuteronomy, as Moreland apparently assumes. See Garlington 1991.

⁵⁷Dunn 1993b: 84-85.

⁵⁸Although the troublemakers may have used the promise to bless the nations in their own presentation of the gospel to the Galatians, in Paul's view this is another gospel because it adds elements of the law to the promise, elements which were intended for a specific period of time in Israel's history. These elements, however, are no longer valid for those in Christ. Cf. pp. 171-177 above. The Galatians themselves are in danger of becoming ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and thus coming under the covenant curse, if they accept circumcision in order to complete their salvation (cf. 3.2-5). It is only the conditional nature of Paul's language that leaves the door open for the Galatians to understand that they themselves will be under the curse if they accept circumcision. But this is a secondary reference; the primary reference is to the troublemakers. On 3.1 as a probable reference to the troublemakers and their demonic influence among the Galatians, see Neyrey 1988: 72-100.

⁵⁹See pp. 214-220 below.

⁶⁰Cf. Morland: 168: "A reader who has been deeply shocked by the double anathema in 1:8-9 will inevitably connect it with the curse in 3:10 during the reading process. The texts will be brought together both because they are curses, and also because the crimes seem to be similar in both verses: To preach against the Gospel (1:8-9) may be equated with a life based on the works of the law (3:10a)." This is especially the case when we note that Paul has cited the promise to Abraham as the gospel preached to him and that works of the law is juxtaposed with the hearing of faith in 3.2-5, which was the Galatians initial reception of the gospel Paul had preached to them. Hence Paul's gospel and curse are conjoined in both contexts. This interpretation seems much more plausible than

purpose of this curse is to place those under the curse outside the covenant community and to protect the covenant community from contamination.

2. Paul's use of Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10b to support his assertion in 3.10a

The question remains with respect to the function of Deut 27.26 to support the above assertion. A major focus of the present study has been to argue that the motif of failure to do all that the law requires is consistently linked with the motif of the violation the covenant through devotion to other gods. The curse of Deut 27.26 within the context of Deuteronomy itself and the broad streams of tradition which flowed from it came on those who were disloyal to the Lord and broke the covenant.

An important question to which recent attention has been devoted is the source, or more precisely the sources, of Paul's citation from Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10b.⁶¹ For as most commentators have noted, Paul's use of Scripture, which he introduced with the characteristic formula γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι, appears to be a citation of Deut 27.26, even though it is commonly acknowledged that it has been significantly modified. The differences between the text of Deut 27.26 and Gal 3.10b are viewed by some as inconsequential⁶² or by others as Paul's attempt to argue against Jewish legalism.⁶³ On the other hand, several scholars have suggested that Paul has modified this text in order to draw into his argument the whole train of thought of the last chapters of Deuteronomy.⁶⁴ This is an important insight which, we suggest, has not been

Scott's (1993b: 659) suggestion that the Galatians would have been able to follow Paul's argument because of the existence of three funerary inscriptions in Asia Minor.

⁶¹Cf. e.g. Koch; and Stanley 1992. However, although both studies may be useful for our understanding of Paul's use of Scripture in Gal 3.10, neither pursues the line of enquiry explored here.

⁶²Cf. e.g. Burton 1920: 164; and Longenecker: 117.

⁶³This view focuses particular attention on the insertion of πᾶς into the translation of the Hebrew text. See, for example, Bruce 1982a: 159; and Mussner: 221-222.

⁶⁴The Deuteronomic nature of Paul's modification has long been noted. Cf. e.g. Bruce 1982b: 28. On Paul's intention to draw on Deut 20-30, see Dunn 1993a: 170; and

thoroughly investigated. We will attempt, therefore, to identify and pull together the strands of Deuteronomy to which Paul refers in Gal 3.10b and then to point toward their significance within the context of Deuteronomy.

A. An Analysis of Paul's citation of Deuteronomy 27.26 in Gal 3.10b.

The text of Gal 3.10b reads:⁶⁵

...γράφεται γὰρ ὅτι Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς
γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά.

If we set aside the customary scriptural introduction, we may compare Paul's citation with the Hebrew and Greek text of Deut 27.26:

אָרָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִקְיִם אֶת־דְּבַר־יְהוָה לַעֲשׂוֹת אוֹתוֹ

Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου
τούτου ποιῆσαι αὐτούς.

Paul has clearly cited the LXX.⁶⁶ Paul's statement in Gal.3.10b closely resembles the LXX translation both at the beginning (Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει)⁶⁷ and the end of

Wright 1992a: 146. We have argued above that although Wright is correct in this helpful insight, the direction he takes from this starting point is doubtful.

⁶⁵NA²⁶ refers to one textual variant in this verse, which is the inclusion of ἐν in some manuscripts. This inclusion, however, occurs primarily in later witnesses and may be explained on internal grounds as an attempt to bring Paul's citation into closer verbal agreement with Deut 27.26.

⁶⁶Both the LXX and Paul's citation insert the adjective πᾶς twice. Both employ the same Greek verb (ἐμμένει) for the hiphil stem יִקְיִם. However, a subtle difference between the LXX and Paul's reference to it is often overlooked. The form ἐμμένει without the accent mark is ambiguous and may be either present (ἐμμένει) or future tense (ἐμμενεῖ) depending on the accent given. In the two standard editions of the LXX (Cf. Wevers, *Septuaginta*; and Rahlf's, *Septuaginta*), the verb is taken as a future tense (ἐμμενεῖ). This is in contrast to both of the standard texts of the New Testament (NA²⁶ and UBS³), in which the verb is a present tense (ἐμμένει). It is surprising that, to my knowledge, this orthographic feature of the LXX and Paul's citation of it has largely remained unnoticed. One recent exception to this is Koch: 164, who notices this distinction

the verse (τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά)⁶⁸, with significant change occurring in the clause which modifies ἐμμένει (πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου). Hence the LXX translated פָּנִי הַחַיִּים לְפָנֶיךָ quite literally, with the addition of πᾶς. Paul, however, has modified the wording of the LXX and the MT. We suggest that a careful examination of the other occurrences of πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου in Deuteronomy indicates that Paul has intentionally incorporated it into his citation of Deut 27.26 in order to draw the significance of this clause and its context into his argument in Gal 3.10.

B. πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου elsewhere in Deuteronomy.

An investigation into the other occurrences of the clause πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου yields the following results. The complete form occurs in Deut

between the LXX and Paul's use of it, but quickly concludes that "in Gal 3.10 liegt ein ausdrücklich futurisches Verständnis fern."

⁶⁷Paul's statement that ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει appears to be a verbatim citation of the LXX of Deut 27.26. Paul has omitted ἄνθρωπος, however. Koch: 120 has recently suggested that Paul has deleted ἄνθρωπος from his citation of Deut 27.26 and Lev 18.5 in order to align the wording with Deut 21.23, which lacks this term. This is a plausible explanation for the omission of ἄνθρωπος in Gal 3.10b. Cf. also Stanley 1992: 238-239. But it is also to be observed that Paul's use of Deut 21.23 in Gal 3.13 has been significantly modified in order to align it with his use of Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10b. It has often been noted that Paul has changed the participle κεκατηραμένος to the adjective ἐπικατάρατος. This change suggests that Paul has attracted the wording of Deut 21.23 to Deut 27.26. See Longenecker: 122; Bruce 1982a: 165; Hong 1993: 85; and Dunn 1993a: 177-178.

⁶⁸Paul here agrees with the LXX of Deut 27.26, with two minor adjustments. First, Paul's addition of the definite article before the infinitive ποιῆσαι is probably a stylistic change which does not affect the function or the meaning of the infinitive. Second, we note that there is a gender change of the personal pronoun from αὐτούς in the LXX, whose antecedent is τοῖς λόγοις, to αὐτά, whose antecedent is, evidently, τοῖς γεγραμμένοις. Thus this change is due, almost certainly, to grammatical conventions based on the change from the masculine plural τοῖς λόγοις to τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, assuming that the latter is a neuter participle. Cf. Stanley 1992: 242-243. On the change to the dative case, see idem: 241.

28. 58, 61; 29.19, 20, 26; and 30.10. Partial forms occur in Deut 9.10 ([πάσας τὰς] γεγραμμένας) and 31. 26 (τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου τούτου).

(1) At 9.10 we read that the Lord gave to Moses tablets of stone.⁶⁹ These were written by the finger of God (כתבם באצבע אלהים/ γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ δακτύλῳ τοῦ θεοῦ), upon which were "all the words" (ככל־הדברים/ πάντες οἱ λόγοι).⁷⁰ This first reference to that which is written occurs within the narrative section of Deuteronomy which details the institution of the covenant at Sinai.⁷¹ The tablets contained ככל־הדברים (πάντες οἱ λόγοι), an observation which provides a verbal link between Deut 9.10 and 27.26. The text, moreover, describes Israel's failure to maintain this loyalty through the manufacture and worship of an image⁷² (Deut 9.12b). The narrative focuses attention on the quick rebellion⁷³ against the Lord (והרהרו/ παρέβησαν ταχύ).⁷⁴ Thus Israel's failure to do the things that the Lord commanded them, all of which were written by the Lord on tablets of stone, is centered on her worship of the image of a calf at Sinai.⁷⁵

⁶⁹The LXX understood the second stone tablets (אֶת־שְׁנֵי לוחֹת הָאֲבָנִים) to refer to two stone tablets (τὰς δύο πλάκας τὰς λιθίνας).

⁷⁰The LXX repeats the verb γράφειν with its translation.

⁷¹This concept of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, of course, is central to Deuteronomy. The important work of G. Mendenhall on the form of Israel's covenant documents in relationship to the suzerain-vassal treaties in the ancient near east has demonstrated that Deuteronomy's fundamental concern is the loyalty that the vassal, Israel, owed to her suzerain, Yahweh. Thus at the heart of Israel's covenant relationship is the covenant loyalty which is due to Yahweh. Deuteronomy's purpose, then, is to call the Israelites to maintain covenant loyalty to the Lord. Cf. Mendenhall 1954a: 50-76; Baltzer; Christensen: xl; and Hillers 1969: 143-168.

⁷²Compare II Kgs 17.16, where Israel forsook all the commandments through the manufacture of an image. The LXX translation of τὰς ἐντολάς refers back to πάντα τὸν νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλαμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν (17.13).

⁷³Cf. 9.7, 23-24.

⁷⁴Cf. also 9.16. It has been argued that Paul's language in Gal 1.6 is drawn from this incident. See Mussner: 53; Dunn 1993a: 40; and Longenecker: 14.

⁷⁵In the context immediately preceding this narrative the Israelites are warned that if they forget the Lord and follow other gods, then they will perish (Deut 8.19). This verse is translated by Tg. Neof.: "And if you forget the teaching of the law of the Lord your God, and go after other idols..." Thus this targum made clear the link between idolatry and the law.

(2) This clause occurs twice in Deut 28. In 28.58 Israel's obligation to do the law is emphasized,⁷⁶ which is modified with **אֵת־כָּל־דְּבַר־יְהוָה הַזֶּה בְּסֵפֶר הַזֶּה**. The LXX translation is πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου, τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ.⁷⁷ One of the major elements of Paul's usage (i.e. "all") and of the LXX of Deut 27.26 is absent here (**הַזֶּה בְּסֵפֶר הַזֶּה**/**τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ**); the term 'all' is, however, implied due to the fact that **הַזֶּה בְּסֵפֶר הַזֶּה** and **τὰ γεγραμμένα** modify respectively **אֵת־כָּל־דְּבַר־יְהוָה הַזֶּה** and **πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου**. In context, the failure which this clause refers to is devotion to other gods and the penalty is the curse.⁷⁸ It is important to note that in 28.61 the participle is negated: the plague which will come upon Israel is one which is not written in the book of this law (**לֹא כָתוּב בְּסֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הַזֶּה**/**τὴν μὴ γεγραμμένην ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου**).⁷⁹ Furthermore, in this passage "that which is (not) written" is sickness (**כָּל־חֲלִי**/**πάσσαν μαλακίαν**) and plague (**וְכָל־מַכָּה**/**καὶ πάσσαν πληγὴν**), not specific commandments. Hence Deuteronomy refers both to the commandments (28.58) and to the penalty for disobedience (28.61) as that which is written in the book of this law.

(3) In Deut 29 this clause occurs three times. First, in 29.19 it is important again to observe that what is written in the book of the law is the curse, not the commandments, as in Deut 9.10 & 28.58. This text (**הַכְּתוּבָה בְּסֵפֶר הַזֶּה**), moreover, is translated with ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου. The translation demonstrates a tendency to expand the text with the simple insertion of **τοῦ νόμου**, which is probably intended to clarify the referent. Second, in 29.20 we read that the punishment required for the person who is guilty of the secret sin of v. 18-19 is that the Lord would separate him from all the tribes of Israel

⁷⁶Cf. Stanley 1992: 241. He argues that this text is the source of Paul's modification.

⁷⁷The presence of the demonstrative pronoun is a consistent feature of the text to which we will refer, though Paul did not include it. Cf. Stanley 1992: 241-242.

⁷⁸On this point, see pp. 52-54, 58 above.

⁷⁹This evidently was viewed as a contradiction within some manuscript traditions of the LXX, which thus mention both kinds of plagues (**τὴν μὴ γεγραμμένην, καὶ πάσσαν τὴν γεγραμμένην ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου**) in order to resolve this contradiction.

(מכל שבטי ישראל⁸⁰). All the curses of the covenant (אלות הנרית/πάσας τὰς ἀρὰς τῆς διαθήκης) are referred to as "that which is written in the book of this law" (הכתובה בספר התורה הזה/τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου). And third, Deut 29.26 describes the punishment promised to fall on those who abandoned the covenant of the Lord (v. 24: אֶת־בְּרִית יְהוָה/τὴν διαθήκην κυρίου του θεοῦ) and went and served other gods (v. 25: אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים/θεοὶς ἑτέροις),⁸¹ The Lord's wrath was upon the land (בְּאֶרֶץ הַהוּא/ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην) for the sin of an individual. The important point to be stressed here, as also in Deut 29.19-20, is that "that which is written in the book of the law" (הכתובה בספר הזה/τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ) is the curse.

(4) The clause occurs in Deut 30.10, which refers to "all the things written in this book of the law" (הכתובה בספר התורה הזה/τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου). The context here is of covenant renewal, and Yahweh's promise to restore Israel to the land after the exile.⁸² This final instance of the full example of the clause cited by Paul refers to the Lord's commandments (מִצְוֹתָי/τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ) and his statutes/requirements (דִּקְדוּתָי/τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ). The LXX supplements this list with τὰς κρίσεις αὐτοῦ, which may refer to the just punishments which the Lord requires for disobedience.⁸³ The pattern traced above in which failure to do all the commandments which are written in the book of the law is linked with the tendency to go and serve other gods can also be seen in Deut 30.

⁸⁰The LXX interpreted this to mean πάντων υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ.

⁸¹According to Deut 29.23ff., covenant faithfulness is the primary issue for Deuteronomy in defining the curse which would fall upon transgressors. On this important point, see pp. 54-57 above. In Deut 29 the curse which resulted in Israel's exile was due to her failure to maintain covenant loyalty by turning to other gods, and this failure is the negative corollary to doing all the commandments written in the book of the law.

⁸²Stanley 1992: 240-241 states that this text "...stands closest to the wording of Gal 3.10 (Deut 28.58 omits), but the fact that it appears in the midst of a list of 'blessings' makes it an unlikely candidate for combination with Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10."

⁸³On this point see pp. 55-56 above.

(5) In Deut 31 a partial form occurs. This passage is in the context of Moses' final instructions to Joshua, which includes his placement of "the book of this law" (הַסֵּפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת/τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου τούτου) in the ark of the covenant. This law was written by Moses (Deut 31.9: וַיִּכְתֹּב מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת), thus linking in this context two of the significant elements of Paul's statement found in Gal 3.10.⁸⁴ The LXX of Deut 31.9 makes this connection even more explicit (καὶ ἔγραψε Μωϋσῆς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου εἰς βιβλίον). This is seen clearly in 31.24, where we read that Moses had written the words of this law in a book (מֹשֶׁה לָכַתֵּב אֶת־דְּבָרֵי הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת עַל־סֵפֶר) / Μωϋσῆς γράφων πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου εἰς βιβλίον). Hence, Deut 31 testifies to the identification of the law as the book of the law which had been written by Moses.

In summary, the language that Paul used in Gal 3.10b to modify his quotation of Deut 27.26 (πάντων τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου) is most closely paralleled by five passages, all of which are found in Deut 28-30. A partial form of this language, moreover, occurs in 9.10 and 31.26.⁸⁵ The evidence we have surveyed, especially from Deut 28-30, suggests that πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου is a formulaic expression which refers either to the commandments of the law or to the curse which falls on those who disobey the law, specifically when God's people turn to other gods. And the penalty of the curse falls upon those who have turned from the Lord to other gods. Thus in Deuteronomy this formulaic expression points both to the obligation to remain loyal to the covenant and to the penalty for failure to remain loyal to the covenant. This important connection in Deut 28-30 between πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου and both the commandments of the law and the curse of the covenant suggests that in Paul's citation of Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10, Deut

⁸⁴Paul does not explicitly state in Gal 3.10 that Moses wrote the law, however.

⁸⁵The preceding analysis thus indicates that Paul may have conflated elements of Deut 9.10; 27.26; 28. 58-61; 29.20-21, 27; 30.10; and 31.26 in his use of Deuteronomy in Gal 3.10.

27-30 influenced his thought concerning the function and significance of the curse. This influence, according to Paul's gospel, means that the curse on ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (i.e. those who are requiring circumcision among the Galatian churches⁸⁶) is the curse on those who are disloyal to God's covenant purpose to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants so that the other gospel functions as another god which is enticing the Galatians away from the Lord (cf. 1.6, and 4.8-9). Furthermore, the presence of a partial form in Deut 9.10 and 31.26 points to the importance of Deuteronomy as a whole for understanding Paul's thought.⁸⁷ Apostasy from the Lord through the worship of idols thus meant not keeping the commandments of the Lord or not remaining within all the things written in the book of the law, and this pattern functions as one of the dominant motifs of Deuteronomy.⁸⁸ Stated positively, the message of Deuteronomy is that the Lord required covenant faithfulness from his people which most often is expressed in terms of keeping all the commandments which are written in the book of the law.

⁸⁶Paul is not arguing against circumcision per se, but rather is arguing against a requirement of the law which was added after the promise (3.15-18) and which is no longer relevant for those in Christ (3.23-29). Some scholars argue that the troublemakers use Deut 27.26 in their own proclamation of the gospel to the Galatians. Cf. p. 162 above. Perhaps the troublemakers use this text, or at least use Deuteronomistic language of obedience to the whole law, to demonstrate that loyalty to the Lord demands circumcision of all converts and to convince the Galatians that they will be cursed if they do not obey the whole law. This possible background may inform our reading of the statement that Paul makes in 4.17. Paul's use of Deuteronomy and Genesis then is intended to demonstrate that circumcision and other works of the law are intended to be temporary within God's plan in redemptive history and that God's intention of blessing all nations is through faith in Christ, not works of the law (as the troublemakers may have argued in their own proclamation of the gospel to the Galatians). Probably Paul's argument here will not have convinced the troublemakers (so Dunn 1993a: 173), but Paul's argument is not intended to convince the troublemakers. It is intended to convince the Galatians to remain loyal to the gospel they have already received.

⁸⁷This understanding of the curse of the covenant, which fell upon those who abandon covenant with Yahweh to serve other gods, is not confined to the passages discussed above, however. In fact, a strikingly consistent pattern can be detected within Deuteronomy which indicates that the curse was invoked on those who failed to obey all the Lord's commandments by worshipping other gods. In addition to the texts discussed in this chapter and in Chapter Three, see 4.1-4, 15-24; 6.1-6, 12-17, 24-25; 7.25-8.1 (compare with 7.2-5, 11-16; 8.10-19); 9.12-16, 23-24; 11.1, 8, 13-17, 26-29, 32; 12.1-2, 28-32; 17.2-5; and 31.12, 16-20.

⁸⁸Garlington 1997: 95-99 notes the importance of this motif for the interpretation of Gal 3.10.

The threat of the curse of the covenant which comes on the nation when it fails to do all the things written in the book of the law by serving other gods is the central concern of Deuteronomy.⁸⁹ This central motif of Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh, which has recently received much attention in Old Testament studies,⁹⁰ has long been overlooked in studies on Galatians 3. The importance of this motif for understanding Paul's argument in Galatians cannot be overstated, however. From the perspective of Deuteronomy, Israel was continually confronted with a choice.⁹¹ If she chose to obey the Lord and remain faithful to him, then she would be blessed in the land promised to Abraham and his descendants. However, if she failed to live within all that the Law required and turned to other gods, she would be cursed and removed from the land. The curse which fell upon those who violated the covenant by worshipping other gods, therefore, is at the center of Deuteronomy. Israel's covenant with Yahweh required obedience to its commandments, and obedience to all the commandments is consistently contrasted with those who abandon the covenant and worship other gods.

C. Paul's modified citation as support for his assertion in 3.10a

Gal 3.10b is clearly intended to support the assertion of 3.10a. The question which has bedeviled scholars is how it does so.⁹² Several have concluded that Paul's use of scripture does not in fact support his claim, and many have recently affirmed and defended the traditional interpretation.⁹³ In chapters three and five we explored the use

⁸⁹At the core of the covenant structure of Deuteronomy, therefore, is the demand of Yahweh that his people give him exclusive devotion. Cf. Baltzer: 37-38; Weinfeld: 81-82; Craigie 1976: 58-59; and Neusner 1990: 29.

⁹⁰See Mendenhall 1954a: 50-76; idem 1954b: 26-46; Weinfeld: 59-157; von Rad 1953: 70-73; Baltzer: 1-93; McConville; McCarthy 1978; and Lowery: 199-200.

⁹¹Ackroyd: 81-82.

⁹²Cf. Garlington 1997: 85.

⁹³Cf. pp. 5-6 above.

of curse terminology in the Jewish scripture and the the postbiblical literature. The previous section has argued that Paul's modification of his citation is intended to point to the broader use of curse terminology in Deuteronomy, especially as it is employed in connection with the dominant motif of covenant loyalty to the Lord.

Much of the controversy over the interpretation of this verse is centered on the significance of the adjective $\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta$. Howard, for example, has stressed the first $\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta$ in Paul's citation of Deut 27.26 and has argued that it is determinative of Paul's purpose here.⁹⁴ But in spite of Howard's enormously helpful contribution to the interpretation of Gal 3, in which the motif of the inclusion of the gentiles is given its proper emphasis, his stress on the first $\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta$ to indicate that all gentiles were under the curse in the sense that they were under the suppressing power of the law⁹⁵ which divided Jews and gentiles must be questioned. The $\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta$ to which Howard refers is part of the LXX Paul cited, not Paul's addition to the text. Moreover, Paul's argument in Gal 3.23-25, we have argued above,⁹⁶ is that is that the law functions to supervise Israel for a period of time, but that this function of the law has ended in Christ. Hence the focus of Paul's argument is on the law's role to supervise and restrict the people of God during the time when they are viewed as minor children. But this does not mean that Paul states that the law functions as a "suppressing power." The thrust of the argument is directed more toward the idea that what is a supervisory function of the law as a $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ then must not continue now for those who have been baptized into Christ.⁹⁷ Furthermore, Howard's stress on

⁹⁴Howard: 58-65.

⁹⁵Martyn: 307-311 has recently argued that Paul takes up a text used by the troublemakers, whom Martyn refers to as the "Teachers", and that he has interpreted this text in light of the apocalyptic schema that he finds in Galatians. Martyn 311: concludes that "...for Paul the curse of the law falls on both observer and nonobserver." This conclusion is based on his understanding of the curse as "enslavement to powers lying beyond the human being's control" (idem: 308). For Martyn this enslavement is a universal human problem. Hence, the criticisms of Howard's similar argument of the law as a suppressing power also apply to Martyn's argument.

⁹⁶Cf. pp. 174-177.

⁹⁷So McKnight 1995: 155.

the term $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ as a reference to Jews and gentiles as a whole fails to recognize that it is qualified by a relative clause, thus limiting its reference. Moreover, within the context of Deuteronomy itself, the language of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ does not function to indict Israel as a whole, but rather to indict the covenant breaker, especially one who turns to other gods. Thus the indictment of Gal 3.10b is not in reference to Jews and gentiles as groups, but rather it is in reference to those who fail to do all that the law requires.

Many scholars instead have pointed to the second $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in Gal 3.10b. These scholars argue that the law demanded perfect obedience to every one of the commandments in the law and if one failed at any point, the curse of the law would fall.⁹⁸ Indeed, the law did expect faithful obedience to all of its precepts, but it also provided the means for atonement through the sacrificial cult. It is difficult to sustain the argument that Paul thought that the violation of a single commandment would bring the curse when he knew that atonement and forgiveness were so near. But perhaps most significant for our purposes, the argument in the previous section has demonstrated that the adjective is consistently part of the clause that Paul combined with his citation of Deuteronomy. Hence its significance in Gal 3.10 is not so much in terms of quantifying the level of sin which would incur the curse, but rather as part of the signpost Paul placed in this citation which points toward the broader context of Deut 28-30.

Therefore, a more fruitful approach to the question of the significance of the second $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is to observe that Paul has modified Deut 27.26 by the insertion of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon$ in the place of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$.⁹⁹ The addition of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ to the LXX translation of Deut 27.26 is typically noted, but

⁹⁸Cf. eg. Longenecker: 117-118; Schreiner 1984: 156; Hong 1993: 137; Amadi-Azuogu: 126-138; and Hübner: 19. Segal: 119-120 offers a variation of this interpretation.

⁹⁹Scholars have long noted this feature of Paul's citation. Several have recently argued that Paul intended to draw on the covenant perspective in Deut 28-30. Cf. Dunn 1993a; Thielmann 1989; Scott 1993a; and Wright 1992a. The present study argues that failure to do all that is written in the book of the law is consistently conjoined with the sin

left unnoticed thus far is that *πάς* is a key component of the clause *πάσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου* elsewhere in Deuteronomy.¹⁰⁰ Hence, this second "all" is simply part of the formula Paul has spliced with his citation of Deut 27.26. Within the context of Deut 28-30, the clause *πάσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου* is understood with reference to the curse which comes upon those who are disloyal to the covenant, especially and explicitly through the abandonment of the Lord and devotion to other gods.¹⁰¹

The first occurrence of a partial form of this clause is in the context of Israel's sin at Sinai (Deut 9.10). Two observations point to the significance of this text for our understanding Gal 3.10. First, the partial clause *כחננים באצבע אלרים*/γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ δακτύλῳ τοῦ θεοῦ and the phrase *וועלירם ככל־הדברים*/καὶ ἐπ' αὐταῖς ἐγγράπτο πάντες οἱ λόγοι are used conjunctively, which may indicate that the two were expressions which functioned within the same semantic field. This especially appears to be the case for the translator of the LXX, who repeated the verb *γράφειν*. The connection in Deut 9.10 thus may have provided Paul with the opportunity to draw into his citation of Deut 27.26 the specific occasion for covenant failure on Israel's part at Sinai. Second, the narrative focuses attention on the rebellion (9.7, 23-24) against the Lord which is described as "quick" (9.12: *מהר*/παρέβησαν ταχὺ; cf. also 9.16). Scholars have regularly noted the probable allusion to this text in Gal 1.6, where Paul begins to rebuke

of idolatry and that this observation has significance for our understanding Paul's argument in Gal 3.10.

¹⁰⁰Cf. Deut 28. 58, 61; 29.19, 20, 26; and 30.10. It is crucial to note that the term *כל* or *πάς* is present in each of these texts. Thus the argument that Paul has purposely chosen the text which had the term *πάς* to fit his own needs fails to convince because in fact the clause he incorporated into his citation had the term "all" in both the MT and the LXX. The significance of this adjective, if any, must lie elsewhere.

¹⁰¹This is the central thesis of Chapter Three. Wright 1992a; Scott 1993a; Thielman 1989; and Amadi-Azuogu: 132-138 all note the importance of Deut 27-30 for our understanding Gal 3.10, but none of them have noticed the close connection between the curse and idolatry, nor have they attempted to apply this insight to the interpretation of this text.

the Galatians for their impending apostasy from the gospel of Jesus Christ and thus from the one who called them into the people of God.¹⁰² These factors suggest that Paul may have been influenced by Deut 9 when he combined the clause πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου with his citation of Deut 27.26. If this is the case, it suggests that he did so in order to draw in the significance of the specific occasion for the violation of the covenant at Sinai.

The point that Paul has drawn in the broader context of Deuteronomy which demanded covenant loyalty from the Israelites is further substantiated when we recognize that the clauses ἐμμένει and τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά also refer to the motif of loyalty to the Lord which dominates Deuteronomy. The former refers to the faithful Israelite who lived life within the boundaries of the law. The latter refers to the obligation to do the law in order to continue in life within the covenant with the Lord. Obedience to the law was the means by which Israel expressed and demonstrated covenant loyalty and faithfulness to the Lord. For Paul the means of expression for that covenant loyalty which results in blessing is through faith in Christ. This is clear in Gal 3.9: οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. The phrase οἱ ἐκ πίστεως is clearly contrasted with ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου in 3.10a, and οἱ ἐκ πίστεως includes the gentiles whom God intended to justify (3.8). These gentiles who have been justified by faith are the present fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham, and they are blessed together with Abraham, the faithful one. The fulcrum upon which the contrast between οἱ ἐκ πίστεως and ὅσοι

¹⁰²Cf. pp. 214-220 below. Although the troublemakers may have used Deut 27.26 in their own proclamation to the Galatians, as some have argued (cf. p. 162 above), Paul's modification of this text suggests that he wants the Galatians to understand the importance of loyalty to his gospel in terms of the loyalty demanded by Deuteronomy itself. Hence Paul's modification of Deut 27.26 and the connection of this modification with the motif of Israel's sin with the Golden Calf, which Paul alludes to in 1.6, indicates that he grounds his assertion of a curse on ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου on the theme of loyalty to the Lord in Deuteronomy itself. And in spite of the fact that the troublemakers likely also appeal to the category of "sons of Abraham" and thus may have used the promise of blessing for the nations in Genesis, Paul's argument is that the works of the law which the troublemakers demand must not be added to the promise to Abraham because these works of the law were intended for a specific period in Israel's history.

ἐξ ἔργων νόμου turns is the issue of the justification of the gentiles by faith. Those who follow this rule are blessed with Abraham,¹⁰³ and those who do not are under the curse. Paul's citation of Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10, therefore, supports his assertion that ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσιν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν because ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου have been disloyal to the covenant as it was expressed to Abraham through the promise that all nations would be blessed through Abraham's descendants.

It is important to recognize, furthermore, that the text Paul cites pronounces a curse on an individual who is guilty of failure to remain within the law.¹⁰⁴ This focus on the individual who is under the curse for violation of the covenant is explicit elsewhere in Deuteronomy (13.1ff.; and 29.18-21). And Paul explicitly states in Gal 1.9 that a curse is on the individual who preaches another gospel to the Galatians (εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω). To be sure, the curse of the covenant (i.e. the exile) on the nation of Israel for her idolatry is an important theme in Deuteronomy, but it is significant that Paul does not cite from a text in which this is explicit, but rather cites a text which focuses on the individual. Thus it is doubtful that Paul cites Deut 27.26 because the nation of Israel is still under the curse of the exile.¹⁰⁵

Thus the logic of Paul's assertion in Gal 3.10a which is supported by Deut 27.26 in 3.10b demands that we understand ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου as something less than obedience and faithfulness to the law.¹⁰⁶ And we have argued that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is a

¹⁰³See also Gal 6.16, where Paul pronounces a blessing on those who follow the rule that circumcision is not an important issue. Cf. Jaquette: 165.

¹⁰⁴So Stanley 1990: 484-485; Matlock: 5; and Bonneau: 61-62. Scott 1993a: 197 correctly concludes that the curse is the result of apostasy, but fails to recognize this important point.

¹⁰⁵So also Bonneau: 62.

¹⁰⁶Several have made this observation recently. Cf. Dunn 1993a: 172-173; idem 1990: 226; idem 1991: 311; Betz: 146; Boyarin: 137-141; Morland: 208-209; and Cranford: 249. The present study argues that the specific way in which they have failed to do all the law is through their opposition to Paul's gospel, which is grounded on the promise to bless all nations through Abraham's descendants and which is an important part of the law itself. And Paul interprets this promise of blessing for gentiles to be a blessing apart from works of the law. This is clear especially in the statement in 3.9 that οἱ ἐκ πίστεως

reference to the troublemakers who are compelling the Galatians to accept works of the law. In Gal 3.8-10 obedience to the law includes faithfulness to the gospel, which is the promise to bless all the nations through Abraham's descendants.¹⁰⁷ Paul argues that the law was added after the promise and thus could not change the terms of the promise, and the law was intended to restrict and guard Israel for a period of time in redemptive history, a time which is now over for those in Christ. Because they have limited the full expression of God's covenant blessing to those who have identified with ethnic Israel and they are also compelling gentiles to observe works of the law, ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under the curse because they have been disloyal¹⁰⁸ to God's covenant purpose to bless the nations through Abraham's descendants.¹⁰⁹ This disloyalty is tantamount to

εὐλογεῖνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. For the blessing comes to those of faith, and in light of the juxtaposition of works of the law and faith in 3.1-5, Paul certainly intends that this blessing is not on those who are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.

¹⁰⁷Paul clearly thinks that νόμος includes elements from the patriarchal narrative, as Gal 4.21 indicates. So correctly Braswell: 78; and Cousar: 74. The troublemakers may also have included the promise to Abraham in their own proclamation to the Galatians, and if so, they certainly will have insisted that this promise of blessing for gentiles only comes to gentiles who are circumcised (Martyn 1985: 321-323). We have argued that Paul states, based on his understanding of scripture and the Galatians own experience, that this blessing comes to gentiles and to Jews apart from works of the law.

¹⁰⁸Hong 1993: 81-82, 140 correctly points to disloyalty to God as the reason for the curse, but he nevertheless maintains the traditional interpretation. Cf. also idem 1994: 175-177. The troublemakers may have used the motif of loyalty to the Lord through obedience to the commandments in their preaching in the Galatians churches. But Paul clearly begins this letter with a warning to the Galatians that they are in danger of disloyalty to the Lord (1.6) and the pronouncement of a curse on anyone who preaches another gospel (1.8-9). Thus for Paul the issue of loyalty to the Lord is bound closely with the gospel he preached to the Galatians, and this gospel has extended blessing to the gentiles apart from works of the law. Paul was commissioned to proclaim this gospel to all nations through the revelation of God's son in him (1.16) and this gospel was proclaimed beforehand to Abraham (3.8).

¹⁰⁹Morland: 209 correctly concludes that "the point at issue is not faith as a personal, intellectual belief. It is rather faith as a constituting element and mark for the Christian community, as an interpersonal act that overturns the division between Jews and Gentiles." The issue for Paul is how Jews and gentiles are related in the covenant community based on faith in Christ, not works of the law. However, Morland seems to argue further that those who rely on works of the law are faced with an impossible dilemma because "...persons who claim obedience to the law cannot at the same time also practice faith as the mark of identity. It is impossible to include the Gentiles both on the basis of the Sinai covenant and on the basis of the Abraham promise as interpreted by Paul. The two principles have to be played off against each other..." Morland apparently

idolatry because it requires that gentiles be circumcized when that function for the law is no longer relevant in Christ.

The results of our examination of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic tradition may help to clarify the underlying logic because these results point clearly to the conclusion that the text Paul cited in Gal 3.10b functions to place the covenant curse on apostates, especially those who reject exclusive devotion to the Lord alone and serve other gods. Moreover, our study in Chapter Five has indicated that this covenant perspective was widespread in the postbiblical period. The present study argues that Paul's use of Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10b to support his assertion that ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν operates within this traditional framework because ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου have been disloyal to the covenant and their disloyalty is tantamount to idolatry.¹¹⁰ The question we have addressed is how they have been disloyal. They have been disloyal because they are now compelling what is intended in redemptive history to be a function of the law for a period of time which is now over. In tracing the path of Paul's argument as he moved from the promise of blessing for all nations to the curse, we have argued that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under the curse because they have been

incorrectly assumes that Paul thought that the law and faith were both equally valid now as a means of definition for the covenant people. Paul has not played the two against each other, but rather he has argued that to elevate the distinctive marks of the law as a means of definition for the covenant people now puts one under the curse because the law's role in this capacity is over (Gal 3.15-29). Furthermore, Moreland (idem: 211) vacillates between the traditional view and his more innovative thesis: "On one hand Deut 27.26 curses the opponents based on the empirical fact that nobody has been able to keep the law. On the other hand it may even curse the opponents because they do not practice faith as the main mark of identity for the Christian church." From this perspective, the latter point functions merely as one of the commandments of the law, and the violation of any single commandment leads to the curse. Our argument in Chapter Three and Chapter Five is that the explicit reason for the curse is consistently the failure to remain faithful to the Lord through devotion to other gods. If this motif has informed Paul's argument in Gal 3.10 in any way, then what Morland terms the failure to "practice faith as the main mark of identity for the Christian church" is analogous to the failure to remain faithful to the Lord in Deuteronomy.

¹¹⁰Garlington 1997: 109-110.

disloyal to the gospel of Jesus Christ, which now functions as the focal point for covenant loyalty.¹¹¹

C. Conclusion

The present study has argued in chapter six that according to Paul in his letter to the Galatians, the gospel he preached among the gentiles is the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham to bless the nations through his descendants. This blessing has come through and in Jesus Christ and all who are in Christ are Abraham's descendants and heirs of the promises. Gentiles who have placed their faith in Christ do not need to be circumcised in order to join or continue in the people of God. This is at the heart of the truth of the gospel that Paul so vigorously defended in Jerusalem, at Antioch, and in the form of his letter to the Galatians. Moreover, the present study has argued that those who are disloyal to the covenant and its central obligation are under the curse. For Paul the gospel functions as the focal point of the covenant loyalty for those in Christ, and all who are disloyal to God's covenant purpose are under the curse because they have failed to do all that the law required. Accordingly, ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under the curse because they maintain ethnic distinctions within the community and thus they compel gentiles to observe these Jewish distinctive elements. Furthermore, the primary purpose of this curse is the purity and protection of the covenant community and the preservation of covenant loyalty among the Galatians. The present study will next examine how other texts in Galatians, with various degrees of clarity, also evidence this Deuteronomistic framework of interpretation. This task will help to confirm that our thesis for Gal 3.10 is plausible within the argument of the letter as a whole.

¹¹¹idem 1997: 106-109.

To be sure, Paul's argument that faithfulness to Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh meant that gentiles might become sons of Abraham and heirs of the promise through faith in Christ, and not through circumcision and other "works of the Law" is not found elsewhere in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, which demanded circumcision for all male children born of Jewish parents and also commonly viewed the requirements of the law as necessary for gentile converts to Judaism.¹¹² Thus Paul's understanding of the grounds on which a gentile might belong to the covenant community significantly contrasts with most of his Jewish contemporaries. However, the way in which Paul frames his polemic against those who from his perspective were disloyal to the covenant shares a large degree of similarity with most, if not all, of the Jewish literature of this period. And Paul derived this framework for his argument from the Jewish scripture. Paul, like many of his contemporaries in Judaism, was greatly influenced by Deuteronomy and he argued that those who were under the curse were those who preached a gospel among the Galatians which was different from the one that they had already received ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως (3.2) and ἐκ πίστεως (3.9). These troublemakers thus were disloyal to God's covenant purpose for his people as it was first promised to Abraham that gentiles would be blessed through his descendants.

¹¹²McKnight 1991: 79-82; and Nolland: 173-194. *Pace* McElaney: 326-333.

Chapter Eight

The Deuteronomistic pattern as it relates to the Gospel of Jesus Christ elsewhere in Paul's Letter to the Galatians.¹

I. Introduction

In the previous two chapters we have argued for an exegesis of Gal 3.10 within the context of the gospel of Jesus Christ which provides blessing for the nations and which sanctions the curse of the law on those who distort this gospel and thus are disloyal to God's covenant purpose. The thesis argued above that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under a curse because they are apostates from the gospel may be confirmed by an examination of other traces of the same perspective elsewhere in Galatians.² The present study, first,

¹It is not the purpose of this thesis to suggest that Paul's use of the Deuteronomistic tradition is monolithic, but rather to argue that it formed an interpretive framework within which his whole argument functions. To be sure, Paul did emphasize various themes at different points in this letter. Our examination of other places in Galatians which provide evidence that apostates are under the curse thus will note both points of contact and points of difference between them and Gal 3.10. However, the widely acknowledged thematic unity of Galatians and its narrow focus on the gospel (cf. e.g. Hansen 1989: 67-70), which means the inclusion of gentiles through faith in Jesus Christ and the challenge to that gospel posed by the troublemakers' requirement of circumcision (cf. e.g. Barclay 1988: 36-74; Gordon 1987: 32-43; Räisänen 1992: 21; Hong 1993: 103; Lührmann: 3; and Bonneau: 62-71), provides the ground for the argument that Paul's train of thought in Gal 3.8-10 may be evidenced in other places in this letter. On the thematic unity of Gal 1-4 and the importance of the theme of the inclusion of the gentiles, see Howard: 46-49.

²Due to space limitations, our study is necessarily restricted to Galatians, but a number of other texts in the undisputed Paulines may also provide evidence of this same Deuteronomistic pattern. In I Thess 2.13-16 Paul describes the persecution the Thessalonians faced at the hands of their own countrymen and compares it to the churches in Judea who faced similar persecution from the Jews (2.14: ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων). Among their sins is the fact that they hinder the gospel which is preached to the gentiles (2.16: κωλύοντων ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσιν λαλῆσαι ἵνα σωθῶσιν) with the result that the wrath of God has come upon them (2.16: ἐφθασεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος). In I Cor 16.22 Paul states εἰ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον ἢ τὸ ἀνάθημα. Love for the Lord is one of the central obligations in Deuteronomy. Compare also Rom 2.22 (cf. Garlington 1990: 142-151.); I Cor 10.14 (Hays 1989: 96 thinks that Paul is here referring to the Golden Calf); II Cor. 11.1-4; and Phil 3.1-21. Cf. also I Cor 9.16, where ἀνάγκη οὐαί, and the motif of the proclamation of the gospel are conjoined. Some scholars take οὐαί to refer to God's eschatological judgment. See, for example, Sandnes: 124; and Stuhlmacher: 152.

will examine two passages in Galatians in which the same covenant perspective is evidenced as it relates to the gospel of Jesus Christ and the necessary loyalty to that gospel. In these passages Paul explicitly linked the danger of the acceptance of the other gospel with apostasy, especially that of idolatry. The first occurrence (1.6-9) links the danger of apostasy for the Galatians with Israel's apostasy (i.e. her idolatry) in the Jewish scripture, and the second (4.8-10) links the present danger with the Galatians' own past in paganism. Paul's polemic in these two important passages in his letter to the Galatians thus is framed in terms which denote that the Galatians are in danger of recapitulating Israel's sin of idolatry or of returning to their own idolatrous past.

Moreover, this study will then consider three other passages in which the same connection is perhaps more subtle, but nevertheless equally clear. First, we will examine a passage (Gal 2.18) in which Paul stated that if he rebuilt the law as a requirement for gentiles, he would be a covenant breaker (παραβάτης). Second, we will see that Paul may have applied covenant curse language to the troublemakers, who were identified as the present Jerusalem (Gal 4.21-31). And third, we will argue that it is significant that Paul bracketed his assertion that "the circumcised" (οἱ περιτευνόμενοι) do not keep the law (6.13a) with statements that they compelled (6.12: οἱτοὶ ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτεμεσθαι) and wanted (6.13b: θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτεμεσθαι) the Galatians to be circumcised. These passages indicate that several other places in Paul's letter to the Galatians also point toward this theological framework from which Paul argued in his attempt to convince the Galatians to remain loyal to the Lord and the gospel of Jesus Christ.

II. The Imminent Apostasy of the Galatians in 1.6-9 and 4.8-10

A. Gal 1.6-9

Commentators have long noted that Paul begins this letter in a manner which contrasts sharply with his typical practice.³ His use of *θαυμάζω* in 1.6 immediately confronts the reader with the central issue at stake⁴: Paul's concern that the Galatians are on the verge of apostasy.⁵ This is confirmed by two elements within verse six. First, commentators have long noted the echo of Israel's sin at Sinai with the Golden Calf in Paul's use of *οὕτως ταχέως*.⁶ Just as the Israelites broke the covenant with the Lord and its central obligation when they turned so quickly to idolatry at Sinai with the Golden Calf,⁷ so also the Galatians are in danger of breaking their central obligation of loyalty to the Lord which is expressed through loyalty to the Gospel.⁸ Hence, Mussner is correct in his observation that "Der 'Abfall' der Galater ist also für den Apostel ein Abfall vom Evangelium. Sie werden dem Ruf Gottes untreu!"⁹ Thus, this apostasy which is disloyalty to the call of God is focused on the gospel. The clear implication of Paul's use of this echo therefore is that the Galatians are in danger of repeating Israel's sin in the wilderness.¹⁰

³Cf. Bruce 1982a: 79-80; Lightfoot: 75; Longenecker: 13; Lührmann: 1; Dunn 1993a: 38-39; and Ebeling: 42. Paul typically began with a statement of thanksgiving for his readers. In the undisputed Paulines, cf. Rom 1.8; I Cor 1.4; Phil 1.3; I Thess 1.2; and Phm 1.4. II Cor is another exception to this pattern, and given its highly polemical nature, may provide a parallel with Galatians at this point. II Cor, however, begins with a blessing pronounced with reference to God.

⁴Bruce 1982a: 80; Hughes: 215-216; Hansen 1994: 195; idem 1989: 33; Hong 1993: 29; Morris: 39; and Cosgrove: 27.

⁵The present tense (*μετατίθεσθε*) strongly points in this direction. Cf. Longenecker: 14; Burton 1920: 18-19; Morris: 40; Dunn 1993a: 40; Matera: 45; George: 91; Martyn: 108; and Ebeling: 44.

⁶The language of the LXX provides a verbal link between Gal 1.6 and Ex 32.8 (*παρέβησαν ταχύ ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ*) and Deut 9.16 (*παρέβητε ταχύ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ*). Cf. Mussner: 53; Longenecker: 14; Betz: 47; and Dunn 1993a: 40.

⁷Cf. Hafemann: 197-198.

⁸Ebeling: 47 makes this same point: "...the charge is transgression of the first commandment."

⁹Mussner: 54-55.

¹⁰Cf. also Judg. 2.17, where Israel's sin of idolatry is termed a quick departure from the way they had been commanded.

Second, the language Paul uses in connection with this impending apostasy (μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ...εἰς...) ¹¹ is the language used in a passage in the LXX for those who turn from devotion to the Lord to other gods. ¹² In the LXX translation of I Kgs 21.25 (= [LXX] III Kgs 20.25), the verb μετατίθημι is used in reference to King Ahab, who was led astray into idolatry by his wife, Jezebel. Moreover, in the time of the Maccabees, this language of apostasy came to be applied to devotion to the law. In II Macc 7.24 Antiochus promised the youngest in a series of brothers who all remained loyal to the law that he would make him both rich and happy, if he would turn from the laws of his fathers (μεταθέμενον ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων νόμων). ¹³ Hence, when Paul used the language which indicated that the Galatians were in danger of turning from the Lord to someone or something else, he employed language which could indicate potential apostasy and disloyalty to the covenant. ¹⁴

The crucial point to make for the present study, however, is that Paul began this letter to the Galatians with a statement which explicitly stated that they were in danger of apostasy from the Lord because they were contemplating a turn from the Lord to another gospel. For Paul the specific occasion for the Galatians' impending defection from the Lord was their acceptance of another gospel.

In verse seven Paul identifies the source of the Galatians' potential apostasy. The danger the Galatians' face comes from οἱ ταρασσοντες ὑμᾶς, that is, those who want to lead them to apostasy. Although ταρασσειν may denote more broadly any political

¹¹Cf. Ebeling: 43-44; and Wright 1994: 231.

¹²The converse of this is used by Paul to describe the conversion of the Thessalonians (cf. I Thess 1.9: καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ). Thus the language of turning from someone to someone is rooted either positively in conversion or negatively in apostasy.

¹³Cf. Mussner: 54; and Matera: 45.

¹⁴According to Weinfeld: 83-84, this language is common in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic literature. For a possible Greco-Roman background for this term, cf. Martyn: 108.

agitation,¹⁵ in this context it refers to those who would lead God's people into apostasy.¹⁶ The group that Paul designates οἱ παράσσοντες ὑμᾶς do this because they want to pervert (θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ) the gospel. Betz has captured the force of Paul's argument:

...if the Galatians were to go over completely to the opposition, they would become, in the Pauline sense, apostates.¹⁷

This other gospel is so radically different from that entrusted to Paul and preached by him that to preach or accept it is, essentially, to abandon the Lord.

This line of interpretation is confirmed by an examination of 1.8-9, in which Paul twice pronounces ἀνάθεμα on anyone who preaches another gospel.¹⁸ K. Sandnes has linked the structure of these two verses with Deut 13, which three times details the danger of someone¹⁹ coming into the community of Israel and leading some within the

¹⁵Dunn 1993a: 43; Longenecker: 16; and Betz: 49.

¹⁶This verb is used twice in I Maccabees for those who led the movement toward apostasy at that time. Cf. I Macc 3.5: τοὺς παράσσοντας τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; and 7.22: οἱ παράσσοντες τὸν λαὸν αὐτῶν. This last passage comments concerning this group: καὶ ἐποίησαν πληγὴν μεγάλην ἐν Ἰσραὴλ, perhaps in reference to the curse of Deuteronomy on those who abandon the Lord. In noun form it is included in a list of the effects of idolatry (Wisd. Sol. 14.25). Compare also Ben Sira 28.9: καὶ ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλὸς ταραξεί φίλους. In the LXX addition to the beginning of Esther the term is used three times (twice in noun form, once in verb form) for the troubling effect of heathen nations on "the nation of the just" (δικαίων ἔθνος). See also Barclay 1988: 36: "Paul's choice of terms for his opponents may echo the Old Testament references to those who 'trouble' Israel."

¹⁷Betz: 50. He rightly links μεταστρέφειν in v.7 with μετατιθέναι in v.6, thus making the charge of apostasy in v. 7 clear.

¹⁸Sandnes: 70 argues that these verses are directed at the troublemakers: "It is beyond doubt that the curse has a reference to the intruders." Longenecker: 18 links this curse with "the judicial wrath of God." So also Lührmann: 12; George: 98-99; and McKnight 1995: 51. On the other hand, see the more careful treatment of Dunn 1993a: 44-47, who rightly argues that the point stressed by Paul is not so much punishment, but rather the protection and purity of the Galatian communities. Cf. also Ebeling: 59: "The sole purpose of the anathema is to maintain the purity of the gospel and the blessing it brings."

¹⁹The danger comes from a false prophet (13.1-5), a relative (13.6-11), or some worthless men (13.12-18. LXX: ἄνδρες παράνομοι). Deut 13 is summarized by the promise that the Lord would bless Israel according to the terms of the promise to Abraham if they

covenant community to another god. He notes the structure of Paul's argument in Gal 1.8-9:²⁰

v. 8

conditional clause: ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται [ὑμῖν]
with accusation: παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν
punishment: ἀνάθεμα ἔστω

v. 9

conditional clause: εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται
with accusation: παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε
punishment: ἀνάθεμα ἔστω

Sandnes then points to a similar structure for the three instances in Deut 13 in which the people of God are seduced to apostasy:²¹

Deut 13.2-6:

conditional clause: ἐὰν δὲ...
with accusation: λατρεύσωμεν θεοῖς ἑτέροις
punishment: ἐκεῖνος ἀποθάνειται...
καὶ ἀφανιεῖς τὸν πονερὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν

Deut 13.7-11:

conditional clause: ἐὰν δὲ...
with accusation: λατρεύσωμεν θεοῖς ἑτέροις
punishment: ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν...λιθοβολήσουσιν αὐτόν...
ἀποθάνειται

Deut 13.13-18:

conditional clause: ἐὰν δὲ...
with accusation: λατρεύσωμεν θεοῖς ἑτέροις
punishment: ἀναιρῶν ἀνελεῖς...
ἀναθεματι ἀναθεματιεῖτε...

remain loyal to the Lord and keep all the commandments, which in this context can only refer to exclusive worship of the Lord.

²⁰Cf. Sandnes: 70-71.

²¹idem: 71.

As Sandnes observes, "in all the instances the accusation is one of apostasy."²² Sandnes draws our attention to three significant points of contact between Deut 13 and Gal 1.8-9: both texts "...deal with preaching based on revelation," "the activity of Deut 13 seduces to θειοὶ ἕτεροι; in Gal 1.6 to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον," and "the punishment in both texts is a curse (ἀνάθεμα)."²³ The formal similarity between Deut 13 and Gal 1.8-9 indicates that Paul was influenced by this Biblical tradition when he wrote Galatians. Moreover, this link with Deut 13 indicates that for Paul the curse was upon apostates,²⁴ and one became an apostate by preaching another gospel which was a perversion of the gospel Paul preached to the Galatians.²⁵ Thus Sandnes concludes that

The curse of God lay upon them because they had perverted the only true gospel. Compared to Deut 13, which forms a significant background for our exegesis of Gal 1.6-9, Paul's gospel replaces the fundamental demand to worship no other gods than Yahweh.²⁶

The curse that Paul twice pronounced is on those who preach another gospel, which functions as another god which entices God's people away from exclusive loyalty to him.²⁷

In the opening verses of the body of this letter, therefore, Paul significantly modified the standard epistolary form to which he regularly conformed in order to pronounce a curse on anyone who was not loyal to the Lord and abandoned him for another gospel. Within the context of the Galatian crisis and with those who have come

²²ibid. He notes that Deut 13 (LXX) refers to πλανήσαι σε ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου (v.6), ἀποστήσαι σε ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου (v.11), and ἀπέστησαν (v.14).

²³ibid.

²⁴Cf. Dion: 147-216.

²⁵One of the common agreements among interpreters of Galatians is that this other gospel focused on the obligation of circumcision for gentile converts. Cf. Bruce 1971: 263: "The most certain feature of the false gospel was its insistence on circumcision."

²⁶Sandnes: 73.

²⁷Such considerations make it doubtful that Paul has employed a magical text here, *Face Betz*: 53.

into the community to trouble the Galatians in view (1.7), the Galatians could only conclude that those who had preached another gospel to them were under the curse pronounced by divine law. Brinsmead correctly argues that the motif of abandonment of the Lord is woven throughout the entire letter.²⁸ In this important opening paragraph, therefore, Paul confronts the Galatians with the central concern of the letter, their impending apostasy under the influence of apostates who preach another gospel, and he presented himself as Israel's prophets did, pointing to the breach of the covenant, the occasion for that breach, and calling for loyalty on the part of the people of God.

B. Gal 4.8-11

In this passage Paul contrasts the Galatians' former life with their life now in Christ. Formerly (τότε) they did not know God (οὐκ εἰδότες θεόν) and were enslaved (ἐδουλεύσατε) to those who by nature were not gods (τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς);²⁹ but now they know God (νῦν δὲ γνόντες), or more properly stated, they have been known by God (μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ). This change of status from pagan idolators to those who now know God adds rhetorical sharpness to Paul's question in v.9:

πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα οἷς
πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦειν θέλετέ

It is especially to be noted that Paul states that the Galatians, if they accept the Jewish law through the rite of circumcision, would be returning again to their former status as

²⁸Cf. Brinsmead: 190. Although he helpfully draws our attention to the presence of this motif in several important texts with which the present study is concerned, he does not do so with respect to Gal 3.10. However, his inclusion of 3.1-5 helps to clarify the context of an interpretation of Gal 3.10 within the parameters of this key motif in Galatians.

²⁹This language reflects a standard Jewish terminology in reference to gentiles which has its roots in the Jewish Scriptures. Cf. Jer 2.11; 5.7; 16.20; Isa 37.19; II Chr 13.9; Ep Jer 16, 23, 30, 49, 51, 52, 65, 72; Dunn 1993a: 224; Bruce 1982a: 201; Matera: 152; Lührmann: 83; and Betz: 213-215.

idolaters, and thus they would be apostates.³⁰ N. Calvert states the issue in this text in the sharpest possible manner:

The Gentiles were formerly idolaters. Paul is accusing them of returning to their idols.³¹

Although this connection that Paul draws between the danger of the acceptance of the Jewish law and a return to paganism has long puzzled scholars,³² three elements of the text indicate that Paul indeed equated the Galatians' acceptance of circumcision and the observance of other elements of the law with the worship of and devotion to idols.

First, Paul questions how those who formerly had been enslaved to idols can desire (θέλειν³³) to turn again to the worship of them (ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν/πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε). Paul's use of the adverbs πάλιν and ἄνωθεν clearly implies that the Galatians are in danger of returning to their former life as pagans with its concomitant idol worship.³⁴ Longenecker writes that Paul's use of these two adverbs:

³⁰Paul may be referring to this danger of apostasy in 5.2-4 when he writes that if the Galatians receive circumcision, then Christ will be of no benefit to them (5.2: Χριστός ὑμῶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει) and they will be cut off from Christ (5.4: κατηρήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ) and have fallen from grace (5.4: τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε). Compare also 6.8 where the one who sows to his own flesh will reap destruction (θερίσει φθοράν).

³¹Calvert: 225. Cf. also Sanders 1983: 101; McKnight 1995: 217; and Howard: 76-78.

³²Bruce 1982a: 202-203 refers to this as "...an astonishing statement for a former Pharisee to make...".

³³The present tense of the verb indicates that the action is still in progress, that is, the Galatians are still facing this choice and have not yet made this crucial decision. See Lightfoot: 171; and Longenecker: 181.

³⁴Martin 1995: 437-461 has applied rhetorical theory to Galatians and has argued that the Galatians did return to paganism because they would not accept circumcision under pressure from those who came in and troubled them. According to Martin, Paul thus argues against this other gospel in order to draw the Galatians, who have returned to their pagan idolatry, back to Christ. Cf. also Betz: 216. However, Ebeling: 46 is certainly correct: "The situation would be clearer (because it would be unambiguous) if the Galatians had simply deserted Christ and the gospel to return to paganism." The whole thrust of Paul's letter to the Galatians is not that they have returned to paganism, but rather that they are in danger of becoming apostates by turning to the law. Martin's article thus illustrates the limitations of rhetorical analysis of Galatians when such conclusions fail to account for the clear direction of the argument beginning in 1.6ff. On the limitations of rhetorical criticism, see Dunn 1993a: 20; and Martyn 1997: 20-23. For a more helpful application of rhetorical analysis to Galatians, see Hansen 1989: 23-44 who argues that Gal 4.8-11 forms a restatement of an initial rebuke in 1.6-9: "The restatement

...emphasizes the fact that by taking on Torah observance Gentile Christians would be reverting to a pre-Christian stance comparable to their former pagan worship.³⁵

Longenecker uses the language of "comparable to" because he wants to refrain from suggesting that Paul viewed paganism and the Mosaic law as qualitatively the same.³⁶ But this is, in one sense, to miss the significance of Paul's argument within its redemptive historical context. For Paul here is not castigating Israel's past, but rather the present requirement of circumcision for gentiles who have placed their faith in Christ.

Second, Paul's employment of the verb ἐπιστρέφετε indicates that he thought that the Galatians were in danger of returning to paganism through the acceptance of elements of the law which defined ethnic Israel.³⁷ In the LXX this verb is used both positively of Israel's returning to the Lord³⁸ and negatively of her turning to other gods.³⁹ Likewise, in the New Testament the term refers either to conversion or to apostasy.⁴⁰ Hence, Paul here is drawing on the commonly recognized language for apostasy in Second Temple Judaism and has applied it to those Galatians who were contemplating⁴¹ such an apostasy from the Lord.⁴²

of this rebuke in 4.9 charges the readers with a return to paganism (idem: 97). For Hansen (idem: 59) this apostasy is made clear when Paul "...charges them with turning away from faith in Christ and the experience of the Spirit to works of the Law and τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα (4.9)."

³⁵Longenecker: 181.

³⁶ibid.

³⁷Cf. Dunn 1993a: 225: "The assessment was not merely ironic: in turning *to* the traditional Jewish understanding of the covenant as defined by the law, they were actually turning *away from* the God of Israel's covenant." Italics are the author's. Hence the pattern of thought in Gal 4.9 is similar to that found in 1.6.

³⁸Deut 30.2, 8-10.

³⁹Deut 31.18, 20. Cf. also Dunn 1993a: 225-226; Longenecker: 180; Betz: 216; and Calvert: 236-237.

⁴⁰Longenecker: 180; and Betz: 216.

⁴¹The present tense (ἐπιστρέφετε) once again suggests that this return was in process and had not yet completely occurred. Cf. Longenecker: 180; Betz: 216; and Dunn 1993a: 225-226.

⁴²In this connection, see Gal 1.6: μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον. Although different verbs are used in the two texts, the

Third, Paul's reference to that which the Galatians would return as ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα strongly evokes the image of paganism. For the στοιχεῖα here probably refers to the elemental forces in the world which were thought to control human destiny.⁴³ In Paul's argument the Galatians would return to these forces through a misplaced devotion to the works of the law:

Since they had already experienced freedom from precisely such slavery Paul found it hard to credit the reports that they wished to exchange their slavery to things which were in reality no gods for a slavery to the law misrepresented to function just like another false god.⁴⁴

Paul's statement that the Galatians wanted to be enslaved again (4.9: πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε) clearly links the present danger with their idolatrous past. Together with his assertion that the law would be a στοιχεῖον for the Galatians, Paul's point is clear. If the Galatians accepted the law, they would thereby be enslaved to another 'false god' which Paul equated with their former life in paganism.⁴⁵

These three considerations indicate that Paul thought that by turning to the law the Galatians would be returning to their pagan roots and they would thus be apostates.⁴⁶ N. Calvert has brought this point into focus for us:

...Paul makes the law the ultimate taboo for a child of Abraham by equating observance of law with idolatry...Now that the Christians in

pattern of thought is clearly the same. On the interpretation that the language of Gal 1.6 functions to indicate that the Galatians are in danger of apostasy, see the discussion on pp. 214-220 above.

⁴³Dunn 1993a: 226. Lührmann: 83-85 correctly identifies idolatry as the issue here but argues that Paul employs this language here because the troublemakers had made a positive connection between the law and the elements of the world. There is sparse evidence of such a connection, however.

⁴⁴Dunn 1993a: 226.

⁴⁵Cf. Stuckenbruck: 104-111. He argues that Paul does not accuse the troublemakers of angel worship and hence this text does not mean that the Galatians would literally be guilty of the worship of angels if they accept the troublemakers' gospel. Paul is here drawing an analogy between the Galatians' former life as idolators and their potential present acceptance of another gospel as idolatry.

⁴⁶Cf. idem: 109. Stuckenbruck highlights the conclusion that *Gentile* acceptance of the Torah *after Christ* "...would mark a 'return' to their former way of life."

Galatians are also children of Abraham by virtue of being 'in Christ', the idolatry which they are to avoid is obedience to the law.⁴⁷

In a recent article on Galatians, N. T. Wright makes this same point, but with a broader reference than the present work:

The irony of Paul's exposition at this point of the letter is of course that Israel has used the (god-given) Torah in the same way, locking herself up thereby inside her own nationalism, not realizing that the design of her god was that the covenant should be the means of his saving the world, and that she too needed liberating from the quasi-paganism involved in the idolization of nation, soil, and blood. That is why, in 4.8-11, the ex-pagan Galatian Christians are warned that if they become circumcised, that is, become ethnically Jewish, they will in effect be reverting to paganism.⁴⁸

In Gal 4.8-11, however, Paul is rebuking the Galatians and confronting the troublemakers, he is not condemning the whole nation of Israel.⁴⁹ Moreover, in the letter as a whole Paul confronted both the troublemakers and the Galatians for either preaching another gospel or being on the verge of accepting this gospel. Nowhere in this letter does he mount a polemic against Judaism. Thus it may be more faithful to Paul's argument to maintain a narrow focus for his admittedly negative references to the law in Galatians, and in Gal 4.8-11 in particular.

III. Other References

A. Gal 2.18

⁴⁷Calvert: 236-237. I understand "law" here in the sense of works of the law, as defined earlier in this thesis.

⁴⁸Wright 1994: 233. However, his argument here appears to be subordinate to his thesis that Israel is still in exile (*idem*: 234). Cf. also Wright 1992a: 240, where he makes a similar statement in connection with his exegesis of Rom 9.30-10.21 when he refers to "...this idolatry of national privilege..." to which Israel clung.

⁴⁹This is a crucial point which must be firmly maintained: Paul asserts that the Galatians themselves would be reverting to idolatry by accepting the law. The point is the idolatrous attachment to the law, not a polemic against Judaism *per se*.

Paul's use of the term παραβάτης in Gal 2.18 provides further evidence that he thought and constructed his argument within the covenant framework outlined in Chapter Three and argued above.⁵⁰ Even though the use of this term and its cognates is rare in the LXX⁵¹ and the Apocrypha,⁵² παραβάτης is used sufficiently often in Paul's letters for the conclusion to be drawn that it refers not merely to sin in general, but rather to violation of the law in particular.⁵³

Paul stated that he would be a παραβάτης if he rebuilt what he once tore down.⁵⁴ Some scholars argue that Paul meant that if he required works of the law in the churches he established, then he would admit that he had been a transgressor of the law during the period of his ministry when he did not require them. In "rebuilding" the law, Paul

⁵⁰This text within its context becomes even more significant for our interpretation of Gal 3.10 in its own context when we recognize the numerous links in the argument which tie these sections together. First, in both Christ's death is a foundational event (2.20 and 3.13). Second, the phrase ἔργων νόμου is a key theme in both (2.16 [3x] & 3.10. Cf. Barclay 1988: 81-83). Third, the truth of the gospel and the gospel preached to Abraham are at the center of the argument (2.14 and 3.8). Fourth, the failure of the law to justify is asserted in both (2.16c and 3.11: In fact, when Paul states that ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον, it is likely he is referring back to the point he had already made in 2.16c). Garlington 1997 has also argued in a similar manner for the importance of the argument in 2.17ff. for our understanding Gal 3.10-13. The observation that Paul raises issues in 2.15-21 which becomes main themes in Gal 3.1ff. is a regular feature of most interpretations of Galatians. See Stanley 1990: 497; Barclay 1988: 82; Hansen 1989: 106-107; Dunn 1993a: 132-150; and Stanton: 99-101.

⁵¹The noun παραβάτης never occurs, and παράβασις occurs once in Ps 100 (101).3, in which the clause ποιούντας παράβασις ἐμίσησα is parallel with οὐ προεθέμην πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου πρᾶγμα παράνομον. Thus in this Greek translation of a psalm transgression is viewed within the context of lawlessness.

⁵²In Wisd. Sol. 14.31 the phrase τὴν τῶν ἀδίκων παράβασιν clearly refers back to the extended discussion of the foolishness of idolatry which begins in 14.8. Thus παράβασις and idolatry are firmly linked together in this text. In II Macc 15.10 the phrase τὴν τῶν ὀρκῶν παράβασιν occurs, but it is not certain if this refers to the conduct of Jews or further refers to the falsehood of the gentiles (τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀθεσίαν), which is probably an allusion to their idolatry. Nevertheless, both phrases are set within the context of the reading of the law and the prophets (II Macc 15.9: καὶ παραμυθούμενος αὐτούς ἐκ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν).

⁵³Lambrecht: 211, 224-225; Burton 1920: 131; and Dunn 1993a: 143.

⁵⁴The echo of Jer 1.10 is clear. Cf. Dunn 1993a: 142.

then would have proven himself to have been a transgressor when he had "torn down" the law.⁵⁵ This interpretation, however, is not likely in view of συνιστάω, which is a present tense, indicative mood verb. The most natural translation of this verb in this clause is that "I demonstrate that I myself am a transgressor." Paul's hypothetical self-designation as a transgressor of the law therefore refers to the possibility of rebuilding the law, not to his former actions which involved the tearing down of certain requirements of the law for gentiles.⁵⁶ M. Bachmann has made this same point and has drawn out the significance of it for us:

...in V. 18a sei nicht der Abbau, sondern der Wiederaufbau von Gesetzesbedeutung der entscheidende Sachverhalt und genau dieses πάλιν οἰκοδομεῖν werte V. 18b als einen fundamentalen Verstoss gegen Gottes Heilswillen und -handeln.⁵⁷

Longenecker sees a similar significance for Paul's use of παραβάτης here: "It has to do with not just breaking a specific statute of the law but with setting aside the law's real intent."⁵⁸ To be a παραβάτης, therefore, means to strike a fundamental blow against the heart of the covenant relationship with the Lord and thus means that one is an apostate.⁵⁹ This fundamental offense against God's purpose in salvation is an offense

⁵⁵Cf. e.g. Boyarin: 115; Bruce 1982a: 142; Burton 1920: 130-132; Lightfoot: 117; Barclay 1988: 80; Lührmann: 48; Matera: 102; Amadi-Azuogu: 91; and Räisänen 1992: 121-122. See also the list of scholars who advocate this view in Hansen 1989: 241, n. 48. Matera: 95 thinks that if Paul reestablished the law, "...he would show that he is a transgressor of the Law since he no longer follows these laws, at least in Antioch."

⁵⁶So Lambrecht: 228-230; Hansen 1989: 106; idem 1994: 201; Martyn: 256; Morris: 88; Dunn 1993a: 142-143; and Garlington 1997: 90. Fung: 120-122 interprets this verse to refer to the rebuilding of the law but understands this within the context of the traditional view.

⁵⁷Bachmann: 56. On the rebuilding of the law as a betrayal of Christ which consists of a fundamental offense against the gospel, see Smiles: 261-266. In Smiles' argument loyalty to Christ replaces loyalty to the law.

⁵⁸Longenecker: 91. He continues: "So here in v 18 Paul insists that to revert to the Mosaic law as a Christian is what really constitutes breaking the law, for then the law's true intent is nullified." Cf. also Hansen 1989: 106.

⁵⁹Garlington 1997: 86-92, who helpfully draws attention to the significance of this text for the interpretation of Gal 3.10.

against the truth of the gospel (2.14) and the gospel preached to Abraham that all nations would be blessed through his descendants (3.8).⁶⁰ And it is precisely Paul's rebuilding of the law which would make him a transgressor,⁶¹ an apostate from the covenant.⁶²

Paul's argument here must also be seen in light of the incident at Antioch,⁶³ during which Paul defended the truth of the gospel against the hypocrisy of Peter and others. Paul may have intended that 2.18 be understood as a accusation against Peter.⁶⁴

⁶⁰Hansen 1989: 107.

⁶¹Lambrecht: 226-227 points out that some scholars who take this line of interpretation argue that one is a transgressor of the restored law because no one can perfectly keep the whole law. Restoration of the law would inevitably lead to condemnation and the curse because the law demands perfect obedience to each prescription, but no one can keep it perfectly. This interpretation thus operates under the same assumption as the traditional interpretation of Gal 3.10 outlined above. It is in this sense that by rebuilding the law Paul would be a transgressor. Lambrecht, however, argues against such an interpretation of Gal 2.18 and concludes that "...it is the restoration itself which also transgresses the new command to live solely for God" (idem: 229) and "...by the restoration of the Law Paul would destroy God's grace and become *ipso facto* a transgressor of that new command to live for God." (idem: 230). Lambrecht himself, however, fails to carry this insight through to his own interpretation of Gal 3.10 (idem: 271-298), in which he argues that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are cursed because although they do some things that the law requires, they "...apparently do not fulfill other prescripts of that same law. So, notwithstanding their partial obedience, they are cursed because of a remaining sinful neglect. Paul is convinced that the whole of the law must be obeyed." (idem: 281).

⁶²Gaston: 71 argues that Paul is an apostate if he builds up and then tears down the church. This appears to be forced into the context, however.

⁶³Hansen 1994: 201; and idem 1989: 100-108.

⁶⁴Cf. Smiles: 258; Longenecker: 90; Boyarin: 114; McKnight 1995: 124; and Dunn 1993a: 142. Although Dunn thinks that Paul is referring back to the Antioch incident, he softens the connection back to Peter. However, in light of the fact that Paul stated that Peter stood condemned (2.11: ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν) because of his actions in Antioch through which he compelled gentiles to behave like Jews (2.14: τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαίειν; on the possible link between ἀναγκάζειν and apostasy in several strands in the postbiblical period, see p. 187, n. 31 above), Peter may well be described as a παραβάτης because he did not walk in line with the truth of the gospel (2.14: οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; the image of walking correctly and not deviating to the right or left is a consistent motif in Deuteronomy to describe the demand for covenant loyalty) and he rebuilt the demands of the law for gentile believers. Whether or not Paul explicitly intended the connection between παραβάτης in 2.18 and Peter's actions in Antioch, his behavior in light of Paul's argument would best be described by this term.

Moreover, the Galatians must understand that the same accusation applies to the troublemakers and potentially to themselves⁶⁵:

...but it can be no accident that the contrasting possibilities represented in these verses line up neatly according to the options available to the Galatians. Verse 18 is illustrative of the action of the "false brethren" in Jerusalem, of Peter and company in Antioch and, above all, of the threatened apostasy of the Galatians.⁶⁶

To be a παραβάτης as Paul argued in 2.18, therefore, is to be a transgressor of the truth of the gospel. This is, in essence, the accusation in 1.6-9 and is the accusation to which Paul returns in 3.8-10 and 4.8-10.

B. Gal 4.21-31

Scholars typically acknowledge that in this section of Galatians Paul most clearly strains his application of scripture to the Galatian crisis.⁶⁷ This is due in large part to the

⁶⁵Once again the occasional nature of this letter must be kept in view. Paul is not leveling a charge against Judaism as a whole, but rather the charge of transgression is within the context of the Galatian crisis. So Brinsmead: 190; Amadi-Azuogu: 92; and Boyarin: 115.

⁶⁶Smiles: 258-259, who then rightly draws points of contact between Gal 2.18 and other texts in Galatians where "...Paul addresses the Galatians directly with regard to their impending apostasy." It is significant that Smiles includes Gal 1.6-9 and 4.8-9 within his argument of texts which must be brought to bear on our understanding of 2.18, and further that he points to the law's power to divide Jews and gentiles as a central concern which 2.18 addresses and which is illustrated by Peter's conduct at Antioch (idem: 259-261). However, Smiles fails to carry this insight through to his interpretation of Gal 3.10 (cf. idem: 228-242), which he understands to mean that the law is an oppressive power which curses all who transgress any of its commands." (idem: 242). Even though Smiles rightly argues against the traditional view (idem: 238-241), at the end of the day it appears that he is forced to return to this interpretation to make sense of Paul's argument in Gal 3.10.

⁶⁷Cf. Barclay 1988: 53: "Indeed, the Abraham story is invoked again in the extended allegory of 4.21-31, a passage whose use of scripture has often seemed to commentators even more forced and artificial than is usual for Paul." Barrett 1976: 15 has correctly noted that the troublemakers probably used detailed scriptural exegesis to support their claim among the Galatians and further that their motives, at least to themselves, were to interpret the Biblical account honestly and faithfully: "The Adversaries did not act out of mere personal spite or jealousy; they held a serious theological position which they supported by detailed biblical arguments."

general agreement that Paul, apparently interpreting in midrashic fashion,⁶⁸ was compelled to expound this story because it had been used by the troublemakers to demonstrate that children of Abraham were circumcised like Isaac.⁶⁹ It is not the purpose of the present study to examine all of the critical issues which a full exegesis of this text would require. Instead, our purpose will be limited to three possible points of contact between Gal 4.21-31 and our exegesis of Gal 3.10.⁷⁰

First, it is striking that Paul refers to the Genesis narrative he cited in Gal 4.21 as the law (τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε).⁷¹ The significance of this observation is intensified when we recognize that Paul has addressed the Galatians as οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι. Paul thus challenged the Galatians who wanted to place themselves under the law and thereby wanted to assume the covenant obligations required of faithful Jews to hear what the law itself said. It is probable that the clause τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε is intended as an echo of the central motif of Deuteronomy with respect to Israel's obedience to the covenant.⁷² Israel was repeatedly admonished to "hear"⁷³, that is to obey, the terms of the covenant. R. Longenecker has noted this correspondence:

⁶⁸Lincoln: 11-32.

⁶⁹Barrett 1976: 10-13; Lincoln: 12; Dunn 1993a: 243; idem 1993b: 96; and Longenecker: 200.

⁷⁰This link contrasts with the typical view that 4.21-31 is an appendix to Paul's argument. However, see Stanton: 109: "The Hagar-Sarah allegory is no mere awkward appendix; it recalls one of the passages in the narrative section of Galatians, and brings to a climax the argument Paul has been developing since 2:15-16."

⁷¹Face Hong 1993: 122-123, who concludes that 4.21b does not refer to the law of Moses in the same sense as 4.21a (and almost everywhere else in Galatians) because it "...plainly refers to the the story of Hagar in the Pentateuch, not to the Mosaic legislation." But three considerations make this conclusion unlikely. First, Genesis is part of the law of Moses and it is unlikely that a sharp distinction exists between narrative and legal code. The Pentateuch as a whole was the foundational document of Judaism. Second, the parallelism with 4.21a only works effectively if we understand that those who want to be under the law are admonished to listen to that law. And third, Paul's citation of an imperative from Gen 21.10 functions in Gal 4.30 as a commandment to be obeyed in a way analogous to the Mosaic legislation (Cf. pp. 224-225 below). Cf. Stanton: 115: "But in 4:21b Paul urges his hearers to listen to what the law really says...Paul does not speak about a different law in 4:21b." Cf. also Morris: 144; and Martyn: 433.

⁷²The classic text is, of course, Deut 6.4, but see also Deut 4.1ff; 5.1ff; 9.1; 11.13, 27; 12.28; 13.18; and 28.1ff.

So Paul's challenge is that if the Galatians would really "hear" the law –that is, understand it fully and respond to it aright– they would not regress to Jewish nomism, for, as he argued earlier, the law's purpose as a pedagogue was to function until the coming of Christ.⁷⁴

If this echo is intentional, then Paul, in a manner analogous to Gal 3.8-10,⁷⁵ has linked this Abrahamic narrative with one of the central motifs in Deuteronomy with respect to Israel's required obedience to the law and will proceed to describe covenant loyalty in terms of the imperative of this narrative (Gen 21.10=Gal 4.30).

Second, scholars debate the degree to which Paul was familiar with strands of tradition which eventually became a part of the written targums. Although we can not be certain with respect to each particular tradition, it is likely that Paul was familiar with at least some of the traditions later encoded in the targums. A significant tradition, which is also found in Rabbinic literature,⁷⁶ is that which linked Ishmael's behavior toward Isaac in Gen 21 with idolatry. The MT and LXX of Gen 21 indicate that Ishmael was "joking" or "playing" with Isaac, possibly with evil intent but not necessarily so (21.9: *קצק לִאֲבִרָהם יִלְדָה*/παίζοντα μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ).⁷⁷ Sarah insisted that Hagar and Ishmael be cast out of Abraham's house because of this behavior. The interpretation of the term *קצק* in the targums, however, reflects a concern with a very specific issue: Hagar and Ishmael were idolaters. For example, Sarah is said to have seen Ishmael "...doing improper actions, such as jesting in a foreign cult (or 'entertaining

⁷³This term is also important in the prophetic *בִּי* pattern, in which the prophet presents the Lord's covenant lawsuit against Israel for breach of the covenant. Compare Deut 32.1ff.; Isa 1.2-3; Micah 6.1-8; and Jer 2.4-13. See Hillers 1969: 124ff.

⁷⁴Longenecker: 207.

⁷⁵Cf. Stanton: 115, who links the interpretation of 4.21ff. with Gal 3.8. Cf. also Braswell: 78; and Lührmann: 89. Amadi-Azuogu: 261 links 4.21 with 1.6.

⁷⁶Cf. the helpful survey of traditions concerning this narrative in Longenecker: 200-206. It is possible to view Gal 4.21-31 as Paul's own targumic translation of Gen 21.9-10 which attempted to draw out the significance of this text for his own audience.

⁷⁷The piel participle *קצק*, used here in an obvious word play on *קצק*, Sarah's son, can refer to playing, joking or amusing oneself. It may also have a more malicious sense which would include fondling, playing around with, or mocking.

himself with idolatry')."⁷⁸ An even more elaborate example of this interpretation is found in another targum, in which Sarah sees Ishmael "...sporting with an idol and bowing down to it."⁷⁹ Scholars have usually expressed uncertainty about the significance of Paul's change of *παίζοντα* to *ἐδίωκεν* in this text. A. Lincoln notes the application of this scripture to the Galatian crisis:

Thus the persecution referred to in verse 29 must be seen as not only being perpetrated against the church by Judaism (cf. 1: 13, 23; 5: 11; 6:12) but also as taking in the behaviour of the Judaizers in troubling the church and mocking or jeering at the believers' claim to be heirs by faith alone (cf. 1: 7ff; 2: 4, 12f; 4: 17; 5: 7, 10, 12; 6: 17).⁸⁰

If Paul was familiar with the tradition which linked Ishmael with idolatry and his attempt to seduce Isaac into idolatry, then he may have intended for the Galatians to understand that the troublemakers "persecuted" the gentile Galatians through their attempt to persuade the Galatians to join them in faithfulness to the law through circumcision.

Third, Paul's use of Gen 21.10 probably is intended to apply specifically to the troublemakers; Paul likely used Gen 21.9-10 so that he could apply the imperative of Gen 21.10 to the situation in the Galatian churches.⁸¹ Indeed, A. Lincoln goes so far as to call Paul's use of Gen 21.10 here "...the punchline of Paul's polemical midrash."⁸² Paul does

⁷⁸Tg. Neof.

⁷⁹Tg. Ps.-J. The manuscript *Editio princeps* of Tg. Ps.-J reads: "bowing down to the Lord."

⁸⁰Lincoln: 27. Lührmann: 92 is typical of commentators who think that *ἐδίωκεν* is a reference to the persecution of Christian churches by Judaism

⁸¹Face Barrett 1976: 13 who thinks that this imperative is "...the command of God to his (angelic) agents, and expresses what the fate of each party is to be." Lightfoot: 184 argues that this statement in 4.30 "...sounds the death-knell of Judaism...". Morris: 149-150 thinks that the reference is to the Sinaitic covenant, not to the troublemakers.

⁸²Lincoln: 27. See also George: 347; Williams 1997: 131; and Hansen 1989: 145-154 who argues on the basis of his analysis of the letter within the form of a Rebuke-Request rhetorical form that the imperative in 4.30 is the focal point of the whole allegory: "Thus, it appears, the focal point in the Hagar-Sarah allegory is the imperative to expel the bondwoman 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."

not have all Jews, or even all Jewish-Christians, in view here.⁸³ Within the context of his rhetorical question in 4.21 (τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε), the rhetorical force thus would be that the Galatians must "hear" the law, that is they must obey the law's commandments,⁸⁴ so that they might cast out the troublemakers, that is, treat them as apostates from the covenant. It is possible that Paul's imperative that the troublemakers be cast out from the Galatian churches is language which reflects the covenant curse in which those under the curse are to be excluded from the assembly.⁸⁵

These three factors suggest a link between Gal 4.21-31 and Gal 3.10 with respect to Paul's use of scripture to argue that the troublemakers should be excluded from the Galatian communities because they have been disloyal to the covenant as expressed to Abraham in the form of a promise to bless all nations through his seed. In Gal 4.21-31 Paul closely links the Abrahamic narrative with the demands of the law, as he did with respect to Gen 12.3/18.18 and Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.8, 10. He may also suggest that the activity of the troublemakers is tantamount to idolatry, if Paul was aware of and drawing on certain targumic traditions, which correspond to our argument above concerning the

⁸³So Longenecker: 217: "The directive of v 30 is not a broadside against all Jews or Judaism in general...Rather, here in v 30 Paul calls for the expulsion of the Judaizers who had come into the Galatian congregations from the outside. Indeed, they were Jewish Christians. But that does not mean that Paul saw all Jewish Christians or all Jews in the same light." See also Hansen 1989: 149; Dunn 1993b: 97-98; McKnight 1995: 232; Amadi-Azuogu: 290-291; and Lincoln: 17 who argues that Paul's reference to the present Jerusalem is motivated by the troublemakers own slogan (Ἱερουσαλήμ ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν).

⁸⁴Lincoln: 29.

⁸⁵Lincoln: 28-29 correctly notes other places in Galatians where Paul refers to the exclusion of the troublemakers from the Galatian churches. This thought may also lie behind Paul's statement in 5.12 that he wished the troublemakers would mutilate themselves (ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονταὶ οἱ ἀναστατούντες ὑμᾶς). Cf. Hansen 1989: 146 and Neyrey 1990: 190-192 (I owe the last reference to D. Garlington, who pointed out its possible relevance to this thesis at the 1995 SBL annual meeting in Philadelphia.), who have recently suggested Paul may have Deut 23.1 in mind and its exclusion from the assembly (LXX: εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου) for those who have been mutilated. However, Betz: 270 plays down the connection to Deut 23.1. More typical is the suggestion that Paul is playing on the confusion on the part of some pagans in the ancient world between circumcision and castration. See, for example, Segal: 208.

function of 3.10b to support 3.10a. And he orders the expulsion of the troublemakers, which corresponds to the primary function of the curse of the covenant within Judaism.

C. Gal 6.12-13

Paul's statement in Gal 6.13a that the troublemakers⁸⁶ do not keep the law has been difficult to reconcile with their apparent demand that the Galatians place themselves under the law:

But if the judaizers, after having taught the necessity of all the law, proved themselves to be law breakers, their influence would be damaged. It is this which Paul intends to show.⁸⁷

But the question remains, how did Paul demonstrate this? If we examine the immediate context, a striking observation emerges. For this verse is preceded by a statement that the Galatians are being compelled to accept circumcision (6.12: οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτευνόμενοι⁸⁸ = ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου?) and is followed by a similar statement (6.13b: θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι). Hence, the failure of 'those of the circumcision' to keep the law is set within the framework of the requirement of circumcision for gentile believers. The flow of thought in these verses is probably not accidental,⁸⁹ and it does conform to our

⁸⁶The referent for the substantive participle here (οἱ περιτευνόμενοι) is difficult to determine with certainty. The position taken here is that the rest of the letter makes it very likely that it refers to the troublemakers, who are Jewish Christians. *Face* scholars, such as Schoeps: 65; and Munck: 87-89, who argue based almost entirely on this verse that reference in this letter to the opponents in the Galatian churches refers to gentile converts who have been circumcised and are placing pressure on the Galatians to do likewise. On the interpretation of this participle, see Donaldson 1994: 177-179; Lightfoot: 222; Longenecker: 292; Dunn 1993a: 338; Hong 1993: 116-120; and George: 55-56.

⁸⁷Howard: 15.

⁸⁸Martin 1995: 452 argues that this participle refers to "... *those who practice the distinctions of circumcision.*"

⁸⁹Cf. Brinsmead: 189: "The opening and closing elements of the letter (1:1-5, 6:11-18) show striking modifications of Paul's epistolary practice, indicating that he has here incorporated items essential to the debate."

understanding of Gal 3.10 in which ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under the curse because they violate the covenant through their insistence that gentiles be circumcised and thus are under the curse of the covenant which is pronounced on apostates.

IV. Conclusion

In his letter to the Galatians, Paul has consistently argued that those who have come into the Galatian churches and have preached another gospel are under a curse. This is most clear in 1.6-9, but is also in evidence in other places in this letter. We have argued that the manner in which Paul begins his letter to the Galatians sets the tone for the rest of this letter, and if this is the case, then it is indeed surprising that Paul's perspective on the Galatian crisis as explicated in Gal 1.6-9 has not been brought to bear on the interpretation of Gal 3.8-10, especially since the motif of gospel/curse ties the two together very closely. Those who advocate circumcision for gentile converts thus find themselves outside the covenant and under a curse. Moreover, if the Galatians accept circumcision, they would find that they had reverted back to their status as pagan idolators and by implication would be under the curse. Hence, ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under a curse because they preach another gospel among the Galatian churches (1.8-9), and the Galatians are potentially under the curse if they accept circumcision because they have in effect returned to their idolatrous past (4.8-10).⁹⁰ Paul's focus in this letter is always on the situation that called forth this polemic response, and his polemical assertions must be understood within the context of this crisis.

⁹⁰Boyarin: 24 has correctly observed that if the Galatians accept circumcision, they will place themselves outside of the covenant: "They will thus show themselves precisely to be *outside of the covenantal promise and not within it as Paul's Jerusalem opponents would have it.*" Italics are the author's.

Chapter Nine

Conclusion

Our study began with the observation that Gal 3.10 is one of the most difficult texts in the Pauline corpus and is one which has received a considerable amount of attention in the last two decades. For Paul's assertion that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under the curse is supported by a text which appears to state the opposite, especially if the group identified in 3.10a is those who observe the law (i.e. all Jews). The traditional interpretation of this text argues that Paul's argument operates on the assumption that no one can keep the law perfectly and therefore everyone is under the curse of the law. Although Paul certainly argues elsewhere that all have sinned (e.g. Rom 3.23), we have argued in this thesis that the curse of the covenant comes upon those who reject the Lord and turn to other gods. Apostasy thus is the fundamental reason for the curse, and this is true both in Deuteronomy and in the literature of postbiblical Judaism.

The interpretation of Gal 3.10 has been the focus of a number of recent studies which have offered an alternative to the traditional view. And although our study has benefited from several of the insights these studies have produced, we have argued that none of them has satisfactorily placed Paul's use of Deut 27.26 within the context of Deuteronomy or the rest of the Jewish scripture. The curse in Deuteronomy functions to punish those who turn to other gods or who entice others to turn to other gods, and the curse also functions to protect the community from their harmful influence. In many texts in Deuteronomy, the curse applies to an individual or a small group of people. To be sure, when the entire nation turned from the Lord, they would experience the curse of the exile.

In order to develop this thesis, we devoted attention in Part One to the contexts of Paul's citation of scripture from Genesis and Deuteronomy. Our examination of the third strand of the promise to Abraham in Chapter Two pointed to the conclusion that, together with the promise of land and descendants, the promise of blessing for the nations is one of the three central strands of the promise and in fact it is the one given most attention in the original formulation of the promise. And although the promise is relatively rare outside of the Patriarchal narrative, in at least two texts it is cited explicitly and it is alluded to in several other places. The context of these other occurrences is the motif of blessing through the king of Israel and the restoration of Israel. In Chapter Three we examined the various terms for curse in Deuteronomy and argued that they are consistently used in the context of the failure to do all the law through the rejection of the Lord and devotion to other gods. This covenant perspective was then traced in several texts in the Deuteronomistic history and in Israel's prophetic literature.

In Part Two we devoted attention to the use of the motifs of blessing for the nations and the curse of the covenant in the literature of Second Temple Judaism. We did this not to argue that Paul was dependant on any particular strand of this literature, but to sketch the interpretive traditions of Paul's Jewish contemporaries. With respect to the third strand of the promise, we discovered in Chapter Four that several texts cite the promise, but either in subordination to Israel's covenant with the Lord (e.g. Ben Sira) and to Israel's status as God's people (e.g. Jubilees) or as a result of the ubiquitous presence of Judaism in the ancient world (e.g. Philo). In several important strands (Josephus and the Qumran literature), the third strand is absent. With respect to the curse of the covenant, we argued in Chapter Five that many strands of evidence from postbiblical Judaism point to the conclusion that this curse functions in a way similar to that in Deuteronomy. The covenant curse is mentioned often in the context of idolatry and the abandonment of the Lord for other gods. In some sectarian literature in this period the curse is employed in connection with some disputed point of practice or belief

in order to exclude other Jews from the category of those who remain faithful to the Lord.

In Part Three we turned our attention to the interpretation of Paul's use of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10. We argued in Chapter Six that in contrast to his Jewish contemporaries who either ignore the third strand or interpret it in an ethnocentric manner, for Paul blessing for the nations is a central aspect of God's covenant with Abraham. The importance for Paul of blessing for the nations is suggested by his account of his call to be an apostle because it is explicitly the gentile mission which he states is the purpose of his call. Paul's defense of the truth of the gospel both in Jerusalem and in Antioch points to its fundamental importance for him. Paul's conviction on this point led him to maintain firmly the truth of the gospel (Gal 2.5) and to confront Peter for failure to walk in accordance with it (Gal 2.11, 15). We then turned our attention to the interpretation of Gal 3.8. Paul's citation of Gen 12.3/18.18 is intended to point to an important aspect of God's covenant purpose for his people right from the start. This is confirmed both by Paul's statement that the promise to Abraham was the gospel preached beforehand to him and that it was a prophetic statement of scripture. Thus God's plan for his people is blessing for the nations, which is the gospel Paul preached. This is further established by Gal 3.15-18, in which the promise is given priority over the law in the sense that the law does not change the plan of God or its terms. For Paul, therefore, the truth of the gospel is a very serious matter and any attempt to change or hinder it is a serious offence.

In Chapter Seven we examined Paul's citation of Deut 27.26 to support his assertion that ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν. Paul's statement in 3.10a was the focus of attention first, and we further established the insight that ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is a reference to the troublemakers in Galatia, with perhaps an implied reference to the Galatians themselves if they accept the troublemakers gospel. We argued that the occasional nature of Galatians must be clearly in view for the interpretation of

Gal 3.10. It is precisely the troublemakers' other gospel which is at issue here because for Paul the designation ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου means to be in opposition to the gospel which was preached beforehand to Abraham and which Paul was commissioned to preach to the gentiles. Moreover, to be under the curse is a reference to the power of the curse to exclude a corrupting person or persons from the community in order to protect it from that harmful influence. Hence ὑπὸ κατάραν is not so much a reference to eternal destiny as it is a reference to the troublemakers as cursed and Paul's desire that the Galatians exclude them from the community, a point Paul makes explicit in Gal 4.30. Paul's support for 3.10a is to cite Deut 27.26, which we argued above is used in the context of the failure to do all the law through devotion to other gods. If the designation ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου refers primarily to the troublemakers (as we have argued it does), then Paul's citation of scripture functions to support the assertion that they have failed to do all that the law requires because they have preached another gospel among the Galatians, have not walked in line with the truth of the gospel, and find themselves in opposition to God's covenant purpose for his people. Thus Paul draws an analogy between the troublemakers' devotion to another gospel and the apostasy in scripture which is a devotion to another god. Paul's argument in Gal 3.10 is that the troublemakers' gospel with its devotion to the law after Christ has come (Gal 3.23-29) is tantamount to idolatry.

In Chapter Eight we argued that this thesis for the interpretation of Gal 3.8 and 3.10 within the context of God's covenant purpose for his people to bless the nations and the curse which falls on those who violate the covenant in a fundamental way is supported by the examination of several other texts in Galatians. Two texts are especially clear examples of this interpretive framework in Galatians, especially with respect to how Paul begins this letter (1.6-9) and how he confronts the Galatians with their impending apostasy from the gospel of Jesus Christ (4.8-10). On the one hand, Gal 1.6-9 suggests that the Galatians are in danger of repeating Israel's sin at Sinai. The other gospel which has been preached to them has placed them on the verge of turning from the God who called

them by grace to another gospel. When he alludes to Deut 13 in 1.8-9, Paul here links the troublemakers' other gospel with devotion to other gods. And those who preach another gospel are cursed (1.8-9). On the other hand, in Gal 4.8-10, Paul argues that if the Galatians accept the law which was presented to them by the troublemakers, then they are about to turn back to their status as idolators who are devoted to their pagan gods through their impending devotion to the law. Paul thus clearly draws an analogy between the Galatians' acceptance of the law now and their former status as idolators. This interpretive framework for the letter to the Galatians may also be noted, perhaps less clearly, at several other points in this letter.

Therefore, this thesis has been devoted to developing the argument that Paul understood the troublemakers' ministry of preaching another gospel to the Galatians and the Galatians' potential apostasy from the Lord within the context of Israel's paradigmatic experience.¹ We have argued that for Paul the heart of the covenant is the promise to Abraham to bless the nations through his descendants. This promise which is the gospel of Jesus Christ functions as the central obligation of the covenant for those who are in Christ, an obligation to which exclusive loyalty is demanded. Moreover, ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are under the curse of the law because they have violated this central obligation through their demand that the Galatians accept circumcision and perhaps other aspects of the law which separate Jew from gentile. In this demand for circumcision, the troublemakers have failed to remain within all things written in the book of the law and thus are under the curse of the law.

¹Cf. Neusner 1990.

Bibliography:

- Abegg, M.
1994 "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT." BAR, Vol. 20, no. 6. 52-55.
- Aberbach, M. and B. Grossfeld.
1982 Targum Onkelos to Genesis. A Critical Analysis Together With An English Translation of the Text. New York: Ktav.
- Ackroyd, P.
1968 Exile and Restoration. A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C., OTL. London: SCM Press.
- Alexander, T.
1994 "Abraham Re-Assessed Theologically: The Abraham Narrative and the New Testament Understanding of Justification by Faith." in He Swore an Oath: Biblical Themes from Genesis 12-50. Ed. R. Hess, G. Wenham, and P. Satterthwaite. Second Edition. Carlisle/Grand Rapids: Paternoster Press/Baker Book House. 7-28
- Allis, O.
1927 "The Blessing of Abraham." PTR, 263-298.
- Amadi-Azuogu, C.
1996 Paul and the Law in the Arguments of Galatians. A Rhetorical and Exegetical Analysis of Galatians 2,14-6,2. Bonner Biblische Beiträge. Band 104. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum.
- Attridge, H.
1976 The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 7. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

1984 "Josephus and His Works." in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Ed. M. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press. 185-232.
- Bachmann, M.
1992 Sünder oder Übertreter. Studien zur Argumenation in Gal 2,15ff. W.U.N.T. 59. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Baird, W.
1985 "Visions, Revelations, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Cor 12:1-5 and Gal 1:11-17." IBL. 651-662

- Baltzer, K.
1971. The Covenant Formulary. Trans D. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press
- Barclay, J.
1987 "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case." JSNT, 31, 73-93
- 1988 Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Bar-Kochva, B.
1989 Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barrett, C. K.
1976 "The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians." Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag. Heraus J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann, und P. Stuhlmacker. Tübingen/Göttingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)/Vandenkoeck & Ruprecht. 1-16.
- Beker, J. C.
1980 Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Belleville, L.
1986 "'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3.21-4.11." JSNT, 53-78.
- Betz, H. D.
1979 Galatians. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Bickerman, E.
1979 The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt. Trans H. Moehring. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Boers, H.
1994 The Justification of the Gentiles: Paul's letters to the Galatians and Romans. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Bohrmann, M.
1989 Flavius Josephus, the Zealots and Yavne: Towards a Rereading of *The War of the Jews*. Trans. J. Lloyd. New York: Peter Lang.
- Boling, R. and G. E. Wright.

- 1982 Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary. AB 6. New York: Doubleday.
- Bonneau, N.
1997 "The Logic of Paul's Argument on the Curse of the Law in Galatians 3:10-14." NovT. XXXIX. 60-80.
- Boorer, S.
1992 The Promise of the Land as Oath: A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch. BZAW 205. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Borgen, P.
1984 "Philo of Alexandria." in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Ed. M. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press. 233-282.
- Boyarin, D.
1994 A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Braswell, J.
1991 "'The Blessing of Abraham' versus 'The Curse of the Law': Another Look at Gal 3:10-13." WTJ. 53. 73-91.
- Brichto, H.
1963 The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible. JBLMS XIII. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.
- Brinsmead, B. H.
1982 Galatians-Dialogical Response to Opponents. SBLDS 65. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Brooks, J. and C. Winbery.
1979 Syntax of New Testament Greek. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Bruce, F. F.
1971 "Galatian Problems. 3. The 'Other Gospel'." Reprinted from BJRL. Vol. 53. No. 2. Manchester: John Rylands Library.
1975 "Further Thoughts on Paul's Autobiography. Galatians 1:11-2:14." in Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag. Heraus. E. Ellis und Erich Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 21-29.

- 1982a Commentary on Galatians. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- 1982b "The Curse of the Law." in Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. D. Barrett. Ed. M. Hooker and S. Wilson. London: SPCK. 27-36.
- Brueggemann, W.
 1977 The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Buchanan, G.
 1970 The Consequences of the Covenant. Supplements to Novum Testamentum XX. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Burton, E.
 1920 The Epistle to the Galatians. I.C.C. Edinburgh/New York: T. & T. Clark/Charles Scribner's Sons.
- 1976 Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 3rd Ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Butler, T.
 1983 Joshua. WBC 7. Waco: Word Books.
- Calvert, N.
 1993 "Abraham and Idolatry: Paul's Comparison of Obedience to the Law with Idolatry in Galatians 4.1-10." in Paul and the Scriptures of Israel. Ed. C. Evans & J. Sanders. JSNTSS 83. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 222-237.
- Cassuto, U.
 1964 A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part II. Trans. I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.
- Charles, R. H., Ed.
 1913 Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Charlesworth, J.
 1983 The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 1. New York: Doubleday.
- 1985 The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday.
- Christensen, D.
 1991 Deuteronomy 1-11. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 6A. Dallas: Word Books.

- Christiansen, E.
 1995 The Covenant in Judaism & Paul. A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Clarke, E.
 1973 The Wisdom of Solomon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clements, R. E.
 1967 Abraham and David: Genesis XV and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition. London: SCM Press.
- Cohen, S.
 1979 Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition. Vol VIII. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Cole, R. A.
 1989 The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. 2nd Ed. Leicester/Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity Press/Eerdmans.
- Collins, J.
 1973 "The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses." in Studies on the Testament of Moses. Ed. G. Nickelsburg, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature. 15-32.
- 1983 Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora. New York: Crossroad.
- 1984 "Testaments," in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Ed. M. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984. 325-355.
- 1985 "The Testament (Assumption) of Moses." in Outside the Old Testament. Cambridge Commentaries on the Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. vol. 4. Ed. M. De Jonge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 145-158.
- Cosgrove, C.
 1988 The Cross and the Spirit. A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Cousar, C.
 1982 Galatians. Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- Craigie, P.

- 1976 The Book of Deuteronomy. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Craigie, P., P. Kelley, & J. Drinkard, Jr.
1991 Jeremiah 1-25. Vol. 26. WBC. Dallas: Word Books.
- Cranford, M.
1994 "The Possibility of Perfect Obedience: Paul and an Implied Premise in Galatians 3:10 and 5:3," NovT, 242-258.
- Crüsemann, F.
1996 "Human Solidarity and Ethnic Identity: Israel's Self-Definition in the Genealogical System of Genesis." in Ethnicity & the Bible. Ed. M. Brett. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 57-76.
- Dahl, N.
1977 Studies in Paul. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Dana, H. and J. Mantey.
1927 A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. Toronto: MacMillan.
- Davies, W. D.
1974 The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1982 The Territorial Dimension of Judaism. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dawson, J.
1988 Ancient Alexandrian Interpretation of Scripture. Unpublished PhD Diss. Yale University.
- Delcor, M.
1989 "The apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Hellenistic period." in The Cambridge History of Judaism. Ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein. Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 409-503.
- DeVries, S.
1985 I Kings. WBC 12. Waco: Word Books.
- Dewey, A.
1996 Spirit and Letter in Paul. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity. Vol. 33. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Diez Macho, A.

- 1978 Neophyti 1. Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana. V: Deuteronomio. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas.
- Dimant, D.
1984 "Qumran Sectarian Literature." in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Ed. M. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press. 483-550.
- Dion, P.
1991 "Deuteronomy 13: The Suppression of Alien Religious Propaganda in Israel during the Late Monarchical Era." in Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel. Ed. B. Halpern and D. Hobson. JSOTSS 124. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 147-216.
- Dommershausen, W.
1985 1 Makkabäer/2 Makkabäer. Die neue echter Bibel: Kommentar zum alten Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag.
- Donaldson, T. L.
1986 "The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3.13-14." NTS. 94-112.

1994 "'The Gospel That I Proclaim among the Gentiles' (Gal. 2.2): Universalistic or Israel-Centred?" Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker. Ed. L. Ann Jervis and P. Richardson. JSNTSS 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 166-193
- Drazin, I.
1982 Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy. An English Translation of the Text with Analysis and Commentary. NP: Ktav Publishing House.
- Dunn, J. D. G.
1988 Romans 9-16. WBC 38B. Dallas: Word Books.

1990 Jesus, Paul and the Law. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.

1991a "What was the Issue between Paul and 'Those of the Circumcision.'" Paulus und das antike Judentum. Heraus. M. Hengel und U. Heckel. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 295-312.

1991b The Partings of the Ways. London/Philadelphia: SCM Press/Trinity Press International.

1991c "Once More, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ." in Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 730-744.

- 1992 "'Yet Once More-'The Works of the Law': A Response". JSNT, 99-117.
- 1993a The Epistle to the Galatians. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black.
- 1993b The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1994 "How New Was Paul's Gospel? The Problem of Continuity and Discontinuity." Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker. Ed. L. Ann Jervis and P. Richardson. JSNTSS 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 367-388
- 1997a "4QMMT and Galatians." NTS, 147-153.
- 1997b "Paul's Conversion-A Light to Twentieth Century Disputes." Evangelium Schriftauslegung Kirche. Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65. Geburtstag. Heraus. J. Adna, S. Hafemann, und O. Hofius. Göttingen: Vanenhoeck & Ruprecht. 77-93
- Dupont-Sommer, A.
1961 The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ebeling, G.
1985 The Truth of the Gospel. An Exposition of Galatians. trans. David Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Eckstein, H.
1996 Verheissung und Gesetz. Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15-4,7. W.U.N.T. 86. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Efron, J.
1987 Studies on the Hasmonean Period. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Vol. 39. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Eissfeldt, O.
1965 The Old Testament: An Introduction. Trans. P. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Ellington, J.
1994 "Translating God's promises to Abraham." The Bible Translator. 203-205.
- Endres, J.

- 1987 Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees. CBQMS 18. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Feldman, L.
 1984 "Flavius Josephus Revisited: the Man, His Writings, and His Significance." in Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, II.21.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 763-862
- 1996 "Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*." in Studies in Hellenistic Judaism. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums XXX. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 57-82.
- Fowl, S.
 1994 "Who Can Read Abraham's Story? Allegory and Interpretive Power in Galatians." JSNT, 77-95.
- Fredriksen, P.
 1991 "Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2." JTS, 532-564.
- Freed, E.
 1994 The Apostle Paul, Christian Jew: Faithfulness and Law. Lanham/New York: University Press of America.
- Friedman, R.
 1981 The Exile and Biblical Narrative. The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works. Harvard Semitic Monographs 22. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Fung, R.
 1988 The Epistle to the Galatians. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- García Martínez, F.
 1994 The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Garlington, D.
 1990 "'ΙΕΡΟΣΥΑΕΙΝ and the Idolatry of Israel (Romans 2.22)." NTS, 142-151.
- 1991 'The Obedience of Faith': A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context. W.U.N.T. 38. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- 1997 "Role Reversal and Paul's Use of Scripture in Galatians 3.10-13." JSNT, 85-121.

- Gaston, L.
1987 Paul and the Torah. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Gaventa, B.
1991 "The Singularity of the Gospel: A Reading of Galatians." in Pauline Theology, Vol. 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon. Ed. J. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- George, T.
1994 Galatians. The New American Commentary. Vol. 30. NP: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Gilthvedt, G.
1989 Dying "Through the Law to the Law" (Gal 2:19). Unpublished Diss.: University of St. Andrews.
- Goldstein, J.
1976 I Maccabees. AB 41. New York: Doubleday.
1989 "The Hasmonean revolt and the Hasmonean Dynasty." in The Cambridge History of Judaism. Ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein. Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 292-351.
- Gordon, T. D.
1987 "The Problem at Galatia." Int. 32-43.
1989 "A Note on ΠΑΙΔΑΓΩΓΟΣ in Galatians 3.24-25." NTS 35. 150-154.
- Grossfeld, B.
1988 The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy. Translated, with Apparatus, and Notes. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 9. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Habicht, C.
1989 "The Seleucids and their Rivals." in The Cambridge Ancient History. 2nd Ed. Vol. VIII. Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B. C.. Ed. A. Astin, et. al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 324-387.
- Hafemann, S.
1995 Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel. W.U.N.T. 81. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Halpern-Amaru, B.
1994 Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature. Valley Forge: Trinity Press.
- Hansen, G. W.

- 1989 Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts. JSNTSS 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- 1994 "A Paradigm of the Apocalypse: The Gospel in the Light of Epistolary Analysis." Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker. Ed. L. Ann Jervis and P. Richardson. JSNTSS 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 194-209
- Hanson A. T.
1988 "The Origin of Paul's Use of ΠΑΙΔΑΓΩΓΟΣ for the Law." JSNT 34. 71-76.
- Harrington, D.
1973 "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34." in Studies on the Testament of Moses. Ed. G. Nickelsburg. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature. 59-68.
- 1985a "Pseudo-Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.*" in Outside the Old Testament. Cambridge Commentaries on the Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. vol. 4. Ed. M. De Jonge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 6-25.
- 1985b "Pseudo-Philo." OTP. Vol. 2. 297-303.
- Hays, R.
1983 The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- 1989 Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Hayward, R.
1987 The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 12. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- 1989 "Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Anti-Islamic Polemic." JSS. XXXIV. 77-93.
- 1991 "Pirque de Rabbi Eliezer and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan." JJS. Vol. XLII. No. 2. 215-246.
- Hillers, D.
1964 Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets. Biblica et Orientalia 16. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- 1969 Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

- Hobbs, T. R.
1985 2 Kings. WBC. Vol. 13. Waco: Word Books.
- Holladay, W.
1971 A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
1986 Jeremiah 1. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Hong, I.
1993 The Law in Galatians. JSNTSS 81. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
1994 "Does Paul Misrepresent the Jewish Law? Law and Covenant in Gal. 3:1-14." NovT, XXXVI. 164-182.
- Hooker, M.
1989 ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ. NTS, 321-342.
- Howard, G.
1990 Paul: Crisis in Galatia. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hübner, H.
1984 Law in Paul's Thought. Trans J. Greig. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Hughes, F.
1994 "The Gospel and its Rhetoric in Galatians." Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker. Ed. L. Ann Jervis and P. Richardson. JSNTSS 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 210-221.
- James, M. R.
1917 The Biblical Antiquities of Philo. Translations of Early Documents 1: Palestinian Jewish Texts. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Jaquette, J.
1995 Discerning What Counts: The Function of the *Adiaphora Topos* in Paul's Letters. SBLDS 146. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Jewett, R.
1994 "Gospel and Commensality: Social and Theological Implications of Galatians 2.14." Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker. Ed. L. Ann Jervis and P. Richardson. JSNTSS 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 240-252.

- Kallai, Z.
1983 "The Reality of the Land and the Bible." in Das Land Israel in biblischer Zeit, Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten 25. hrsg. Georg Strecker. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 76-90.
- Kim, S.
1981 The Origin of Paul's Gospel. WUNT 2.4. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Kister, M.
1992 "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah." in The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18-21 March, 1991. Ed. J. Barrera and L. Montaner. Vol. 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 571-588.
- Kline, M.
1963 Treaty of the Great King. The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Knibb, M.
1976 "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period." The Heythrop Journal. 17. 253-272.

1985a "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Ed. J. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday. 143-155.

1985b "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." in Outside the Old Testament. Cambridge Commentaries on the Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. Vol. 4. Ed. M. De Jonge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 178-192.

1987 The Qumran Community. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koch, D.
1986 Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Kuschel, K.
1995 Abraham: Sign of Hope for Jew, Christians and Muslims. Trans. J. Bowden. New York: Continuum.
- Lambrecht, J.
1994 Pauline Studies. Leuven: University Press.

- Laperrousaz, E.
 1989 "Does the Temple Scroll Date from the First or Second Century B.C.E.?" in Temple Scroll Studies. Papers presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987. Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPSS 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 91-97.
- Leaney, A.
 1966 The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning: Introduction, translation and commentary. The New Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Levinson, B.
 1996 "Recovering the Lost Original Meaning of ולא הכסה עליו (Deuteronomy 13.9)." JBL. 115. 601-620.
- Lightfoot, J. B.
 1957 The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians. Reprint of 1865 Edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Lincoln, A.
 1981 Paradise Now and Not Yet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lohse, E.
 1971 Die Texte aus Qumran. München: Kösel-Verlag.
- Longenecker, R.
 1990 Galatians. WBC 41. Dallas: Word Books.
- Lowery, R. H.
 1991 The Reforming Kings: Cults and Society in First Temple Judah. JSOTSS 120. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Lührmann, D.
 1992 Galatians: A Continental Commentary. Trans. O. C. Dean, Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Lull, D.
 1986 "'The Law was our Pedagogue': A Study in Galatians 3:19-25." JBL 105. 481-498.
- Mack, B. L.
 1984 "Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions in Alexandria." in Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, II.21.1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 227-271.

- Maher, M.
1992 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 1B. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Maier, J.
1985 The Temple Scroll. An Introduction, Translation & Commentary. JSOTSS 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Mann, T.
1991 "All the Families of the Earth': The Theological Unity of Genesis." Interpretation, XLV. 341-353
- Martin, B.
1989 Christ and the Law in Paul. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Martin, T.
1995 "Apostasy to Paganism: The Rhetorical Stasis of the Galatian Controversy." JBL, 437-461.
- Martyn, J. L.
1985 "A Law-Observant Mission to Gentiles: The Background of Galatians." SJT, 307-324.
1991 "Events in Galatia. Modified Covenantal Nomism versus God's Invasion of the Cosmos in the Singular Gospel: A Response to J. D. G. Dunn and B. R. Gaventa. in Pauline Theology. Vol. 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon. Ed. J. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
1997 Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. AB 33A. New York: Doubleday.
- Matera, F.
1992 Galatians. Sacra Pagina Series 9. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.
- Matlock, R.
1996 "Helping Paul's Argument Work? Galatians 3.10-14 in Recent Interpretation." Unpub. paper delivered at the 1996 SBL annual meeting.
- McCarthy, D.
1978 Treaty and Covenant. A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament. Analecta Biblica 21A. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
1983 "Covenant in Narratives from late OT Times." in The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall. Ed. H. Huffman, et. al. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns. 77-94.

- McComiskey, T.
1985 The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- McConville, J.
1984 Law and Theology in Deuteronomy. JSOTSS 33. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- McEleney, N.
1974 "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law." NTS. 319-341.
- McKenzie, S.
1991 The Trouble with Kings. The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XLII. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- McKnight, S.
1991 A Light Among the Nations. Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
1995 Galatians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- McLean, B.
1996 The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology. JSNTSS 126. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- McNamara, M.
1992 Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis. Translated, with Apparatus and Notes. The Aramaic Bible. Vol 1A. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Mendels, D.
1987 The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B. C. Claims to the Holy Land. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 15. Heraus. M. Hengel und P. Schäfer. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Mendenhall, G.
1954a "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition." BA 17. No. 3. 50-76.
1954b "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law." BA. 17. no. 2. 26-46.
- Metzger, B.
1957 An Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Milgrom, J.

- 1990 "Foundations and Deviations in the Laws of Purity of the Temple Scroll." in Archaeology and the History of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin, Ed. L. Schiffmann, JSPSS 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 83-99.
- Mitchell, C.
1987 The Meaning of BRK "To Bless" in the Old Testament. SBLDS 95. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Moo, D.
1983 "'Law', 'Works of the Law', and Legalism in Paul." WTJ 45. 73-100.
1987 "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years." SJT. 287-307.
- Moore, C.
1977 Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions. AB 44. (Garden City: Doubleday.
- Morland, K.
1995 The Rhetoric of Curse in Galatians. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Morris, L.
1996 Galatians: Paul's Charter of Christian Freedom. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Munck, J.
1977 Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- Murphy, F.
1993 Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mussner, F.
1974 Der Galaterbrief. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder.
- Myers, J.
1974 I and II Esdras: Introduction, Translation and Commentary. AB 42. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Neusner, J.
1973 The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Vol. 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- 1990 Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. Exile and Return in the History of Judaism. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 02. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Neyrey, J.
 1988 "Bewitched in Galatia: Paul and Cultural Anthropology." CBQ, 72-100.
- 1990 Paul, in Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Nickelsburg, G.
 1973 "An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses," in Studies on the Testament of Moses, Ed. G. Nickelsburg, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature. 33-37.
- 1981 Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- 1984 "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded." in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Ed. M. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press. 89-156.
- Nickelsburg, G. and M. Stone
 1983 Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Nolland, J.
 1981 "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" JSJ, 173-194.
- Noth, M.
 1966 "'For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse'," in The Laws of the Pentateuch and Other Studies, Trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas. Edinburgh/London: Oliver & Boyd. 108-177.
- 1981 The Deuteronomistic History. JSOTSS 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- O'Brien, P. T.
 1993 Gospel and Mission in the Writings of Paul: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Oepke, A.
 1973 Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament IX. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

- Oesterley, W.
1935 An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. New York: MacMillan.
- Olson, D.
1994 Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Orlinsky, H.
1986 "The Biblical Concept of the Land of Israel: Cornerstone of the Covenant between God and Israel," in The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives. University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity. No. 6. Ed. L Hoffman. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 27-64.
- Patte, D.
1983 Paul's Faith and the Power of the Gospel: A Structural Introduction to the Pauline Letters. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Payne, D.
1986 "Isaiah," in The International Bible Commentary. Ed. F. F. Bruce. 2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Perlitt, L.
1983 "Motive und Schichten der Landtheologie im Deuteronomium." in Das Land Israel in biblischer Zeit. Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten 25. hrsg. Georg Strecker. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 46-58.
- Priest, J.
1983 "Testament of Moses." The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Ed. J. Charlesworth. Vol. 1. New York: Doubleday. 919-926.
- Pyne, R.
1995 "The 'Seed,' the Spirit, and the Blessing of Abraham" BibSac 152. 211-222.
- Räsänen, H.
1983 Paul and the Law. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
1992 Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays. Trans. by D. Orton. J.S.N.T.S.S. 43. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Rahlfs, A.
1935 Septuaginta. 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Rajak, T.
1984 Josephus: The Historian and His Society. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

- Reider, J.
1957 The Book of Wisdom: And English Translation with Introduction and Commentary. New York: Harpers & Brothers.
- Sanders, E. P.
1977 Paul and Palestinian Judaism. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
1983 Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
1992 Judaism: Practice & Belief 63 BCE-66 CE. London/Philadelphia: SCM Press/Trinity Press International, 1992.
- Sandmel, S.
1984 "Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance." in Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. II.21.1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 3-46.
- Sandnes, K.
1991 Paul-One of the Prophets? W.U.N.T. 242. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Sarna, N.
1989 Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia/New York: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Schiffmann, L.
1983 Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code. Brown Judaic Studies 33. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
1990 "The Impurity of the Dead in the Temple Scroll." in Archaeology and the History of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin. Ed. L. Schiffmann. JSPSS 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 135-156.
1994 Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls. Philadelphia/Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Schlier, H.
1971 Der Brief an die Galater. Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. 14 Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schoeps, H.
1961 Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Trans. H. Knight. London: Lutterworth Press.

- Schottroff, W.
 1969 Der altisraelitische Fluchspruch. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 30. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Schreiner, T.
 1984 "Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible? A Re-examination of Galatians 3:10," JETS. 151-160.
 1991 "'Works of Law' in Paul," NovT. 33. 217-244.
 1993 The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Schürer, E.
 1986 The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135). Revised and Edited by G. Vermes, et. al. Vol. III. Part I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
 1987 The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135). Revised and Edited by G. Vermes, et. al. Vol. III. Part II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Scott, J.
 1993a "'For as Many as are of Works of the Law are under a Curse' (Galatians 3.10)." in Paul and the Scriptures of Israel. Ed. C. Evans & J. Sanders. JSNTSS 83. Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 187-221.
 1993b "Paul's Use of Deuteronomic Tradition." IBL. 112. 645-665.
 1995 Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians. W.U.N.T. 84. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Segal, A.
 1990 Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Seland, T.
 1995 Establishment Violence in Philo & Luke: A Study of Non-Conformity to the Torah & Jewish Vigilante Reactions. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Silva, M.
 1996 Explorations in Exegetical Method: Galatians as a Test Case. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

- Skehan, P. and A. DiLella
 1987 The Wisdom of Ben Sira. AB 39. New York: Doubleday.
- Smiles, V.
 1988 The Gospel and the Law in Galatia: Paul's Response to Jewish-Christian Separatism and the Threat of Galatian Apostasy. Unpub. PhD Thesis: Fordham University, 1988.
- Smith, R.
 1984 Micah-Malachi. Vol. 32. WBC. Waco: Word Books.
- Stadelmann, H.
 1980 Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum. W.U.N.T. 2.6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Stanley, C.
 1990 "'Under a Curse': A Fresh Reading of Galatians 3.10-14." NTS, 481-551.
 1992 Paul and the Language of Scripture. Citation technique in the Pauline Epistles and contemporary literature. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stanton, G.
 1996 "The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ." in Paul and the Mosaic Law. Ed. J. D. G. Dunn. W.U.N.T. 89. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 99-116.
- Stuart, D.
 1987 Hosea-Jonah. Vol. 31. WBC. Waco: Word Books.
- Stuckenbruck, L.
 1995 Angel Veneration and Christology. A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John. W.U.N.T. 2. 70. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Stuhlmacher, P.
 1991 "The Pauline Gospel." in The Gospel and the Gospels. Ed. P. Stuhlmacher. Trans. J. Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 149-172.
- Talmon, S.
 1991 "The Internal Diversification of Judaism in the Early Second Temple Period." in Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. Ed. S. Talmon. JSPSS 10. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 16-43.

- Taylor, N.
1992 Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity. JSNTSS 66. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Thielman, F.
1989 From Plight to Solution. A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. LXI. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
1994 Paul & the Law: A Contextual Approach. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Thiering, B.
1989 "The Date and Composition of the Temple Scroll" in Temple Scroll Studies. Papers presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987. Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPSS 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 99-120.
- Thuruthumaly, J.
1981 Blessing in St Paul (Eulogein in St Paul). Pontifical Institute Publications No. 35. Mannanam, India: St. Joseph's Press.
- Tomson, P.
1990 Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Assen/Minneapolis: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press.
- Tromp, J.
1993 The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 10. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Turner, L.
1990 Announcements of Plot in Genesis. JSOTSS 96. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Tyson, J.
1973 "'Works of Law' in Galatians." JBL. 423-431.
- VanderKam, J.
1985 "The Book of Jubilees." in Outside the Old Testament. Cambridge Commentaries on the Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. Vol 4. Ed. M. de Jonge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 111-144.
1994 The Dead Sea Scrolls Today. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- van Unnik, W. C.

- 1974 "Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num 25.1ff)." in Travels in the World of the Old Testament. Studies Presented to Professor M. A. Beek on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday. Ed. M. Heerma van Voss, et. al.. Assen: Van Gorcum. 241-261.
- Vermes, G.
 1973 Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. 2nd Ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
 1987 The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Third Edition. London: Penguin Books.
- von der Osten-Sacken, P.
 1987 Evangelium and Tora: Aufsätze zu Paulus. Theologische Bücherei. Bd. 77. München: Chr Kaiser Verlag.
- von Rad, G.
 1953 Studies in Deuteronomy. Trans. D. Stalker. London: SCM Press.
 1961 Genesis: A Commentary. Trans. J. Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
 1966 Deuteronomy. The Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press.
- Watson, F.
 1986 Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wehmeier, G.
 1970 Der Segen im Alten Testament. Theologischen Dissertationen 6. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt.
- Weinfeld, M.
 1972 Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Weingreen, J.
 1959 A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew. 2nd Ed. Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- Weitzman, S.
 1996 "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit." IBL 115. 49-61
- Weltman, S.
 1990 The Biblical Polemic against the foreign divine images. Unpublished PhD Diss., Drew University.

- Wenham, G.
1994 Genesis 16-50. WBC 2. Dallas: Word Books.
- Wernberg-Møller, P.
1957 The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Vol. 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Westerholm, S.
1986 "Torah, nomos, and law: A question of 'meaning'." Studies in Religion. 15. 327-336.

1988 Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Westermann, C.
1978 Blessing in the Bible and the Life of the Church. Trans. K. Crim. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1980 The Promises to the Fathers: Studies on the Patriarchal Narratives, trans. D. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1985 Genesis 12-36: A Commentary. Trans. John Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Williams, S.
1988 "Promise in Galatians: A Reading of Paul's Reading of Scripture." JBL. 709-720.

1997 Galatians. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Winger, M.
1992 By What Law? The Meaning of Νόμος in the Letters of Paul. SBLDS 128. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Winston, D.
1979 The Wisdom of Solomon. The Anchor Bible. Vol. 43. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Wintermute, O. S.
1985 "Jubilees." The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Ed. J. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday. 35-51.
- Witherington, B.
1991 "The Influence of Galatians on Hebrews." NTS. 37. 146-152.

- 1994 Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Wright, C.
1990 God's People in God's Land: Family, Land, and Property in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids/Exeter: Eerdmans/Paternoster.
- Wright, N. T.
1992a The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Thought. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
1992b The New Testament and the People of God. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
1994 "Gospel and Theology in Galatians." Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker. Ed. L. Ann Jervis and P. Richardson. JSNTSS 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 222-239.
- Yadin, Y.
1983 The Temple Scroll. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Young, N.
1987 " PAIDAGOGOS: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor." NovT. 151-176.
1998 "Who's Cursed—And Why? (Galatians 3:10-14)." IBL. 117. 79-92.
- Zeiltin, S.
1950 The First Book of Maccabees. Trans. S. Tedesche. New York: Harper & Brothers.

